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Abstract

This dissertation begins by outlining the underlying factors impacting the provision of care through advisory programs in schools through a widespread literature review. The networked model of the ecological systems theory is used to represent the influences that the different stakeholders have in an advisory program. A needs assessment follows that empirically examined how the problem of ineffective high school advisory programs manifests itself at the International School of Kenya (ISK). Then, a comprehensive literature review frames the intervention for an effective high school advisory program and training program for teacher advisors. Due to the researcher’s context, instead of applying and evaluating a particular program, the school decided to implement a high school wide program and have the researcher evaluate the 11th and 12th grade portion of the program. The evaluation of the program is described in detail. Further, the findings of the evaluation study are presented including reliability measures for the different scales created followed by quantitative and qualitative findings for both process and outcome evaluation of redesigned high school advisory program. This dissertation ends with a discussion of the findings, which identifies limitations of the study and recommendations for moving forward.

Advisor: Dr. Douglas Mac Iver
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To each and every one of the students I’ve crossed paths with during my teaching career. Thanks for allowing me to be part of your story. Thanks to all of you who said yes to giving back to our community through local action projects. Your hard work has definitely paid off.

It is without a doubt that I believe you have already changed the world.
Preface

This applied dissertation was completed to better understand the effect consistent and valuable social, emotional, and academic support from teachers can have on high school students. As it becomes clear that high school need to change (Hamilton & Mackinnon, 2013) to accommodate for students’ socioemotional needs in a more personalized way (McClure, Yonezawa, & Jones, 2010), an in-depth evaluation of the International School of Kenya’s (ISK) advisory program was necessary. This program was underdeveloped and students did not respect it as evidenced anecdotally when students during the researcher’s first assembly laughed out loud when reminded to attend advisory. The longitudinal ten-month study which evaluated ISK’s eleventh and twelfth grade advisory program and teacher advisors training sessions took two years to plan and one to implement. A needs assessment took place during the spring semester of 2017, which informed the decision of ISK’s leadership team to make the advisory program and the provision of social, emotional, and academic support one of its priorities for the 2018-2019 academic year.

Echoing what the needs assessment found, the literature indicated that teacher advisors need to have clear roles and expectations (Phillippo & Stone, 2013; Cole, 1994) to increase their feelings of self-efficacy (Bandura, 1986) around the new role they have been assigned. There are different ways of advising, undergraduate advising literature proposed three types: (a) prescriptive, (b) developmental (Crookston, 1994), and (c) “learning-centered advising” (Lowenstein, 2005, p.72). ISK created an advisory working group to redesign the its advisory program, they combined the three types of advising along with structures provided by The Advisory Toolkit (Fauci et al., 2006) and The Advisory Guide: Designing and Implementing Effective Advisory Programs in Secondary Schools (Poliner & Lieber, 2004). The researcher and the high school assistant principal planned the advisor training sessions with feedback from grade level leaders about the needs of their particular advisors.
All high school students and teachers participated in the advisory program, as it was an ISK initiative. However, the evaluation study only covered the eleventh and twelfth grade programs. Convenience sampling was used to gather the sample that rendered 13 students and 7 teachers participating. The study followed an explanatory sequential design with quantitative data, surveys, completed pre, mid, and post program by students and pre and post program by teacher advisors. Qualitative data was collected after the mid and post program surveys with students and after the post program survey with teacher advisors. Students participated in grade level specific focus groups while teacher advisors participated in individual semi-structured interviews. Most findings were not statistically significant, due in large part to the small sample size; there was a positive increase trend in most variables collected. As the program moves forward, it is important to ensure that all students are receiving the same quality support from their advisors and that the program is being implemented consistently. Further, consistent and valuable professional development for teacher advisors is needed to increase their self-efficacy on this new role as well as their buy-in for it.
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Chapter 1 Overview

This chapter introduces the researcher’s problem of practice by emphasizing the need for an effective implementation of an advisory program at the high school level. There are three underlying factors for the problem: (a) evolution of schools, (b) evolution of teacher role, and (c) the fostering of teacher-student relationships. Two theoretical frameworks, Bandura’s (1986) social cognitive theory, and Ainsworth’s (1989) attachment theory are used to explore said factors. Neal and Neal’s (2013) networked model of the ecological systems theory is used to represent the different influences that the different stakeholders have in the advisory program. As times change, high schools need to do so too (Hamilton & Mackinnon, 2013) and among those changes is the evolution of what duties a teacher is expected to fulfill (Phillippo & Stone, 2013). For this to happen effectively, and ensure that teachers take on the role of advisors, ongoing training (Gatta, McCabe, & Edgar, 1997) and the promotion of self-efficacy are key (Cole, 1994). If this happens along with a culturally relevant atmosphere (Ladson-Billings, 1995; Watson, Sealey-Ruiz, & Jackson, 2014), secure relationships between advisors and advisees are more prone to happen, increasing student’s perceived teacher support and decreasing academic worry, the internalization of symptoms and physical health problems (Conner, Miles, & Pope, 2014).
Chapter 1: Introduction to the Problem of Practice

**Advisory programs (and why high schools need them)**

Advisory programs are not new in the educational arena, rather, they have gone through different iterations as the needs of teenagers have changed, and a call for restructuring high schools has surfaced (Hamilton & Mackinnon, 2013). Since the nineteenth century, educators in secondary schools have also played the role of advisors, providing students with vocational guidance. However, from the middle of the twentieth century, the need for a distinct time when advisors could regularly meet with the group of advisees assigned to them was identified as a pressing need (Galassi, Gulledge, & Cox, 1997a). The subsequent establishment of structured advisory programs in secondary schools featuring regular advisor-advisee group meetings -- especially in middle schools -- was an effort to ensure that every student in these schools had at least one adult in the school who really knows them, cares about them, and was available to help them with their problems (Mac Iver, 1990; George & Alexander, 1993).

In 1995, the Carnegie Council on Adolescent Development summarized a decade of work that they had supported to help middle grades schools transform themselves to better meet the needs of young adolescents in *Great Transitions: Preparing adolescents for a new century* report. This report reiterated the "fundamental need of young people […] for a stable, supportive bond with a caring adult who can help them prepare for social roles that earn respect, route them to needed resources, and encourage them to persist in education" (Carnegie Council on Adolescent Development, 1995, p. 11). This need does not disappear once these young people make the transition to high school. Thus, recent proposals to restructure high schools include: (a) a greater degree of personalization of the educational experience (McClure, Yanezawa, & Jones, 2010), (b) an increase in school belonging through the intentional nurturing of non-academic teacher-student advocacy relationships
(Roybal, Thornton, & Usinger, 2014), and (c) an increase in the sense of community (Shulkind & Foote, 2009). Further, it is a misconception that transition ends in the middle grades; there is an array of complex changes that occur when students go from Middle School to High School (Myrick & Myrick, 1990) and later on from High School to College. These transitions are dealt with more efficiently when there is "at least one person in the school whom the student can turn for assistance" (Myrick & Myrick, 1990, p. 11).

A lot of researchers have provided the different components that an advisory program should have to be effective (Galassi, Gulledge & Cox, 1997b; Shulkind & Foote, 2009; Benson & Poliner, 2013). However, few have provided an overarching definition of this program. Cole (1992) defines the advisory program as “an organizational structure in which one small group of students identifies with and belongs to one educator, who nurtures, advocates for, and shepherds through school the individuals in that group” (p. 5). It is this definition that best embodies what the International School of Kenya (ISK), the researcher’s school, sets out to do. However, similar to many of the schools studied in the existing research, the school had a variety of objectives for the program with no clear roadmap of how to meet those diverse objectives. ISK’s 2016 advisory program had four main objectives: (a) support experiential learning, (b) address personal and social concerns, (c) tackle different grade-dependent counseling matters, and (d) assign each student a teacher available for close guidance providing academic, social and emotional support (International School of Kenya, 2016).

Bronfenbrenner’s (1979) ecological systems theory (EST) provides a framework to explain and understand individuals in a particular context or setting. This theory stresses the importance of “proximal processes [which are] enduring forms of interaction [that] occur on a fairly regular basis over extended periods of time” (Bronfenbrenner, 1979, p. 1644). The original model presented a nested organization of the different systems at play (microsystem,
mesosystem, exosystem and macrosystem). However, Neal and Neal (2013) reformulated it into a networked model.

ISK’s advisory program can be examined further using this networked model. Rather than having students as the focal individual of the model, the advisory program itself becomes the focus, which allows for the highlighting of all the different interactions and underlying factors that influence this program. Figure 1.1 illustrates the interaction between all of the identified stakeholders of the advisory program: (a) students/advisees, (b) teachers/advisors, (c) organizers, (d) leadership team, (e) parents, and (f) the board of directors.

![Networked Model of Ecological Systems, Focused on the Advisory program at ISK.](image_url)

In ISK’s advisory program, there are three microsystems: (a) Advisory program-Teachers/advisors-Students/advisees, (b) Advisory program-Teachers/Advisors-Advisory organizers-Leadership team, and (c) Advisory program-Students/Advisees-Parents-Leadership team. There are two mesosystemic interactions: (a) Leadership team-Advisory organizers and (b) Students/Advisees-Parents. In the former, input from the leadership team frames (i.e. objectives or administrative needs) what the advisory organizers can plan and
implement. While the latter presents a more complicated and intricate relationship as the current context of ISK has more than 70 nationalities, the effect of parental input (i.e. values and expectations) may differ by child. There are also two exosystems: (a) Parents-Board of Directors and (b) Leadership Team-Board of directors, in which decisions made regarding the direction the school is going will exert an influence indirectly on the advisory program and its objectives. The macrosystem is the school’s vision to prepare students for tomorrow’s challenges while the chronosystem is the ever-changing interactions in the advisory program, as students/advisees in an international school tend to move every two years, as do teachers/advisors.

Problem Statement

High schools are fast-paced environments (Cawelti, 1989), where students feel out of place and lacking meaningful connections with peers and teachers (Brown, 2001). Recent calls to restructure high schools (e.g., Hamilton & Mackinnon, 2013, p. 9), include calls to focus on “positive youth development” in order “to optimize student engagement and effort”, to create “caring, consistent student-adult relationships” and to “develop and deploy the collective strengths” of teachers playing multiple, differentiated teacher roles to meet students’ needs. Such calls have led some high schools to revamp and strengthen their advisory programs. Students are exposed to increased amounts of stress in high school due to high academic expectations, their extracurricular commitments, and the need to make consequential decisions about their future. As a result they need consistent, caring teacher support. Those which have such support are less likely to develop physical and mental illnesses (Conner, Miles, & Pope, 2014). Instituting advisor-advisee relationships establishes teacher support, fosters a sense of community (Shulkind & Foote, 2009), creates an advocate for that student (Anfara, 2006), and increases levels of personalization (McClure et al., 2010).
During the academic year of 2016-2017, the researcher identified the advisory program at The International School of Kenya as not fulfilling its primary objective, which was to address personal and social concerns of students as well as providing that close guidance relationship between advisor and advisee (International School of Kenya, 2016). Rather, administrative activities that interfere with group cohesion and the advisor-advisee bond took place during the program’s allocated time. Not too much changed during the 2017-2018 academic year as the advisory program became bi-weekly rather than weekly and attached to student’s free block. However, during the 2018-2019 the high school leadership at ISK made the advisory program one of its priorities to ensure that students receive consistent and valuable social, emotional, and academic support. The program implemented and the study conducted to evaluate it are described in subsequent chapters of this dissertation.

**Theoretical Frameworks**

Two theoretical perspectives guided the study: (a) Bandura’s (1986) social learning theory and (b) Ainsworth’s (1989) attachment theory. Two key components of Bandura’s theory, self-efficacy, and reciprocal determinism provided the framework to understand the manner in which both students and teachers act in an advisory program. Regularly, teachers are trained to deal with classroom management and academic issues. However, when expanding the role to that of an advisor (Phillippo & Stone, 2013), teachers feel unprepared to deal with the added emotional and social concerns. This leads to a lack of buy-in and the failure of said program (Cole, 1994). These feelings of unpreparedness or incompetence are due to a lack of what Bandura coined as self-efficacy. Self-efficacy, as described by Bandura (1986), is the individual’s “judgment of their [own] capabilities to deal effectively with different realities” (p. 21). Allowing teachers to build self-efficacy around their role as advisors is imperative for the success of any advisory program (Anwar, 2014).
Advisory programs can become the vehicle for a school to create an environment that is conducive to student learning, the formation of relationships, and for positive personal growth (Miglin, Stephens, Hurd, & Al-Bataineh, 2015). In his reciprocal determinism model, Bandura (1986) recognizes the importance of the environment and how it has an important influence on the individual’s cognitions and behaviors. It is through careful planning and effective implementation that a supportive environment established in an advisory program (Shulkind & Foote, 2009; Benson & Poliner, 2013) can influence the advisee’s perception of the support received from their advisor (Conner et al., 2014; Danielsen, Samdal, Herland, & Wold, 2009; Klem & Connell, 2004; Wang & Eccles, 2012). By creating a supportive, trusting and caring environment (Ladson-Billings, 1995) positive mentoring relationships between advisors and advisees are more prone to occur.

Further, Ainsworth’s (1989) attachment theory provides a framework to understand the affectionate bond that could be fostered between advisors and advisees in an advisory program that ensures continuity for a few years. This theory looks at the behavioral system of individuals to form a bond that “yields a survival advantage […] increasing [their] chances of being protected by those to whom he or she keeps proximity” (Ainsworth, 1989, p. 709). If students are in an advisory group where their advisor gets to know them, their relationship can turn into an affectionate bond that makes the advisor evolve into an advocate for the student (Anfara, 2006). An advisor can become for students a secondary attachment figure in the school setting characterized as secure (Van Ryzin, 2010) when dealing with academic, social and emotional issues.

**Literature Review**

**Evolution of Schools**

During most of the twentieth century, schools were the place where students would get trained for simple and repetitive factory jobs, however, during the twenty-first century,
the focus of education changed to ensure students are informed critical thinkers (Leland & Kasten, 2002). Despite this, educational practices seem to remain the same, being reactive rather than proactive, educational leaders identify a problem and develop a course that deals with the issue (Tyack & Cuban, 1995).

The restructuring of high schools in the United States was a palpable need during the twentieth century as more and more high school graduates were unprepared for personal, academic and professional life challenges (Gardener, Larsen, Baker, Campbell, & Crosby, 1983). Advisory programs have been embedded into schools since the 1800s (Galassi et al., 1997a); however, it became evident that only addressing the vocational component of high school (Wraga, 1998) was not enough. Students needed to have at least one "teacher or other adult in the school [that] really knows them, cares about them, or is available to help them with their problems" (Mac Iver, 1990, p. 458).

The Great Transitions report called for the creation of communities of learning in middle schools, which would entail a safe environment where teachers and students could foster trusting relationships between each other (Carnegie Council on Adolescent Development, 1995). Being able to establish these communities in high schools as well provides for greater "personalization [which] raises student's expectations for themselves and teachers' expectations for students" (McClure et al., 2010, p. 3), and enhances the school’s learning environment.

Making a conscious decision to provide students with a personalized experience that enhances their educational experience is a key step to ensure meeting student needs in such as a fast-paced environment (Cawelti, 1989). Rutledge, Cohen-Vogel, Osborne-Lampkin, and Roberts (2015) explored this possibility and found that high performing schools made deliberate efforts to personalize while connecting not only with students but also parents, while the principals informed students of high expectations for both internal and external
examinations. A way of personalizing the student experience is through a version of the learning communities proposed by the Carnegie Council on Adolescent Development (1995) also known as group advisories. Hagborg (1995) conducted a study with a sample of 140 White students from 9th and 10th grade that were randomly assigned to groups of 12 to 14 who met weekly for 45 minutes with a teacher advisor. The results indicated that satisfaction with group advisories was gender-driven, perhaps due to its verbal nature where students share their thoughts and feelings: females had higher satisfaction with group advisories than with other highly organized activities.

**Need for program innovation/competition.** Advisory programs were implemented in secondary schools because they proved to be an effective strategy in the middle grades (Manning & Saddlemire, 1998). However, it has created a monopoly (Betts, 2005) in which advisory has become the single program used to address the academic, social and emotional needs of students (Cawelti, 1989). With a lack of competition, there is no need to change the program, as there are no benchmarks to compare its effectiveness with other alternative programs (Berends, Goldring, Stein, & Cravens, 2010). Two alternatives to the advisory program that are structured differently but address similar objectives are the House System (Green, 2006) and small learning communities (Carnegie Council on Adolescent Development, 1995; Hooper, 1999; Cotton, 2001).

The House system has its roots in the English education system, where students are placed in a house with students from all grades and are assigned a housemaster and different teacher advisors (Dierenfield, 1975). Under this system, the school can showcase their diversity through the houses and encourage students to take on different positive behaviors that will be rewarded with points while competing against other houses for a reward at the end of the school year (Green, 2006). This program fulfills most of the objectives set forth by an advisory program as it allows students to have a sense of belonging to something bigger
than themselves as they stick with their house until they graduate; it fosters a sense of community through different competitive activities and personalizes the educational experience the student has in school (Green, 2006). Brennan (2012) implemented the House system in a Catholic school in Phoenix with the objective of fostering a stronger sense of community and Catholic identity. The sample consisted of 72 students, K-8, and 18 teachers, who completed surveys pre and post the implementation of the House system, ten students, 5th to 8th grade, and six teachers participated in a focus group. The researcher found that although the system creates group cohesion between members of the same house, teachers and students alike, the close relationship attained by an advisory program between advisor and advisee is not achieved by the House system. However, the sample size was small and the context very particular, conducting studies in the United Kingdom where the House system is more common could yield more reliable results.

As in the House model, small learning communities exist under the premise that human interaction will increase if the complexity of the organization decreases; achieved by breaking down the structure into smaller units (Hooper, 1999). A small learning community is a model that includes a group of students and teachers that meet in a common place during the school day (Cotton, 2001). By adopting these types of communities, schools would move from the compartmentalized traditional sense of education where every teacher has their subject area to a more organized cross-disciplinary approach to education (Oxley, 1994). This model fulfills most of the objectives of an advisory program; the smaller educational setting allows for a higher rate of personalization of the educational experience, allowing students to feel a sense of belonging as teachers and students alike know them, and fostering a sense of community through the cross-disciplinary approach (Cotton, 2001). This model calls for a complete restructure of the school and allows for the close relationships between students and
teachers throughout the day rather than in a separate time frame, however, the personal advocacy relationship is weaker (Hooper, 1999) than the one present in an advisory program.

**Experiential/authentic experiences.** Providing students with authentic learning experiences is one of the new challenges educators face. However, it is this type of experiences that will provide a surge in understanding and learning (Brown, Collins, & Duguid, 1989). Students need exposure to experiential learning activities that will allow them to transfer what is learned in the classroom to real life scenarios (Cobb & Bowers, 1999). These can be achieved through different strategies such as (a) career and work exploration course (Gaylor & Nicol, 2016), (b) a summer pre-college program (Harkness, Johnson, Hensley, & Stallworth, 2010), and (c) a work-based internship program (Bennett, 2007).

Gaylor & Nicol’s (2006) approach examined the relationship between student enrollment in a career and work exploration course and career decision-making self-efficacy as well as career exploration motivation in a public high school in the Canadian province of Saskatchewan. The sample consisted of 14 students, pulled from 11th and 12th grade, who completed the Career Decision-Making Self-Efficacy Scale before and after enrolled in the aforementioned course. Data collected was analyzed thematically and using dependent t-tests. Students that enrolled in the course demonstrated higher motivation and confidence related to career-related decision-making self-efficacy, however due to the small sample size the results need to be considered cautiously. Going beyond a high school course, Harkness et al. (2010) examined the implementation of the Southwest Ohio Secondary Teachers Academy summer immersion college program ran in conjunction with the University of Cincinnati and Miami University attended by students who expressed interest in becoming mathematics or science teachers. After the program, during the participant’s senior year in high school, they participated in five Saturday sessions addressing college readiness. The program ran for two years, the first one being a pilot year to polish the program and the second year were the
study was conducted. The study had an ethnically diverse sample of 44 students from Ohio. Paired t-tests were conducted and it was found that student’s knowledge about college life increased, their image of college changed and expanded due to their exposure to the two different systems. Leaving the four walls of a classroom, Bennett (2007) examined the effect of a mandatory sixty-hour work-based internship program in Midwestern US high schools. Behind the study lays the importance of preparing students for what they will find in the workplace as well as the increasing unemployment rates among recent graduates. The study found that receiving social support from a mentor in the workplace positively impacted seniors’ disposition towards occupational engagement. This positive impact was due to the higher reception of feedback on the seniors’ performance in a more personalized fashion that was supportive and conducive to learning in preparation for their eventual joining to the workplace. Finding ways in which schools can implement these types of programs is imperative to reap the benefits of them.

**Evolution of teacher role**

The role that a teacher holds in a school is one that has been characterized by what happens inside a classroom, where the teacher imparts knowledge by standing in front of rows of students sitting on desks waiting to be filled with information. However, as the needs of students change due to the different circumstances they encounter both inside and outside the classroom, the expectation of what a teacher is supposed to be and do has evolved to include different roles such as the one of advisor (Galassi at al., 1997a) and advocate for students (Anfara, 2006).

The evolution of the teacher role into the advisor role, where almost no input from teachers has been collected and has been guided by external needs, has led some teachers to feel incompetent when it comes to this evolved role (Galassi et al., 1997a). It is now an expectation for teachers to fulfill a “fundamental need of young people […] for a stable,
supportive bond with a caring adult who can help them prepare for social roles that earn respect, route them to needed resources and encourage them to persist in education” (Carnegie Council on Adolescent Development, 1995, p.11). This can happen in two distinct ways, during class or during the advisory program. In the latter option, teachers are expected to create a positive teacher-student relationship, informally counsel students in their advisory group about their daily stressors and, at times, become an informal social worker while identifying any problems at home (Phillippo, 2013). Providing students with a stable support system is a feat that should not fall over only on the advisor, but a well-thought-out group of individuals that can provide both formal and informal support.

The expansion of high school teachers’ roles to include the responsibility to advise their students and provide them with academic and socio-emotional supports can meaningfully enhance students’ academic experiences during the high school years, if these teachers receive the professional development supports, curriculum supports, and planning supports they need to understand and fulfill this new responsibility (Phillippo, 2013). Not only that but, by understanding and fulfilling this new role, teachers forge closer, more satisfying, relationships with their students which helps keep the teachers from wanting to leave the profession (Myrick & Myrick, 1990).

**Teacher self-efficacy.** In line with Bandura’s (1986) self-efficacy construct and the expansion of the role teachers need to take as they embark on advisory programs (Phillippo, 2010; Phillippo & Stone, 2013), the construct of teacher self-efficacy emerges and remains center stage as it is imperative for the success of any advisory program (Cole, 1994). The construct can be defined as “teacher’s belief in his/her own ability to plan, organize, and execute actions that are required to achieve desired educational targets” (Anwar, 2014, p.10). Further, Pfitzner-Eden (2016) recognizes that teacher self-efficacy is more adaptable at the
early stages of a teacher’s career as they are still mastering the different components of the educational arena both inside and outside the classroom.

Expanding the role of what teachers are familiar with causes teacher self-efficacy to come into play and questioned as teachers are presented with diverse challenges they had never encountered before. The advisory program presents such challenges, where teachers need to go beyond their regular classroom duties and provide students with not only academic, but also social and emotional support (Yonezawa, McLure, & Jones, 2012), forging with students “relationships and not only [filling a] time slot” (Benson & Poliner, 2013, p. 52).

Phillippo (2010) conducted a qualitative study in which she examined how teachers in small high schools enacted the role of advisors providing social and emotional support beyond academics. The researcher also examined the effect the teacher’s personal schema on what an advisor ought to do affected the way the enactment of the role. Using a purposive sample, teachers from Californian schools were chosen who met the following student characteristics: (a) 40% low-income; (b) 65% or more nonwhite; and (c) no more than 400 students. All schools had an advisory program where classroom teachers took on the role of advisors. However, each program was applied at differing degrees depending on the school. During a six-week period, observations and interviews were conducted with 44 teacher advisors to collect data on how the teachers guided and supported their advisees socially and emotionally. Data was also collected on the advisor’s understanding of the role itself and their perception of the expectations of an advisor. Teachers with higher human resources or life experiences showed more confidence in establishing caring relationships with their advisees. Further, teacher advisors that had a clear and well-developed schema of the role of advisor were able to provide socio-emotional support even when not explicitly prompted to do so and in more complex situations. It is imperative to have teachers understand what the
advisor role entails as their understanding of it will allow them to feel confident, increase their self-efficacy and provide students in their advisory group the support they need. Phillippo’s results and conclusions need to be interpreted with caution, especially when trying to generalize them to larger high schools, as large high schools may have a different set of challenges.

**Lack of training and preparation.** One of the major concerns teachers raise when addressing the topic of the advisory program is not having the necessary skills provided to them so they can achieve the objectives set forth. This should be addressed with teacher professional development which should occur not only at the beginning of the year, but throughout the whole year ensuring different issues that come up are dealt with appropriately (Gatta, McCabe, & Edgar, 1997). The lack of consistent professional development focusing on the successful implementation of an advisory program is a disservice to teachers as the program turns into one more thing teachers need to plan for on top of their other school-related responsibilities (Galassi et al. 1997a). This lack of clarity and technical support from the administration or advisory leadership team perpetuates the lack of buy-in teachers have when new initiatives are brought into schools (Cole, 1994).

Niska (2013) conducted a quantitative study in schools of New England that examined the effect that professional development can have on middle school teachers that become advisors. Specifically, it looked into the impact of acquiring new knowledge and skills to take on the advisor role as well as the effect coaching can have on the quality of the advisory program. The researcher acquired the sample of 34 advisors from five different schools through convenience sampling, most of them being non-Latino White females with differing years of experience. The advisors were randomly assigned to one of three conditions: (a) no professional development; (b) 42-hour course on advisory; and (c) 42-hour course and coaching for 20-24 sessions. Advisors were asked to fill out a pre-and post
Advisor Knowledge Assessment to test the effect of the professional development course. Additionally, throughout the intervention, advisors were observed randomly to evaluate their performance; this was a single blind procedure as the observer was not aware of the advisor's assigned condition. The researcher found that advisors in conditions B and C showcased a significant difference in knowledge about group development and understanding of student voice. In line with Bandura’s (1986) emphasis on the importance of the environment, advisors in condition C were more aware of the importance of physical and emotional environment, which echoed in their professional practice. Finally, advisors in condition C also increased their feelings of self-efficacy in regards to the role of advisor, being part of professional development and having the support of their coach, validated their efforts and increased their confidence.

**Fostering teacher-student relationships**

Advisory programs depend on the fostering of a relationship between teachers and students in their new roles as advisors and advisees. Belonging is an essential need for humans, who actively seek out and work on to foster relationships (Smerdon, 2002). Klem and Connel (2004) recognize the importance of students’ need to establish and perceive a relationship with their teachers. As is common in the interaction of people, some people like each other more than others, this is true for teacher-student (Raufelder, Scherber, & Wood, 2016) and advisor-advisee relationships. Establishing a strong relationship between advisor and advisee is not a simple task, especially in a controlled and formal environment that can lead to students finding the relationship artificial (Noddings, 1992).

Teachers that become advisors are expected to foster relationships with students assigned to their advisory period. Every teacher brings with them different characteristics that could predict the fostering of such relationship (Yoon, 2002) or that can determine the type of relationship fostered (Cooper & Miness, 2014).
Yoon (2002) conducted a quantitative study that examined three teacher characteristics as possible predictors of teacher-student relationships; specifically, the effect of: 1) the stress the teacher experienced in handling behaviorally challenging students, 2) the negative affect the teacher experienced in interacting with his or her students, and 3) the self-efficacy of the teacher in relating to disruptive or oppositional students. The researchers selected their sample of 113 elementary teachers using convenience sampling from two metropolitan districts in the United States. Ninety five percent of the sampled teachers were female and 88% were Caucasian. Teachers completed a survey in May and asked to consider the whole school year when reporting on their relationships with their students. Teachers reported on their perceived stress, self-efficacy to deal with challenging students, negative affect and the percentage of students with whom they had good relationships and the percentage of students with whom they had negative relationships. The researcher found that the teachers who reported significantly more negative relationships with students were those teachers who reported higher levels of stress and negative affect. These teachers with high levels of stress and negative affect also reported substantially less self-efficacy than other teachers. Thus, it is evident that to avoid negative relationships with students; teachers need to have stress and negative feelings under control to ensure that their self-efficacy can enable them to deal with challenging situations. This can be seen in advisory sessions when teachers might need to deal with or become an advocate for a student’s challenging personal or academic situation while feeling unprepared for the role they have been assigned and are also dealing with the day-to-day stresses of teaching. Beyond day-to-day stresses, examining the effects of unexpected stressors in the teacher’s life and how this affects the fostering of a positive relationship with advisees is of upmost importance since life tends to be unpredictable.
Moving away from a teacher-centric perspective in the fostering of relationships with students, Cooper and Miness (2014) conducted a mixed method study that used data from a larger study on student’s perceptions of high school in a large city in Texas. The study examined the role that student’s perception of teacher understanding influenced the development of caring relationships with teachers. More specifically, it examined the difference between caring as a virtue and caring as relationship. They also investigated if there were any teacher behaviors or dispositions specific to the type of relationship formed between teachers and students. Through the use of a survey that included questions about teacher care and understanding, the researchers chose five classrooms to observe, and six to eight students from each class to interview. Teachers identified as virtuously caring were likable and caring towards the whole group, while teachers identified as relationally caring would establish one-on-one conversations with students and go beyond a teacher’s duty. Students that experienced the most well-rounded relationships with their teachers were those where teachers understood them both personally and academically. This was the case thanks to a combination of both student and teacher dispositional factors or what Bandura (1986) would call personal factors in his reciprocal determinism model, as the students opened up to the teachers as they showed interest and developed an understanding for the student as both a learner and an individual. Advisory programs look to help virtuously-caring teachers become relationally-caring advisors who go beyond the duties of a regular teacher and grow to be advocates for their students while also equipping these students to also advocate for themselves inside and outside of school.

Culturally relevant and deep relationships in the midst of wide cultural diversity and mobility. The International School of Kenya has a context in which its student population has a high mobility rate and is made up of more than 70 nationalities (International School of Kenya, 2016). On average, there is a 20% student population...
turnover at ISK’s high school (J. Dale, personal communication, June 1, 2019). Most students are globetrotters, Third Culture Kids (TCKs) who have accompanied their parents across multiple international moves as their parents’ careers have taken them away from their home culture to live, study, and work abroad. As a result, these TCKs are raised neither fully in their parent’s culture nor fully in the world of the other culture(s) where they have lived and gone to school (Pollock & Van Reken, 2004, p. 6). Advisory programs in international schools need to take the special needs and assets of TCKs into consideration when planning not only their advisory sessions but also the other transition-related supports they provide incoming and outgoing students. For example, international schools should seek to provide sessions and supports that help TCKs reflect upon and value their wide-ranging experiences and learning opportunities while also adaptively coping with: a) the grief and shock that serial cultural transitions may trigger and b) the disrupted relationships that may occur as students leave places, or prepare to leave places, where they have begun to put down roots.

With so many different home cultures influencing the school’s culture, it is also important for international schools to have culturally relevant pedagogies and guiding philosophies (Ladson-Billings, 1995) that build a community where everyone can develop a sense of belonging (Watson et al., 2014) both inside and outside the advisory program. Ladson-Billings (1995, p.160) defines cultural relevant pedagogy as a process that focuses on collective empowerment of a group rather than that of an individual. She argues that students need to experience success in their academics and develop cultural competence and a critical consciousness (e.g., to critique the social order of their own culture(s) and other cultures). Ladson-Billings conducted an ethnographic study of eight teachers in a low income, predominantly African American school district who were successful with African American students. Both African American parents and principals nominated teachers they felt were excellent in their practice, had high attendance rates and low disciplinary issues. Teachers
that appeared in both nomination lists were invited to participate. At surface levels, the researcher couldn’t find similarities, however once she got past teaching strategies; she found that these teachers shared “philosophical and ideological underpinnings of their practice” (Ladson-Billings, 1995, p. 162). The researcher found that all teachers were proud of their profession, they all felt part of a community and wanted to give back to it, they felt responsible to work for their student’s success, and they maintained a fluid relationship with their students. This relationship with all students went beyond the classroom and allowed for the fostering for a community of learners where everyone was responsible for everyone else’s learning. Teachers in the study were able to meet their curricular needs by maintaining a culturally responsive classroom where they would critically analyze the content being presented.

Culturally relevant care and relationships allow educators to understand their students by raising awareness of the assets each student possesses and brings in from home. However, to fully understand what effective culturally relevant pedagogy looks like in a wider variety of contexts, it is important to replicate this study in districts serving other ethnic groups who are outside of the broader culture’s mainstream (e.g., predominantly Hispanic or Native American districts in the U.S.) and to also study highly diverse schools and districts that teach students from many cultures and backgrounds.

**Perceived social support.** Student’s perception of the support being offered by teacher advisors can impact not only their academics, but also their social and emotional wellbeing (Conner et al., 2014). Raufelder et al. (2016) found a positive effect that stems from a caring relationship between advisors and advisees, which provides evidence for Bandura’s (1986) reciprocal determinism model and its focus on the environment. The researchers conducted a quantitative study that examined if student motivation influenced by liking a particular teacher will have a mediating effect between teacher-student relationship
and academic self-regulation. The random sample for the study from 23 public secondary schools in Brandenburg, Germany, consisted of 1088 students aged 12 to 15. This age group was selected as they typically demonstrate lower levels of motivation. Their study showed that when students perceive a positive teacher-student relationship or even just liking one of their teachers, their motivation tends to be higher and they strive to achieve more in their academics. Females reported higher motivation based on liking a particular teacher. If positive, caring relationships are nurtured, there will be a “responsive environment […] that can help set the foundation for student success” (Ellerbrock et al., 2015, p. 51) inside and outside the classroom.

Klem and Connell (2004) also provide evidence for Bandura’s (1986) focus on the environment and the importance of student perceptions of the support provided by teacher advisors. The researchers pulled their sample from a longitudinal dataset of six elementary schools and three secondary schools from the 1990-1995 school years composed of 1,846 elementary students and 2,430 secondary students. Students, parents and teachers completed the Research Assessment Package for Schools. The researchers found that students will report higher engagement if they perceive their teachers as caring and creators of a conducive environment for learning who hold high and clear expectations. Further, disengaged students are more likely to report low levels of teacher support.

Perception of support has different benefits for students; Yonezawa et al. (2012) found that when high school students perceive a “considerate and high expectation approach” (p. 43) they tend to have a higher level of school engagement and work ethic. Furthermore, when students perceive the advisor-advisee relationship in a positive light, student’s feeling of identification and membership with the school increases, especially those students who entered high school with low levels of membership (Smerdon, 2002). This perception of a positive relationship can lead to the formation of what Ainsworth’s (1989) refers to as secure
attachment and turn the advisor-advisee relationship into more of an affectionate bond. Which raises the question if students need to perceive support from only one adult in the school or from more, this was the main research question that Conner et al. (2014) examined in their quantitative study. The researchers examined perceived teacher support in the context of well-resourced, high-performing schools, more specifically, how these perceptions relate to student’s reports on their physical health and academic woes. Further, they researched if it is more beneficial for students to perceive support from the majority of teachers or to have one close relationship with a teacher. All 14 high-performing schools applied to be part of the study that would provide them with baseline data on their student’s experience. The sample consisted of 5,557 students from grades 9 to 12, almost evenly split between genders. Students completed the Stanford Survey of Adolescent School Experiences that measured perceived teacher support as well as school engagement, health, and integrity as well as a self-report on how many teachers really care for students. There was a higher significant negative correlation between perceiving support from more than one teacher and academic worry, internalizing symptoms and physical health problems. Although this finding might seem contrary to advisory program’s need for one adult to care for the student, it actually highlights the need of not only one adult, but a support system from part of the entire staff that is committed to provide holistic and comprehensive support for academic, social and emotional needs as they arise (Shockley, Schumacher, & Smith, 1984, p. 70).

**Summary of Factors and Underlying Causes**

As times change and high school students face different realities and problems, their schools need to restructure and provide a more comprehensive support system that addresses adolescents’ most-pressing needs (Hamilton & Mackinnon, 2013). One of the avenues schools can explore is the implementation of an advisory program (Benson & Poliner, 2013) that meets academic, social and emotional needs of students. Having a clear mission on what
the advisory program wants to achieve and the role expectations of an advisor (Phillippo & Stone, 2013) will allow teacher advisors to create a culturally relevant atmosphere. This clarity will allow for an increase in trust and openness (Ladson-Billings, 1995; Watson et al., 2014) in the whole campus with an increase in perceived teacher support. This new environment will allow schools to reap the benefits of students fostering secure relationships with not only one but with multiple adults (Conner et al., 2014) that can potentially become advocates for the student (Anfara, 2006). Therefore, the following three factors will be explored empirically in Chapter 2 in the context of the International School of Kenya (ISK) as these factors illuminate how ISK might increase the effectiveness of its advisory program: (a) the evolution of ISK to meet current student needs better; (b) the evolution of the teacher role at ISK to that of an advisor and the need for training and promotion of self-efficacy; and (c) the fostering of secure teacher-student relationships with an emphasis on perceived teacher support at ISK.
Chapter 2 Overview

This chapter empirically examines how the problem of ineffective high school advisory programs manifested itself in the 2016-2017 academic year at the International School of Kenya (ISK). At the time, there were three different programs in different grade levels at ISK: an experiential learning program for ninth grade, a work experience program for tenth grade and what sounds like a traditional advisory setup for eleventh and twelfth grade. To assess these programs, two surveys were constructed, one for students \((N=54)\) and one for teachers \((N=12)\), that collected quantitative data. Selected data from the school’s annual school climate survey was also used to triangulate the data collected by the researcher. Data analyses focused on whether survey items intended as multiple indicators of a construct displayed enough internal consistency to support the construction of a composite scale to measure that construct. Analyses also focused on providing descriptive statistics on key measures to document the strengths and weaknesses of ISK’s advisory program in 2016-2017 and to identify needs of advisors and students that were not being adequately addressed.

Composite scales of sufficient reliability could be created for all key constructs except for Teacher Role Breadth. Descriptive statistics from the student data suggested that ISK was not adequately addressing personal and social concerns of students nor providing a close guidance relationship between advisor and advisee. For example, both female and male students reported low levels of closeness to and influence from their advisor, though male students reported significantly greater closeness and influence than did female students. Data from the teacher survey showed that teachers’ self-efficacy as an advisor was lower in the ninth and tenth grade, which may be attributed to the complexity of the programs in these grade levels. Further, across all grade levels, most teachers wanted to have a say in the personalization of advisory sessions.
Chapter 2: Empirical examination of the factor and underlying causes

Professional Context

The International School of Kenya (ISK) is located in Nairobi, Kenya. It is a co-ed K-12 institution that serves a diverse student body, more than 70 nationalities are represented. During the 2016-2017 school year, 943 students were enrolled at ISK, 335 in the high school, which represented 47 nationalities. Most of the students enrolled at ISK are considered Third Culture Kids as most of them have been relocated from their original culture to accommodate their parent’s professional commitments.

Problem of Practice in Context

The 2016-2017 school year marked the first one that the researcher was at the International School of Kenya. When the researcher attended the first high school assembly of the year, a single mention of advisory caused laughter among most of the students. It was the following week when the researcher found himself with an assigned advisory period with no training, form of direct guidance, or clear expectations about his role or the program itself. The researcher was not familiar with any of the students and was not provided any information about them. Although the high school had a set list of objectives for the program as a whole, there was no cohesion in it. Each grade level seemed to have its own program and with unique expectations for both teachers and students. An experiential design program replaced the 2015-2016 ninth grade program while a work-experience preparation replaced the former tenth-grade program as initiatives from particular teachers. The eleventh and twelfth-grade programs were almost nonexistent. Advisory groups met once every two weeks. However, these upperclassmen did not usually show up, sessions with a clear agenda were rare, and sessions were not replaced if holidays or other events interfered with them. At times, upperclassmen advisory groups could have been meeting monthly or not at all. Even
though attendance was mandatory and taken, there was no follow-up or clearly delineated consequences for missing an upperclassmen advisory group meeting.

It was also evident that different advisors took their roles differently than others. In some sessions with detailed plans some advisors completed the plan; but others let their advisees out early without completing the proposed activity. Also, some teachers tended to let students work completely on their own (rather than facilitating the activities) and ignored off task behavior (i.e. using phones or computers for social media access). Students were not taking advantage of advisory’s potential; students were not even aware of the purpose of advisory, as every year it had a different approach, which was not communicated to them explicitly. Students constantly expressed their frustration about the advisory programs, wanting to have a longer lunch break, rather than going to a session where not even the advisor was engaged.

The hoped for evolution of each advisor from a traditional classroom teacher to one who advocates for and provides supports for their advisees’ best interests holistically (academic, social and emotional) is not easy, and had not happened at ISK during the 2016-2017 school year. Teachers still acted as regular classroom teachers during advisory, instructing students to complete the task at hand, and in some cases, did not even interact with their advisees. It is important that teacher advisor start conversations with their students to ensure they see advisory as a place where trusting and open advisor-advisee relationships can be fostered. However, that was not the case during the 2016-2017 school year.

Purpose

The needs assessment presented in this chapter was guided by both the literature on advisory programs as well as the program’s situation during the 2016-2017 school year. The program did not work as a unit; rather, it worked as three different entities with no scope or sequence. Students, teacher advisors, teacher organizers, administration, parents, and the
school’s board of directors were all identified as key stakeholders in the advisory program. However, only the first two were chosen for the needs assessment as their experience was essential to understand the problem from the ground up and influence whatever change was needed. It is students and teacher advisors who experience first hand the need to challenge the industrial model of education and enact a more personalized model that supports each student’s specific needs (Fauci et al., 2006). Each group of stakeholders has a different experience with the advisory program, and it was important to capture their thoughts to ensure a clear understanding of said program. The needs assessments allowed the researcher to capture what the school was doing right and what areas of the advisory program needed to be modified to ensure that the objectives of said program were met or establish if a full revamp was needed.

The student survey was designed to answer four research questions:

RQ1. What is the transition experience of students?

RQ2. What is the perceived social support and academic press students feel from their advisors?

RQ3. Do students consider their advisors as part of their attachment network?

RQ4. Do students perceive an influence from their advisors inside and outside of the school setting?

The teacher survey was designed to answer three research questions:

RQ5. How effective do teachers feel in their role as advisors?

RQ6. What is the teacher advisor’s knowledge and perspective on the supportive and transition activities of the program?

RQ7. What are teacher preferences in regard to the advisory program’s organization?

The use of student data from the school’s annual climate survey allowed the researcher to triangulate the data collected from the need assessment’s student survey with
the support students perceive from teachers in general, as reported on the climate survey. In addition, the climate survey data provided valuable information from a larger sample of students regarding different underlying factors of the problem of practice like school membership and the fostering of a safe, open and trustworthy school-wide environment.

**Method**

**Participants**

For this needs assessment, two of the major stakeholders identified for the advisory program were surveyed: teachers/advisors and students/advisees. These represented the two entities that interact most directly in the program itself. Secondary data on school climate not collected by the researcher but through a school-wide student survey was used to triangulate the data collected through the student sample.

**Students.** Complying with the guidelines set forth by the school’s leadership team when approving this needs assessment, the student sample was taken from the five sections of Psychology courses that the researcher teaches. The leadership team pointed out that students from all grade levels take these courses, and felt that it was desirable to avoid a high school wide disruption that surveying the entire student population would entail. The resulting sample consisted of 54 students, which was 71% of the researchers’ student population and 16% of the entire high school population. Students from all grade levels participated in the survey. The sample was composed as follows: (a) 50% twelfth grade students \((n=27)\), (b) 32% eleventh grade students \((n=17)\), (c) 7% tenth grade students \((n=4)\), and (d) 11% ninth grade students \((n=6)\). One student of the tenth grade was excused from the survey as he was part of the researcher’s own advisory group. The sample was primarily female (76%) and the age of respondents ranged from 14 to 18, with 39% being 17. Twenty different nationalities of the 47 reported nationalities in the high school were represented in the sample. This does
not include dual nationalities, which were 13 cases in the sample. The United States and Kenyan nationalities were the modes with five respondents (9%) each.

**Teachers.** There are 39 faculty members in the high school available to be advisors. Thirty-four of them were advisors during the 2016-2017 school year. There were eleven advisors in ninth grade, seven in tenth grade, eight in eleventh grade and eight in twelfth grade. Twelve (35%) of those teacher advisors, three per grade level, were surveyed based on convenience sampling. Their ages ranged from 31 to 50 years of age while there was an even split in the respondent’s gender. There were seven different nationalities represented, the United States being the mode with 42% of the respondents. Further, there was a range in years of experience as advisors, two being the minimum and 20 the maximum with an average of 8.5 years.

**Secondary data on school climate.** All students from fifth to twelfth grade were prompted to answer the online survey on school climate. Looking at the high school results, 229 students (68%) out of the 334 students completed the survey. The completion percentage by grade level was the following: (a) ninth grade, 48% (47 students out of 97); (b) tenth grade, 81% (54 student out of 66); (c) eleventh grade, 67% (50 students out of 74); and (d) twelfth grade, 80% (78 students out of 97).

**Measures**

Two different surveys were constructed using published scales and new questions created by the researcher and his advisor to assess the needs of the advisory program at the International School of Kenya. Each of them was focused on the respondents and their experience as part of the advisory program, one for students (Appendix A) and one for teachers (Appendix B). The school climate survey (Appendix C) was created by the leadership team of the school and has been applied for years to compile longitudinal data. Chronbach’s alpha was used to report internal reliability of all composite measures.
Students. The student survey was constructed to collect data about different variables identified in the literature and the observations of the advisory program. The following variables were included: (a) student transition experience, (b) student perceived social support, (c) student perceived academic press, and (d) student’s attachment network.

Student transition experience. The high school students’ at ISK have had multiple transition experiences in their young lives and are expecting more ahead. Most students are considered third culture kids (TCKs) who have moved around often. Pollock and Van Reken (2004) define TCKs as “a person who has spent a significant part of his or her developmental years outside the parents’ culture. The TCK frequently builds relationships to all of the cultures, while not having full ownership in any.” Students frequently transition both into and out of the school, whether to move to another international school in another country or to college. The survey prompted students to indicate the number of countries they had lived in since birth and whether or not they would stay in Kenya after high school graduation and the country they would most probably go to.

Student perceived social support. This variable was defined as the extent to which students perceive teacher support in regard to their academic, social, and emotional issues, through their willingness to help, be fair, listen and make a sincere effort to establish a close relationship. It was measured through two different scales: Phillippo and Stone’s (2013) student survey items of the Teacher Support Scale ($\alpha=0.78$) applied in three metropolitan high schools in California and an adapted version of the Teacher Support Scale ($\alpha=0.96$ for frequency and $\alpha=0.91$ for importance) in Malecki, Demaray and Elliott’s (2000) The Child and Adolescent Social Support Scale, applied in Midwestern US public schools, that replaced the term teacher for advisor. The former is a true/false scale in which the option unsure was added after a participant in the cognitive interview process suggested it, the latter is a two-part scale where respondents answered how often they receive the support described on a 6-
point scale ranging from never (1) to always (6) and in the second part of the scale they reported how important this support is to them on a 3-point scale ranging from not important (7) to very important (9).

**Student perceived academic press.** This variable was defined as high expectations regarding student academic performance and was measured using Phillippo and Stone’s (2013) student survey items of the *Teacher Academic Press Scale* (*α*=0.82). This scale is composed of six items on a 4-point scale ranging from strongly disagree (1) to strongly agree (4).

**Student’s attachment network.** This variable was defined as the extent to which a student considers their advisor a secondary attachment figure as reported in their closeness and inclusion in their support network as well as the reported influence the advisor plays in the student’s life. It was measured through two different scales: the influence portion of the *What sort of relationship do I have with my advisor?* section of Van Ryzin’s (2010) *Long-Term Effects of Learning Environments* survey applied to 209 secondary school students, and an adapted version of Trinke and Bartholomew’s (1997) *Attachment Network questionnaire*, applied to 223 university students. Van Ryzin’s (2010) section was composed of three parts: (a) two open questions regarding time spent with advisor over the past week, (b) a checklist of shared activities with advisor over the past week, and (c) ten items on a 7-point scale ranging from strongly disagree (1) to strongly agree (7) on advisor’s influence (*α*=0.81). The adapted version of the *Attachment network questionnaire* prompted respondents in five open questions to provide the name and relationship to them of the person in their school setting to whom they would want to/ actually go to or would like to go to when something bad happens.

**Teachers.** The teacher survey was constructed to collect data about different variables identified in the literature and the observations of the advisory program. Two variables were
included to collect data on the teacher role in the advisory program: (a) teacher role breadth and (b) teacher self-efficacy. Three separate variables were included to collect data on the program’s effectiveness: (a) supportive activities, (b) transition activities, and (c) planning preference.

**Teacher role breadth.** This variable was defined as the teacher’s intentional inclusion of social and emotional support of students in their definition of their professional responsibilities, in this case being an advisor. It was measured using Phillippo and Stone’s (2013) teacher survey items of the *Role Breadth Scale*. This scale is composed of fourteen items on a 6-point scale ranging from strongly disagree (1) to strongly agree (6). The researchers did not use the scale as whole, rather they combined certain items and created a yes or no scale regarding role breadth. For this study, the researcher explored more illuminating ways of combining the items into composite measures, capturing key aspects of teacher’s role definition and breadth.

**Teacher self-efficacy.** This variable, defined as the beliefs teachers hold about their ability to successfully organize and take action on activities related to their own teaching responsibilities, in this case being an advisor. It was measured using Phillippo and Stone’s (2013) teacher survey items of the *Efficacy Scale* ($\alpha=0.92$). This scale is composed of sixteen items on a 5-point scale ranging from not confident at all (1) to highly confident (5). An additional seventeenth item was added by this researcher (Understand when and who to contact when a student needs support) after a teacher proposed it be added during the cognitive interview process prior to finalizing the teacher survey for the needs assessment. If the scale was to be reused, this researcher recommends the original response options be modified to omit the “neutral” midpoint option as it does not seem to represent a true midpoint in a confidence scale.
Supportive activities. This variable, defined as the activities that center around social or emotional needs of students like meeting with the student to provide guidance. It was measured using Mac Iver and Epstein’s (1991) Use of supportive activities section of their Practices, Programs, Policies and Staff in the middle grades questionnaire. This scale is composed of nine items on a 5-point scale ranging from never (1) to daily (5) and, in its original application, this scale predicted lower projected dropout rates.

Transition activities. This variable, defined as the activities that prepare students as they: (a) leave a grade level; (b) leave the school; (c) arrive at school at the beginning of a new school year; or (d) arrive at school mid-year. All of these ensure that students transition successfully. It was measured using an adapted version of Mac Iver and Epstein’s (1991) Organization of the Transition from the elementary to the middle grades section of their Practices, Programs, Policies and Staff in the middle grades questionnaire. This adaptation measured the: (a) transition to high school of new students using a seven-item yes or no scale, which would benefit from the inclusion of an “unsure” option, (b) transition from high school to college using an open question about activities that take place to prepare students to smoothly transition to college, and (c) transition of new students at the beginning and mid-year transfers with four items on a four-point scale, ranging from weak (1) to excellent (4) where respondents were prompted to match their ideal program with how transitions occur in the school. In its original application, this scale predicted lower number of students needing to repeat the grade level immediately following a transition.

Planning Preference. This variable, defined as the extent to which teachers would prefer a set plan for advisory session versus an open-ended session plan to be adapted depending on the needs of their advisees. It was measured through a closed question that asked teacher respondents their preference on whether they wanted to: (a) plan their own advisory sessions, (b) have a detailed plan for each advisory session, or (c) have a say in
personalizing detailed advisory sessions. The third option was added after the cognitive interview process when it was suggested by one of the participating teachers.

**Secondary data on school climate.** This variable was defined as the student's perception of a safe and nurturing school environment centered on student learning. It was measured using a questionnaire created by the leadership team at the researcher’s school. This online questionnaire is composed of one item that collected student grade level and 12 items on a 4-point scale ranging from strongly disagree (1) to strongly agree (4).

**Data Collection Methods**

Different procedures were followed for teachers and students who responded their corresponding survey described in the section above. All data collection methods were presented and approved by the leadership team of the researcher’s school. The school followed their own procedure to collect the School Climate data, by sending an email with a SurveyMonkey link to the student school-wide survey.

**Students.** During the first five minutes of a class period, students were briefed by the researcher about the objectives of the needs assessment, the problem of practice and their role in the data collection. The student and parent letter of consent (Appendix D) was distributed, and students were instructed to read it and ask questions if necessary. They were instructed to bring it back next class. Students had the option to sign up for a time where they were available to complete the survey; this included the next class period. All students signed up to take the survey during class, which accommodated their multiple commitments. Students that returned their letter of consent were instructed to sit and wait for a survey. Students sat away from each other to avoid any distraction or response bias. The researcher distributed surveys and instructed students to fill out the demographic information. Directions were read out loud by the researcher for every section. Once students were done, the surveys were collected. Students were then debriefed on the contents of the survey, reminded they could withdraw
their results at any time, reminded that if they had any questions, they could contact the researcher or his advisor and finally that they would get a summary of the results.

**Teachers.** An email was sent to all grade level advisors asking for voluntary participation in the needs assessment, providing a short description of the objective of the data collection. Teachers were asked to provide a time of their convenience when they could answer the teacher survey. Eight of the 34 advisors responded and set up an appointment for the researcher to go to their classroom and administer the survey. Teachers were briefed on the objective of the needs assessment, and each of them read over and signed the teacher consent form (Appendix E). The researcher answered any questions the respondents had during the survey. After the survey was completed, the respondents were debriefed on the contents of the survey, reminded they could withdraw their results at any time, reminded that if they had any questions they could contact the researcher or his advisor and finally that they would get a summary of the results. To complete the survey sample, missing teachers from each grade level were approached by the researcher to complete the survey; the same procedure was followed with each of the missing four respondents.

**Secondary data on school climate.** All high school students were emailed about responding to the survey on school climate. There were daily reminders for two weeks in the daily bulletin, two email reminders, and an announcement during assembly. Teachers were asked to remind students to complete the questionnaire during class as well. Students received a link to the SurveyMonkey questionnaire.

**Findings and Discussions**

All the data collected from the student and teacher survey was uploaded into SPSS by the researcher, and a different number of analyses were conducted to make sense of the data, and the variables studied with the guidance of my advisor. This section outlines the key
findings found driven by the research questions posed in the Goal and Objectives section of this report.

**Student Survey Results**

**RQ1. What is the transition experience of students?** Having a majority expatriate student body, it is important to describe the student’s transition experience. Student respondents \( N=54 \) reported on the number of countries they have lived in since birth. Only 11\% of the sample \( n=6 \) reported having lived in one country, 24 \% \( n=13 \) in two, 20\% \( n=11 \) in three, 19\% \( n=10 \) in four, while 26\% \( n=14 \) reported having lived in five or more countries.

In regard to their transition experience after their time in the high school, 96\% \( n=52 \) of the sample indicated that they would not stay in Kenya after high school graduation. Respondents identified twelve different destinations they would mostly probably go to, being the United States the most popular option with 43\% \( n=23 \) and the United Kingdom, including England and Scotland, the second most popular option with 24\% \( n=13 \) of respondents.

**RQ2. What is the perceived social support and academic press students feel from their advisors?** Part of student’s perceived social support from their advisor revolves around how close they feel to them. The two items that measured the relative closeness students feel towards their advisors were significantly correlated \( r=0.8, p<0.01 \). Perceived closeness was calculated by averaging both items. Male students report a higher relative closeness \( M=3.23 \) than females \( M=2.32 \) on the 7-point scale \( F(1, 52)= 4.57, p=0.04 \). However both values are on the negative side of the scale, which indicates a lack of relative closeness from the perception of students. No other demographic variable had a significant relationship with this computed variable. Reporting to have completed an activity one-on-one with their advisor over the week prior to the survey was a strong predictor of perceived closeness.
However even respondents that reported completing an activity with their advisor were below the midpoint of the scale ($M=3.65$).

Each of the two scales for perceived social support from advisors was computed into a particular variable for analysis. Advisor support was computed using the adaptation of the Phillippo and Stone (2013) scale by including the “Unsure” option in between the “Yes” and “No” ($\alpha=0.85$). Advisor support 2 was computed using the adapted version of the Malecki, Demaray, and Elliot (2000) scale ($\alpha=0.92$). The computed advisor support variables have a positive significant correlation ($r=0.9$, $p<0.001$). Importance of advisor support was measured by the second section of Malecki et al.’s (2000) scale ($\alpha=0.88$).

Significant positive correlations between the different computed variables previously mentioned were found: (a) perceived closeness and advisor support 1 ($r=0.61$, $p<0.01$), (b) perceived closeness and advisor support 2 ($r=0.65$, $p<0.01$), and (c) perceived closeness and importance of advisor support ($r=0.31$, $p<0.05$).

From the demographics collected, only gender rendered significant results when comparing means with the computed variables. Both genders reported similar values in the advisor support 1 scale [Male, $M=2.4$ and Female, $M=2.05$; $F(1,52)=5.9$, $p<0.02$] with two representing the “Unsure” option. Males reported higher levels of perceived advisor support in the second scale ($M=3.6$) closer to the “Most of the time” option unlike females ($M=2.89$) that were closer to the “Some of the time” option [$F(1,52)=5.18$, $p<0.03$].

Perceived academic press from advisors was measured through an adapted version of Phillippo and Stone’s (2013) scale ($\alpha=0.88$). Only gender rendered a significant comparison [Male, $M=2.5$ and Female, $M=2.02$; $F(1,52)=5.55$, $p<0.02$] indicating that all respondents are in the negative side of the scale, disagreeing or strongly disagreeing that their advisor is pressing them academically. However, significant relationships were found between perceived academic press and: (a) advisor support 1 ($r=0.81$, $p<0.01$); (b) advisor support 2
(r=0.89, p<0.01); and perceived closeness to advisor (r=0.61, p<0.01). This indicates that the more students reported a perceived academic press from their advisor, the closer they felt to him or her and more support they perceived from them. In a school that holds academic standards in high regard, this finding could indicate that the advisor could potentially become part of the student’s support system as someone who pushes academically but is also aware of social and emotional needs.

RQ3. Do students consider their advisors as part of their attachment network?

Student respondents only mentioned their advisor in three of the five open questions regarding their attachment network in school. No more than two respondents (3.7%) mentioned their advisor in the questions where they were included. This contrasts with Van Ryzin’s (2010) results where he found that 40% of respondents reported their advisor as a secondary attachment figure. “Friend” was the most common option in each question with “no one” and “counselor” close behind in all questions.

RQ4. Do students perceive an influence from their advisors inside and outside of the school setting? Perceived advisor influence was computed including 10 items from Van Ryzin’s (2010) scale (α=0.86). Only gender rendered a significant comparison, males (M=2.43) recognizing a little more influence than females (M=1.79) [F(1,52)=4.51, p<0.04]. Both genders can be found in the negative side of the scale closer to the “disagree a little” and “strongly disagree” options in regard to advisor influence over their life.

Significant relationships were found between perceived advisor influence and: (a) advisor support 1 (r=0.72, p<0.01); (b) advisor support 2 (r=0.71, p<0.01), (c) perceived academic press (r=0.68, p<0.01), and (d) perceived closeness to advisor (r=0.73, p<0.01). Building a relationship in advisory and providing support while still maintaining high academic standards and emotional care provides the platform for advisors to influence student’s life inside and outside the classroom.
**Teacher survey results**

**RQ5. How effective do teachers feel in their role as advisors?** The scale used to determine the teacher role breadth from Phillippo and Stone (2013) did not hold well with the sample ($\alpha=0.5$). When the items were analyzed, two separate scales could be formed, one that looked at the perception of the role breadth while the other focused on teacher perception of the advisory program. But neither scale had acceptable internal consistency reliability. However, particular items do provide valuable information regarding teacher perception of the role they need to take on as advisors. More than 80% ($n=10$) of teacher respondents slightly agreed to strongly agreed that they believe they must be both a teacher and a counselor to their students, more than 80% ($n=10$) also believe that their primary role is not only to teach students, they also need to deal with their emotions and feelings. However, once mental health issues were brought up, 74% ($n=8$) of teachers recognized that professionals other than themselves should be primarily responsible for student’s well-being. All teachers agreed or strongly agreed that they play an important role in their student’s life in general. Thus, teachers’ perceptions of the role they were playing in students’ lives contrasted with the low levels of perceived advisor influence reported by both male and female students that was described earlier.

Further, teacher self-efficacy regarding their role as advisors, was measured using Phillippo and Stone’s (2013) scale ($\alpha=0.88$). Two items did not make positive contribute to the scale’s reliability. These two items, measured the advisor’s self-efficacy in connecting students to: (1) specific resources or (2) specific contacts when they are in need. One of the items came from the original scale while one was an item added to the scale during cognitive interviews. Not only were these two items not strongly related to the other items on the scale, they did not correlate significantly with each other. Once these items were removed, the
scale’s reliability increased to $\alpha=0.89$. Thus, Teacher self-efficacy scale scores in this needs assessments used the shortened version of the scale.

With one exception, demographic variables were unrelated to teacher self-efficacy. The grade level of teacher’s advisory group however was correlated with teacher self-efficacy ($r=0.71$, $p<0.01$). The higher the grade level, the more self-efficacious the advisor felt. For example, there was a 1.13 point difference in self-efficacy between ninth grade teacher advisors and twelfth grade advisors. Looking at the context of the different programs of advisory, this makes sense as ninth grade teachers ran an experiential design program and tenth grade advisors ran a work experience training program, which are both more demanding than the biweekly check-in meetings eleventh and twelfth grade advisors conducted with their advisees.

**RQ6. What is the teacher advisor’s knowledge and perspective on the supportive and transition activities of the program?** From the provided list of supportive activities, no teacher respondent selected the “Daily” option. Only in the first three items (Meet with individual students about problems; Give career information and guidance; and Discuss academic problems or issues) was the option “Weekly” chosen. All other question responses mean scores ranged from a 1.25 to a 1.91 which correspond to the “Never” and “Few per year” options. Administrative activities are replacing supportive activities that aid students in their high school experience and beyond.

The scale regarding teacher knowledge about student transitions into the school would have benefitted from adding an “unsure” option. Although 60% of teachers reported that transition activities for new students are not planned, 83% reported that orientation is planned for students, which might indicate a discrepancy between what teachers and the school consider a transition activity. Most teachers reported that new students do not attend regular
classes or assembly before enrolling and that they do not communicate with the new student’s previous teachers.

Ensuring that seniors have a smooth transition to college is imperative in the school, however 33% of teacher respondents were sure there were no activities or were not sure about what is planned to prepare students. The other 66% respondents split evenly reporting that counselor based activities along with the optional skills driven senior week occurred. Not enough is being run for seniors to ensure a successful transition occurs.

Finally, the teacher perception of the advisory program as an ideal match to what they would want in a program was surveyed through the use of Mac Iver and Epstein’s (1991) scale ($\alpha=0.9$). Removing the last item, which deals with senior transition to college rather than incoming student’s transition into the school, increases the reliability measure to $\alpha=0.91$. No teacher respondent considered the program to be an excellent ideal match to the program they would like to see. Mid-semester transition had the lowest mean score ($M=1.75$), while beginning of the year transition had the highest ($M=2.33$), indicating that most teachers believe that the school is running a fair program, which needs to improve or add several practices.

**RQ7. What are teacher preferences in regard to the advisory program’s organization?** No teacher respondent selected the plan your own advisory sessions option. Most respondents, 92% ($n=11$) selected the third option that included an element of freedom in personalizing detailed advisory sessions. Only one respondent would like to have a detailed plan to follow for each advisory session.

**School climate survey results**

Through careful analysis of the questions in the school climate survey, it was evident that some of them were not applicable to the scope of this study. Four out of the twelve
questions could further inform the researcher about what was found through the student survey.

For the item “my teachers know me as an individual person”, 76% of respondents agreed or strongly agreed. For the “I am treated with respect at ISK” item, 87% agreed or strongly agreed. Also, 80% of the respondents considered ISK to be a caring community, where 94% of respondents can feel safe and secure. However, this does not match with the low scores reported in the student survey with regard to perceived social support from advisors or closeness to them, which most closely relate to the 45% of respondents that disagreed with the statement: “Others listen when I have ideas about improving the school.” These results are inconsistent with the findings of the research regarding perceived support and influence from advisors, the same environment students are reporting about ISK should be mimicked in the advisory sessions.

**Key Takeaways from the Needs Assessment**

The needs assessment found that students did not perceive a close relationship with their teacher advisor. Also, that although male students reported greater closeness with their advisors as compared to females, the value was still on the negative side of the scale with typical responses of “not close at all” when referring to the perceived closeness to their advisor. Further, teacher advisors reported that they believed they play an important role in the student’s life; however, students did not agree and reported low to null influence from their advisors. Additionally, teacher advisors reported they did not feel ready to take on the new role of advisor. Finally, most teacher advisors reported they would like to have a say on personalizing advisory sessions depending on their advisees’ needs.
Chapter 3 Overview

There is a need to implement effective advisory programs in high schools to provide positive advocacy relationships between teacher advisors and students (Anfara, 2006). There were three underlying factors for the researcher's problem of practice: (a) evolution of schools, (b) evolution of teacher role, and (c) the fostering of teacher-student relationships. As was shown in the Spring 2017 needs assessment reported in Chapter 2, the International School of Kenya’s high school advisory program was not providing academic, social and emotional support to students by fostering a close relationship with their advisor. This chapter reviews the literature relevant to high school advisory programs, and because there is a gap in the peer-reviewed literature regarding high school advisory programs, literature related to undergraduate advising is also explored. Crookston (1994) proposed two types of advising, prescriptive and developmental, and Lowenstein (2005) proposed “learning-centered advising” (p.72). There are different ways of advising students, individually, in group sessions or mediated by technology. Teacher advisors need clarity around their new role (Phillippo & Stone, 2013) to get on board a new program (Cole, 1994). Their self-efficacy (Bandura, 1986) needs to be fostered to ensure they form close relationships with their advisees and follow a personalized ethic of care (Noddings, 2005). This can be achieved through professional development sessions that are ongoing and focused. The International School of Kenya planned on training teachers so they could implement the redesigned high school advisory program during the 2018-2019 school year.
Chapter 3: Intervention Literature Review

Introduction

Because there is a gap in the peer-reviewed literature regarding high school advisory programs, the literature related to undergraduate advising is explored in depth especially in regard to the type of advising. Crookston (1994) proposed two types of advising, prescriptive and developmental, while Lowenstein (2005) proposed a third type, “learning-centered advising” (p.72). There are different ways of advising students, individually (Anderson, Motto, & Bourdeaux, 2014), in group sessions (Battin, 2014) or mediated by technology (Alfarsi, Omar, & Juma, 2017; Kalamkarian & Karp, 2017). There are different ways of structuring a high school advisory, Poliner and Lieber (2004) presented a procedure that allows schools a lot of freedom, while Fauci, Ossenheimer, Christenson, Shulkind, and Tsapatsaris (2006) presented a more structured way. To be able to implement any of the different ways of advising, teacher advisors need to be clear about their role (Phillippo & Stone, 2013) to ensure buy-in (Cole, 1994). Their self-efficacy (Bandura, 1986) needs to be fostered to ensure they can foster close relationships and follow a personalized ethic of care (Noddings, 2005).

This chapter summarizes the problem of practice identified in the researcher’s school, the International School of Kenya (ISK), mentioning the underlying factors identified in Chapter 1 of this dissertation. Following Ainsworth’s (1989) attachment theory, Bandura’s (1986) social learning theory and Lave’s (1991) situated learning theory as theoretical frameworks; the following aspects will be explored in depth: (a) structure and focus of advisory programs and (b) focus of professional development for teacher advisors. Lastly, it will provide an overview of the implemented intervention in response to the researcher’s problem of practice.
**Problem of Practice**

High schools tend to be places where students feel they cannot establish a meaningful connection with peers or teachers (Brown, 2001). Students are exposed to higher levels of stress and choice, relative to what they experienced in middle school (Cawelti, 1989). Schools have been called to restructure the way they provide care to students (Hamilton & Mackinnon, 2013). Care can be defined as the intentional provision of social, emotional and academic support (Hampton & Graham, 1979; Myrick & Myrick, 1990), which is shown and identified by students in the way of a caring relation with their teacher (Noddings, 2005).

One way high schools have provided care since the 1800s is through advisory programs with a vocational focus that had the intention of aiding students to make choices for their future (Galassi, Gulledge, & Cox, 1997). These programs were transformed into programs that support students not only with academic choices, but also provided social and emotional support (Hampton & Graham, 1979; Myrick & Myrick, 1990; Phillippo, 2010). During this time, teachers took on the role of advisors to a group of students and provided them with vocational advice related to their future academic or professional choices (Galassi et al., 1997). In Galassi et al.’s (1997) account, advisors acted as a sounding board for students before they met with the college counselor to decide on their plans for after graduation. Presently, if implemented effectively, advisory programs can foster meaningful, positive advocacy relationships between advisors and advisees (Anfara, 2006) beyond vocational advice. These programs can also foster a sense of community (Shulkind & Foote, 2009) and most importantly, increase the levels of personalization in the student’s educational experience (McClure, Yonezawa, & Jones, 2010).

The International School of Kenya (ISK) has run an advisory program in both the middle and high school for the last eight years. Different iterations of these types of program have been attempted at ISK with no real success in the high school. In the 2016-2017
attempt, the high school program did not fulfill its primary objective, which was to address personal and social concerns of students as well as providing a close guidance relationship between advisor and advisee (International School of Kenya, 2016). Rather, administrative activities that interfered with group cohesion and the advisor-advisee bond were run during the time allocated for the program.

During the 2016-2017 school year, the ninth and tenth grade advisory programs were replaced by an experiential design and work experience program respectively. No additional training was provided to teachers that took on a role in any of these new programs. No program or alternative was established to continue providing students with any type of pastoral care. Furthermore, the eleventh and twelfth grade advisory programs have remained unchanged for years, even when both students and teachers have reported their discontent with it. The International School of Kenya was failing to provide their high school students with an effective advisory program that addressed social, emotional and academic concerns. Further, teachers were not trained or guided when they were asked to lead an advisory group where they need to establish an advocacy relationship with different students in a multicultural environment.

During the 2017-2018, no substantial change was enacted to the advisory program. However, at the end of the academic year ISK’s high school leadership team decided to make it one of their priorities to provide consistent social, emotional, and academic support to students though committing to the redesign of the advisory program. A group of committed professionals, led by the researcher and the high school assistant principal, formed the Advisory Working Group where advisory was redesigned to ensure a consistent planning protocol and application of the redesigned ISK’s high school advisory program. This working group will be elaborated upon in this and the following chapters of this dissertation.
Examination of the problem of practice in context of extant literature, the following underlying factors related to middle and high school advisory programs were identified: (a) evolution of schools to meet current student needs, (b) the evolution of the teacher role to that of an advisor, (c) the need for training and promotion of self-efficacy, and (d) the fostering of a secure teacher-student relationships with an emphasis on perceived teacher support. These factors guided the needs assessment study described in Chapter 2. Further, these factors and the needs assessment results will guide the intervention literature review presented in this chapter.

**Theoretical Frameworks**

Two of the three theoretical frameworks, Ainsworth's attachment theory (1989) and Bandura’s social learning theory (1986), proposed for the framing of the analysis of the intervention literature were previously used in the analysis of the underlying factors of the researcher’s problem of practice in Chapter 1. Taking into consideration the ultimate goal of an advisory program, providing students with social, emotional, and academic support (Hampton & Graham, 1979; Myrick & Myrick, 1990; Phillippo, 2010), it is important to frame the intervention literature using Ainsworth’s work to ensure that the proposed intervention can provide students with secure attachment to their advisors in the caring relationship (Noddings, 2005) they will potentially establish. Also, it is important to continue utilizing Bandura’s work to frame the intervention literature as self-efficacy is one of the most important factors when implementing a new program such as advisory as it will increase levels of buy-in (Cole, 1994). An additional framework, Lave’s situational learning theory (1991) is included in this chapter as it provides a different lens for the analysis of the newly acquired role of teacher advisors and how they can internalize the responsibilities and learn the necessary skills to implement an effective advisory program. A brief explanation of
how each of these frameworks can be used to understand the intervention literature as well as to support the proposed intervention is provided in this section.

Ainsworth’s (1989) attachment theory provides a framework to understand the affectionate bond that could be fostered between advisors and advisees depending on the type of advising that the program runs. Crookston (1994) described two different types of advising, prescriptive and developmental. The latter focuses on fostering a relationship beyond the academic course choice that occurs in the former. There is also a third type of advising proposed by Lowenstesin (2005), “learning-centered advising” (p.72) which goes beyond establishing a close and secure relationship, but builds on the importance of taking every opportunity presented to the student as a learning opportunity. Each of the previously mentioned types of advising can lead to the perception of a secure attachment from the student if the program they receive matches their expectations of the teacher-student advising relationship (Anderson et al., 2014).

Bandura’s social learning theory (1986), specifically the idea of self-efficacy, guides one of the components of the proposed intervention. Self-efficacy is the “judgment [individuals have] of their [own] capabilities to deal effectively with different realities” (p.21). Providing teachers with the opportunity to develop the skills necessary to be effective advisors will increase the odds of teachers buying into the program (Cole, 1994). Bandura also proposes the idea of vicarious learning where individuals learn through the observation of other people’s behavior and the rewards attached to it.

Lave’s (1991) situated learning theory states that learning should not be considered as simply internalizing knowledge but as a product of the interaction between members who participate in a culture or specific context. Authentic contexts provide the learner with the opportunity to apply the learned knowledge. Further, Brown, Collins, & Duguid (1989) establish that one cannot easily separate what is learned from how and where it will be used.
It is by combining both of these ideas that Lave’s (1991) conceptualization of learning goes beyond a “shared cognition” (p.65) and looks at the learning process as one where the learner is creating a membership with a community of practice. Providing teacher advisors with the opportunity to form a community of practice around this newly acquired role could potentially increase their role knowledge, their self-efficacy levels and most importantly their buy-in (Cole, 1994). This will, in turn, provide teacher advisors with the skills necessary to foster a secure attachment (Ainsworth, 1989) between their advisees and themselves as well as the potential establishment of a positive advocacy relationship (Anfara, 2006).

The three theories summarized above will be used to frame different portions of the intervention literature presented in the following sections. Three major sections follow: (a) structure of advisory programs, (b) professional development needs for teacher advisors, and (c) overview of proposed intervention.

The first section will make reference to different ways of structuring advisory programs; examples will be drawn from undergraduate advising methods, as there is gap in the empirical literature regarding high school advisory programs. There is extensive research on middle school advisory programs, some of which was used for Chapter 1 of this dissertation, and ways of advising undergraduate and graduate students. Undergraduate research was selected, as students that participated in the intervention are eleventh and twelfth grade students who are all planning on attending university and will encounter similar methods of advising. There are commonalities between the experiences that high school seniors face during their last year and their first year in university. Students, especially third culture kids (TCKs) (Pollock & Van Reken, 2004), have to navigate a new school and meet different demands that although might be at a different level, still elicit stress and emotional reactions which their advisors could help them navigate either by referring them to university’s mental health services or the high school counseling department (Schanfield,
TCKs have to uproot once more, as most international posts tend to be two year contracts, leaving behind another culture and trying to navigate new cultural norms or what they believe to be “home” (Pollock & Van Reken, 2004). Just like high school seniors go through a transition experience, undergraduate freshmen experience one as well. As high school students get ready to transition to a new chapter in their life, and in an effort to ensure they are successful, it is important to focus on “deliberate efforts to get ready and get in” (Oliver, Ricard, Witt, Alvarado, & Hill, 2010). Oliver et al. (2010) propose that programs should provide students with experiences that prepare them for university as well as offer them with strategies to adjust to life after high school and matriculating into university. Also, the academic decisions taken during a student’s IB experience determine their future academic path both in high school and beyond; this is similar to the experience undergraduate students face as their academic choices determine their future in their institution. Academic advising as proposed in undergraduate institutions (Crookston, 1994; Lowenstein, 2005) can inform decisions high schools make to ensure they are preparing students for what is to come.

To close off the section, the experience of a group of high schools with a particular structure (Fauci et al., 2006) will be outlined as well as a different structure proposed by Poliner and Lieber (2004).

The second section will address the professional development needs of teacher advisors. This section will make reference to research studies that focused on the development of teacher self-efficacy due to the lack thereof in the results of the teacher survey in the needs assessment. Also, it will cover interventions that focused on increasing cultural awareness, as ISK is a school that hosts more than 69 nationalities. Furthermore, it will examine a program that has a multidisciplinary focus when providing care to students.

Finally, the third section will provide the context in which the researcher is working in, specifically revolving around the high school advisory program planning committee. Also,
it will present an overview of the intervention to address ISK’s needs, requirements and procedures. Moreover, an outline of the first semester sessions for eleventh and twelfth grade will be presented and a lesson will be explained.

**Structure of Advisory programs**

Even before the Carnegie Council on Adolescent Development (1995) called for the restructuring of how high schools provide care for students, Johnson, Morton and Obley (1979) had already outlined the potential uses of advisory programs in schools beyond the advisor-advisee relationship. They proposed four general goals for advisory programs: (a) both the advisor and advisee should collaborate to build an educational plan for the advisee, (b) advisors should guide students to be goal-oriented, (c) advisors should guide students in their inquiry of different career paths, and (d) parents should be invited to participate in the advisor-advisee relationship (Johnson et al., 1979).

Not only have advisory programs been used in middle schools and high schools, postsecondary institutions have emulated them by providing student advising which occurs mainly during freshman year but at times continue all throughout the student’s undergraduate experience (Gordon, Habley, & Grites, 2008). There is a gap in the empirical literature regarding high school advisory programs and how they should be run. There are a few books published that cover particular experiences of schools and authors. As the students that partook in the intervention were in grades 11 and 2, undergraduate advising provides insight on how to structure a high school program to prepare students to what they will find after graduating from ISK. Further, two different programs (Poliner & Lieber, 2004; Fauci et al., 2006) that were published to help high schools structure their own program will be outlined. While Poliner & Lieber’s is more of a how-to-guide; Fauci et al.’s not only guides the design but also provides ways to assess the program and results from schools that have applied their program.
Student advisement at the undergraduate level

Providing students with a personalized experience is one of the different promises some postsecondary institutions make to students in order to recruit them (Waldeck, 2006). Beyond the personalized experience, there are different ancillary services universities offer to students when they first enroll (Daniel, 2013). One of these services to enhance the student experience and provide a competitive advantage for the institution is student advisement (Battin, 2014). There are different manners in which students are advised at the undergraduate level: (a) individually (Anderson et al., 2014), (b) in a group or seminar setting (Battin, 2014), and (c) through an expert artificial intelligence system (Alfarsi, Omar, & Juma, 2017; Kalamkarian & Karp, 2017).

Individual advising. Conducting an effective undergraduate advising program is no easy task and it is a task postsecondary institutions consider a challenge (Gordon et al., 2008). Anderson et al. (2014) conducted a quantitative study in a Midwestern university where they explored “student expectations and perceived advisor behaviors in relation to satisfaction with academic advising” (p. 32). From the 2,777 solicitation emails, only 115 participants were included in the sample, most of them being Caucasian. The advisor behaviors under investigation were those that aligned with two of the most common frameworks for advising students: (a) prescriptive or (b) developmental. The former refers to the framework where the advisor has the power and helps the student advisees with their academic course choices. The latter, refers to a holistic approach where the advisor becomes not only a teacher but also a kind of mentor aiding the student academic and professional goals (Crookston, 1994).

Students at this university reported to be more satisfied with their advisor when their expectations of their advisors were met, however most advisors did not meet student expectations. Anderson et al. (2014) found that the framework was not the key element for
the advisement program; rather it was the meeting of student expectations. Hence, meeting student expectations is necessary and that comes from getting to know each individual advisee and their particular needs.

Further, Lowenstein (2005), going beyond Anderson et al. (2014), proposed a third framework that should be considered, “learning-centered advising” (p. 72). This framework refers to an advising relationship in which the advisor guides the student to appreciate the inherent value of learning and the opportunities their chosen courses and extracurricular path can build a strong foundation for their future. This framework expands the close relationship formed in the developmental framework and contrasts with a course selection focus of the prescriptive framework. If expectations are met and a close relationship, based on the inherent value of learning is formed, then it would be more likely that a secure attachment (Ainsworth, 1989) is formed between advisor and advisee. This type of secure relationship ensures that students know their advisor is there for them when they need them.

**Group advising.** Academic advising at the undergraduate level can also occur in a group format. Battin (2014) conducted a case study in the criminal justice department of a small state owned university. The researchers tested the effectiveness of a group-advising program as they had a large student body and not enough advisors to have an individual advising program. Due to university policy, all students were advised by tenure-track faculty, however there were only three tenure-track faculty and 230 enrolled students. Each faculty member was responsible for advising approximately 77 students the first year and then 115 students when a faculty member retired.

Student advising seminars were implemented following Gordon et al.’s (2008) group model, requiring every student to attend a seminar before registration began (Battin, 2014). In Gordon et al.’s model all students receive general information, create a plan to be approved by the advisor after the session, and only if they need extra help do they need to schedule an
individual meeting with their advisor. Besides the seminars, students had access to digital resources online in the department’s website. Allowing for student choice and making it clear that help can be sought if needed, this program can foster a secure attachment (Ainsworth, 1989) as students are not obligated to follow a prescribed program. This program also encourages students to take control of their academic progression, which could potentially foster self-efficacy (Bandura, 1986) in some students.

This pilot program ran for three years trying to change the culture of advising in the department. Battin (2014) reported that through a university wide survey about academic advising that was sent to all undergraduate and graduate students, it was found that students in the criminal justice department had high levels of satisfaction from the group-advising program. However, only 16.5% of the criminal justice students responded.

**Technology-mediated advising.** Innovation to the traditional advising programs at the undergraduate level happens through the use of technology, especially to address the equitable advisement tradition. The use of artificial intelligence in the form of an expert rule-based system that follows the prescriptive framework (Crookston, 1994; Lowenstein, 2005) can replace the use of advisors in postsecondary institutions. Going beyond what the university in Battin’s (2014) study offered as online resources, both Alfarsi et al.’s (2017) and Kalamkarian & Karp’s (2017) studies focus on the use of expert programs that replace face-to-face interactions in the advisement program.

Alfarsi et al. (2017) piloted an expert program that could potentially replace the need for a face-to-face advising program in the Information and Technology department of the Al-Buraimi University College in Oman. The authors also measured the satisfaction of the participants while using this program. Kalamkarian & Karp (2017), on the other hand, conducted 18 focus groups with 69 students from six colleges in the United States, in both
urban and rural areas. These focus groups collected data on student’s attitudes toward their college’s technology-mediated advising practices.

Both studies found similar results; not all participants were satisfied with having technology replace face-to-face interaction with an advisor. Alfarsi et al. (2017) found 79.04% participant satisfaction when using the expert program; they reported that there was an accurate selection of the courses needed for their academic program. On the same line, Kalamkarian & Karp (2017) reported that students were comfortable using technology-mediated advising when the support they needed was for administrative activities, which Crookston (1994) would consider prescriptive advising. However, students preferred an advising-as-teaching approach when they needed cognitive support, which Lowenstein (2005) considers “learning-centered advising” (p. 72).

Although participants recognized technology-mediated systems are more efficient, students would rather wait in line and have a face-to-face interaction with an advisor. This was especially true when they referred to making complex decisions about their programs as these decisions can have a great impact on their college career (Kalamkarian & Karp, 2017). Students also reported that they did not believe a technology-mediated program could provide them with the valuable personalized feedback they expect from an advisor-advisee relationship (Alfarsi et al., 2017). The results from both studies indicate that students would rather develop a relationship with their advisor, one where they can talk through their decisions and get real-time advice, instead of having to deal with a computer program. It seems to be that students are seeking a relationship that provides them with a secure attachment (Ainsworth, 1989).

The literature on undergraduate advising provides three distinct ways of advising students: (a) prescriptive, (b) developmental (Crookston, 1994), and (c) "learning-centered advising (Lowenstein, 2005, p. 72). These three can be provided to students individually
(Anderson et al., 2014), in groups (Battin, 2014) or through the use of technology (Alfarsi et al., 2017; Kalamkarian & Karp, 2017). High schools, on the other hand, tend to prefer following a group approach when running advisory programs as they face the same issues identified by Battin (2014), there are not enough adults on campus to have individual pairings. However, even in a group approach, advisors attempt to get to know students personally, so they can foster a positive advocacy relationship (Anfara, 2006). Two different examples of high schools that have successfully planned and executed advisory programs will be presented in the next section.

**High School Advisory Programs**

The main objective of an advisory program is to “help students figure out who they are, where they are headed, and how they’re going to get there” (Vander Ark, 2015). All of these questions are common in high school students. Although most of peer-reviewed literature available has been conducted in middle schools were advisory programs are more prevalent, an array of doctoral dissertations have been conducted since the year 2000 exploring the effectiveness of different advisory programs implemented in high schools around the United States. These studies have found that advisory programs tend to fulfill one their main objectives which is to increase the relationships between teachers and students participating in the program, however, it is still not clear what effect they have on academic achievement. Most programs in these studies have a combined approach between a developmental and prescriptive approach (Crookston, 1994) to advising their students.

A case study was conducted by Stover (2009) in a high school in Western North Carolina. The school had identified a high number of students dropping out of school. The school had tried different types of programs in the past, however, the dropout numbers did not decrease. The central office pushed for these numbers to decrease, which made the school choose to implement a new program, which was modified from the Check and Connect
model from the University of Minnesota. This model was adapted to fit the particular needs of this school in North Carolina. Groups of students would meet with an advisor twice a month in a classroom setting for 20 minutes for a check or connect session. Check sessions would be used to check on student’s level of engagement in school or to identify if any signs of withdrawal were present (Stover, 2009). Connect sessions were used to respond to particular student needs depending on their profile. This model uses a mixed approach of prescriptive and developmental advising. The author found that the check and connect model implemented had a positive impact on teacher/student relationships and on monitoring student performance. However, it did not show positive or negative impact on social skills and behaviors.

Another study was conducted to investigate the effectiveness of an advising program in a high school in rural Hawaii (Van Ornum, 2014). The author reported that the main objective of this program was to give students a chance to track their progress towards graduation and to prepare students for the decisions they would need to take after high school. Van Ornum (2014) recognize that “no two advisory program are alike” (p. 30) and the needs of each school continuously change, which makes it imperative for programs to change as well. This program used small groups of eight to 12 students that met with an advisor for 30 minutes twice a week. Following the Hawaii State Department of Education’s curriculum, grade 11 advisory had the overarching theme of career readiness while the grade 12 program covered career options and planning. The evaluation showed that both advisors and advisees perceived that the advising program actually improved relationships and helped develop students’ plans for when they left high school. Advisors asked for more professional development, time to plan for the program, and for the school to share the evaluation of the program. This program also combines the prescriptive and developmental approaches
proposed by Crookston (1994). The program gave students a chance to plan their academic path in school but at the same time, think beyond high school.

Adams (2016) conducted a mixed methods case study that aimed to investigate if a student advisory program had an impact on school climate by measuring student’s perceived connectedness and belonging. This study took place in a suburban high school in Southern Pennsylvania. Students filled out The Hemingway survey created by Michael Karcher and some students were purposefully selected to participate in individual interviews. The advisory program took place during the middle of the day to increase attendance and ensure students were in the right mindset. Sessions happened everyday for 10 minutes. Unlike other programs, this high school had mixed grade level groups and there was no academic component, rather the program focused on the social aspect of student life, which students appreciated. The author found that 80% of the students surveyed were glad to have an advisory program and all students that participated in interviews believed that the advisory program was good for the high school. However, almost 40% of student respondents did not feel more connected to their high school due to the advisory program. Adams (2016) found that the student advisory program did have a positive impact on the school’s climate and student’s perceived sense of belonging and connectedness to their high school. One of the aspects that influenced students’ reports of belonging were having friends and teammates and having teachers the care about them. The latter reason is one that needs to be fostered in all advisory programs but also in informal ways (Noddings, 1992).

The three previous studies all found positive impacts on the relationships built between teachers and students in an advisory program. This was not the focus of the study conducted by Gard (2014) who analyzed seven years of data from an urban high school in the Southwest, US. These years included three in which no academic advisory was implemented and four where it had been implemented. The main objective of this program was to increase
student’s academic achievement. This academic advisory program was implemented to replace after school tutoring which had proven unsuccessful. All teachers were required to participate. Groups of 20-25 students met with their advisor everyday for 30 minutes. The first 10-15 minutes were used to cover a specific curriculum, Grade 11 focused on college and what they needed to apply while Grade 12 focused on their senior capstone project and applying for financial aid. This program combined Crookston’s prescriptive approach and Lowenstein’s (2005) “learning-centered advising” (p. 72). After the curriculum is covered, students had the chance to stay and work in their group or go to other academic teachers for help. Teachers could also request students to drop by during the advisory program. Gard recognizes that advisory programs do build and maintain a student/school relationship, however, he did not find that the academic advisory program implemented actually helped increase academic achievement of students.

Providing students with social, emotional, and academic support is not an easy task. Schools around the world are deciding to spend the time and effort to set them up because they see the positive impacts they can have on students (Pearsall, 2017). Every school is different (Van Ornum, 2014) and freedom is necessary when implementing a program so that is actually valuable and meaningful for student’s experience in any particular school (Gard, 2014). It is clear that more research is needed to establish is advisory programs can have positive impacts not only on relationship building but also on academic achievement as well as on social skills.

Although these types of studies have been conducted, there is still a gap in the empirical literature related to high school advisory programs. However, different programs have been published for schools to modify and apply them to their particular context. Two programs that focus on high school advisory programs will be outlined. Poliner and Lieber

**The Advisory Guide.** Poliner and Lieber (2004) created a guide for schools to follow when planning their own advisory program. This guide includes every step a school might need to think about, including how to brand the program and ensure buy-in from all stakeholders. Further, it provides schools with different designs in action by featuring other schools and their programs as exemplars to follow. Also, nine essential components of advisory programs are included: (a) goals and outcomes; (b) schedule; (c) accountability for advisors, advises and program; (d) grouping; (e) advisor’s role and expectations; (f) linking advisory to other programs; (g) content and format; (h) professional development for advisors; and (i) materials. All of these elements make up what Poliner and Lieber coin the “the advisory puzzle” (p. 13). All of these elements need to be taken into consideration according to the authors as an advisory program is planned. However, the authors also warn schools not to dwell for too long in a small planning committee setting as the most important piece is buy in. Yet, the plan needs to be clear enough, especially on what is being asked from teachers as their buy-in (Cole, 1994) is critical and a premature plan can affect that. To help with the planning process, the authors also present steps to follow when establishing a program including professional development for teachers. Finally, a variety of activities and structures are presented for schools to choose from. This helps to start building a structure where students can foster a positive advocacy relationship (Anfara, 2006) with secure attachment (Ainsworth, 1989) with their advisors. The only piece left out by Poliner and Lieber is the evaluation of the program itself. There is no mention of how to ensure that the program developed is accomplishing its objectives.

**The Advisory Toolkit.** Fauci et al. (2006) from the Wildwood Outreach Center created a compilation of the experiences of four schools at applying a high school advisory
program: “(a) Federal Hocking High School in Stewart, Ohio; (b) High Tech High in San Diego, California; (c) Los Angeles Leadership Academy in Los Angeles, California; and Wildwood School, in Los Angeles, California” (p. xiii). The authors present a guide for schools to familiarize themselves with the concept of advisory. In this guide, Fauci et al. cover how to design and implement an advisory program, what an advisor is expected to do and how to best train them. They also provide an extensive curriculum that can be used to set up an advisory program in both middle and high school. Further, the authors showcase the advisory curriculum by featuring Wildwood School’s advisory program from sixth to twelfth grade. Finally, unlike the guide proposed by Poliner and Lieber (2004), Fauci et al. actually provide a list of instruments on how to assess advisory. They also present the results of two of the four schools that are featured in the toolkit.

Fauci et al. (2006) suggest that advisory programs should be evaluated following two specific goals: (a) provide information to reflect upon and lead to improvement and (b) to showcase improvements in student’s performance and school culture. They also stress the fact that the program needs to be assessed throughout its implementation and make the necessary adjustments. To assess the advisory programs being implemented in High Tech High teachers met monthly to discuss changes needed to both the structure and the content of the program. In contrast, teachers at Los Angeles Leadership Academy met at the end of the year.

The use of surveys is another way to assess an advisory program; Wildwood School surveyed students, teacher advisors and parents at the end of the school year while Federal Hocking High School surveyed teacher advisors only (Fauci et al., 2006). Wildwood used a combined survey with close ended and open ended question to survey 25 advisors, 201 students and 85 parents, in contrast, Federal Hocking asked each teacher advisor to fill out a narrative report. Wildwood found that almost all advisors felt advisory had a positive impact.
on student’s academics, critical thinking, and sense of membership to the school community. Further, they found that most advisors found advisory helpful to build relationships with both students and parents. Advisors at Federal Hocking reported to have enjoyed being able to establish relationships with their students, however they sometimes felt the program was not clear enough in its sense of direction and purpose (Fauci et al., 2006). The authors report that Federal Hocking used the results of the assessment to determine the best course of action regarding the training of advisors and the direction each of the grade levels should take in each of the sessions.

Wildwood also conducted student and parent surveys (Fauci et al., 2006). Through the student survey they were able to recognize that a large number of students perceived advisory as a positive influence on their academic success, in their social and emotional well-being. Further, they felt comfortable in advisory and were able to establish a relationship with their advisor who got to know them well, as reported by students. In the parent survey, Fauci et al., report that most parents had positive responses for close-ended question of the Wildwood survey. Also, parents had a positive response to the fact that their kids were able to create a community within the school with a group of students and a caring teacher advisor. Being able to establish a group and individual relationships with a secure attachment (Ainsworth, 1989) is a trend in all the survey results, further, a perceived influence of advisory over academic performance improvement could be enhanced by using Bandura’s (1986) self-efficacy theory, as student’s perception of their own abilities increase, there is potential for additional improvement in their academic performance.

Just as important as how to structure and assess advisory program sessions, it is important to understand that the sessions will not run themselves. There are different groups of people involved in the creation and running of an advisory program, teachers who take on a new role and become advisors (Phillippo, 2010; Phillippo & Stone, 2013) are responsible of
running all sessions with their advisory group. In the next section, the different foci of the 
trainings available for teachers taking on a new role are outlined and discussed in the light of 
advisory programs.

Professional Development needs for teacher advisors

Research shows that teachers need training to take on the new role of advisor, as this 
is not something that is explicitly taught in teacher training programs (Hampton & Graham, 
1979; Pfitzner-Eden, 2016). This new role comes with new responsibilities (Phillippo & 
Stone, 2013), that lead to feelings of inadequacy by many teachers (Cole, 1994). Due to this 
feeling of inadequacy, the focus of the professional development provided to teachers has 
centered on developing self-efficacy (Anwar, 2014) around this advisor role. Furthermore, as 
students in international schools are diverse in multiple ways, training that enhances teacher’s 
cultural awareness (Tucker & Herman, 2002; Tucker et al., 2005; McKim & Velez, 2017) 
have been conducted. Finally, it is clear that teacher advisors cannot support a student 
holistically on their own, an appropriate personalized ethic of care (Noddings, 2005) 
provided by a multidisciplinary team including guidance counselors (Manning & Saddlemire, 
1998; Myrick & Myrick, 1990) and school administrators (Shockley, Schumacher, & Smith, 
1984) need to be actively involved. There is a gap in the empirical literature surrounding 
studies covering professional development programs focused on high school advisory 
programs (Phillippo, 2010). There are some that the following section covers; however, there 
is an array of studies included covering programs unrelated to advisory programs focused on 
teacher self-efficacy, teacher cultural awareness, and on the use of a multidisciplinary 
approach for student support. All of these studies provide different frameworks that could be 
extrapolated to an advisory program, especially on how to increase teacher self-efficacy, 
cultural awareness, and the provision of student support.
Self-efficacy focus

When teachers are asked or assigned to take on the role of advisors, there tends to be a lack of knowledge of what the role really entails (Phillippo, 2010; Phillippo & Stone, 2013). When assigning this new role for teachers, it is imperative to have a support system for teachers, especially focused on the self-efficacy of experienced teachers. Self-efficacy is more prone to develop during teacher’s early career stages as they are still mastering their craft (Pfitzner-Eden, 2016). Experienced teachers on the other hand tend to benefit from not only self-efficacy focused professional development, but also from the ongoing support of a coach (Niska, 2013). Anwar (2014) found that teachers tend to be more optimistic about their roles and responsibilities when they perceive high levels of support from parents and students. Shockley et al. (1984) echo this by recognizing the need for the participation of the different stakeholders to provide an effective and relevant advisory program to students. If this is done, teacher levels of self-efficacy increase and positive relationships between teacher advisors and student will be more prevalent (Dillow, 2006). Further, teachers who have high levels of self-efficacy tend to be more resilient towards obstacles (Tschannen-Moran & Hoy, 2001) and willing to experiment with new ideas depending on student’s needs (Berman, McLaughlin, Bass, Pauly, & Zellman, 1977; Ghaith & Yaghi, 1997).

McKim and Velez (2017) found that teachers could benefit from participating in vicarious experiences that increase their feelings of self-efficacy when being assigned a new role. Following Bandura’s (1986) understanding of vicarious learning in his social learning theory, it is imperative for teachers to be able to experience either in person, through role-playing or by watching a video of what an excellent lesson entails. The researchers found that this strategy was most effective when the person being observed is similar to the observer. If this were extrapolated to the high school advisory program, professional development
sessions would benefit from providing advisors with vicarious experiences where they are exposed to seasoned advisors fulfilling the expected role.

Furthermore, it was found, in a mixed methods study conducted by Zwart, Korthagen and Attema-Noordewier (2015) in six primary schools in the Netherlands where 91 teachers participated in a positive rather than deficiency focused professional development program, that teachers self-reported increased self-efficacy. This program focused on training teachers to identify and use strengths rather than weaknesses when coaching students for both academic and nonacademic issues. This program also pushed for the use of ongoing reflection and coaching strategies. Researchers found a significant quantitative increase in self-reported self-efficacy that was confirmed through semi-structured interviews, where teachers mentioned that they appreciated the opportunities of having authentic experiences with their students by applying the strategies provided in the program, hence increasing their confidence and competence. Ensuring that teachers are able to put into action what is being learnt during professional development sessions is key. Following Lave’s (1991) situated learning theory it becomes clear that practicing allows teachers to apply concepts and strategies in preparation for leading an advisory program. Not only do teachers need to believe that they can effectively run an advisory program, an array of variables come into play when they lead the different sessions, one of particular importance is being culturally aware.

Cultural awareness focus

Every student walking into a classroom brings with them a particular set of nuances. This is multiplied in an international school setting where students not only bring personal, but also cultural nuances. It is imperative to understand that the dynamics in a classroom or advisory group are influenced by culture and language in more ways than one (Villegas & Lucas, 2007). Further, even within cultures there can be nuances that the teacher or advisor is
not aware of that can affect how to establish a relationship with that student (Lindsey, Roberts, Campbell, & Jones, 2005). In many cases, it is incorrect to assume that nationality perfectly equates to the culture of a particular student. Advisors needs to be socioculturally conscious as defined by Villegas and Lucas (2007), “[having an] awareness that a person’s worldview is not universal but is profoundly influenced by life experiences, as mediated by a variety of factors including race, ethnicity, gender and social class” (p. 31)

A program was implemented by Tucker et al. (2005) that resulted in the promotion of “culturally sensitive teaching self-efficacy” (p.32). This program was based upon the self-empowerment theory (Tucker & Herman, 2002) which is closely related to Bandura’s (1986) social learning theory as it states that both positive and negative behaviors from students are influenced by their self-motivation, perceived self-control, self-reinforcement, and adaptive skills to engage in success rather than problematic behavior both academically and socially. The program was also a response to reports that teachers have less interaction with students from whose cultural background is different than theirs (Frey, 2002). Additionally, there are some teachers that even before meeting a student already have low expectations for his or her academic ability based on preconceived ideas about the student’s culture (Villegas & Lucas, 2007).

Tucker et al. (2005) ran a teacher training program that they dubbed the Model Program with 62 teachers from six elementary schools in the southeast of the United States. Only 19 of the participants were African American. There were two treatment groups, teacher-only intervention and school-wide intervention, and a control group with no training. The program consisted on a mandatory six-hour workshop where teachers received training on how to apply effective strategies when teaching a culturally diverse student body. More specifically, on how to motivate and empower students and parents from different cultural backgrounds as well as to normalize concerns and doubts that teachers might have about
teaching culturally diverse students. The researchers did this through interactive presentations and role-playing exercises to apply the learned behaviors. This is in line with Lave’s (1991) situated learning theory as teachers had the opportunity to not only learn skills necessary for teaching a diverse student body, but also to create a community of practice that faces the same challenges.

An optional follow-up session was conducted by Tucker et al. (2005) to answer teacher questions or address issues at two different times nine weeks later. Only twelve teachers attended either of the sessions. Having different strategies to accommodate different cultural sensitivities gave teachers that participated in this program the self-efficacy necessary to teach all of their students. The researchers stress the importance of training teachers to focus on student empowerment, focusing on success rather than problematic behaviors, and providing culturally sensitive environments that promote and celebrate cultural diversity both inside and outside of the classroom (Tucker et al., 2005). Tucker et al. (2005) found significant gains in culturally sensitive teacher self-efficacy after attending the program, however no gains were identified in general teacher self-efficacy.

Trainings such as the one investigated by Tucker et al. (2005) promote that teachers who hold a particular view on a culturally diverse student can change their perspective to one that is more aligned with what they believe of students in the dominant culture group. Teachers must see themselves as part of the school community that become advocates for all students (Villegas & Lucas, 2007), which will potentially lead to the formation of secure attachment (Ainsworth, 1989) relationships between students and their teachers and/or advisors. Understanding that all students have distinctive cultural values and needs (Lindsey et al., 2005) is the first step to be culturally sensitive.
Multidisciplinary focus

Providing students with what Noddings (2005) dubs as a personalized ethic of care is challenging. Schools need to be ready to have a team that gets all of the different stakeholders of an advisory program together and actively involved in the implementation process (Shockley et al., 1984). The need to provide social, emotional, academic (International School of Kenya, 2016) and even vocational support (Galassi et al., 1997) for students calls for the implementation of a program that is multidisciplinary in nature, which brings up the need to train teacher advisors in an array of different skills to ensure they can run an effective multidisciplinary advisory program.

Recently, Patrick Cook-Deegan created a program with a multidisciplinary focus at Stanford University's d.school, a hub for creativity, collaboration and innovation (Stanford University, 2017). Project Wayfinder has the mission of inspiring young people to “become intentional meaning-makers engaged and empowered to contribute to the world around them” (Project Wayfinder, 2017). The inspiration for this program comes from what Cook-Deegan (2016) states is the problem with the current state of our high schools: they have no space for student’s voice, dreams or their purpose beyond completing the necessary credits to graduate. This program focuses on student’s purpose (their why) as well as in what is it that the will do to fulfil it (their what) (Cook-Deegan, 2017). Teachers are trained in this program and given the necessary skills to guide a student to find their purpose. It is not only geared towards increasing feelings of self-efficacy, but also it focuses on skill development for the provision of personalized care and guidance. Unlike other trainings where teachers only look at the program, following Lave’s (1991) situated learning theory, students attend so teachers can practice running sessions with real participants in an applicable context. Further, they create a community of practice during the training but also through the online platform where teachers can communicate and share their experiences (Project Wayfinder, 2017). It allows
teacher advisors to offer personalized support to each of their advisees as they go through the 15 activities of the program. As the program is still in its initial stages, there is no empirical evidence to show its effectiveness.

Looking at the different foci for teacher training, it is important to take into consideration what needs to be accomplished in order to ensure buy-in from teachers to apply a new program (Cole, 1994). A multidisciplinary approach is necessary, as this will provide teachers with the necessary content knowledge to be culturally aware (Tucker & Herman, 2002). Also, it will provide teachers with an array of skills to feel empathetic and to establish a positive advocacy relationship (Anfara, 2006) with their students, which could lead to a perceived, secure attachment (Ainsworth, 1989). Further, if this is done, teacher advisor self-efficacy (Bandura, 1986) could potentially increase as teachers will have a clearer idea of their role (Phillippo & Stone, 2013) and will feel better equipped for it. The next section will provide an overview of the researcher’s proposed intervention. Both components of the intervention will be presented: (a) eleventh and twelfth advisory program and (b) professional development program for teacher advisors.

**Overview of ISK’s 2018-2019 advisory program**

An advisory program was structured taking into consideration the underlying factors identified in Chapter 1 of this dissertation, the needs assessment findings presented in Chapter 2, and some of the literature outlined in this chapter. An advisory working group led by the researcher and the high school assistant principal planned and executed professional development sessions and the advisory program during the 2018-2019 academic year. The study attached to the redesigned advisory program followed a pre and post intervention design, as there was no ethical way of assigning a control and experimental group for an advisory program that all students and teachers need to be involved with. This section provides the context in which the program took place. It will also outline the program and
will present an overview of the sessions that were offered to eleventh and twelfth grade students. Further, it will include an overview of the professional development sessions for teachers who took on the role of advisors.

**Context**

Since the high school advisory program for the 2017-2018 school year was not reviewed, the high school assistant principal at ISK created an advisory working group in May 2018 to effectively plan a program for the 2018-2019 school year. This made for an ISK program rather than a program created solely by the researcher; but the researcher co-led this working group. The program was planned for all high school grade levels. The working group created the advisory program following, but modified to meet the context’s needs, Fauci et al.’s (2006) published program *The Advisory Toolkit*.

The program was implemented during the 2018-2019 academic year for all high school grade levels; however, the focus of the researcher’s dissertation was to evaluate the eleventh and twelfth grade advisory program only. The working group followed what advisory program literature states; it is imperative to have a multidisciplinary team come together to create a valuable experience for students and teacher advisors (Manning & Saddlemire, 1998; Myrick & Myrick, 1990). This group included all grade level leaders for the 2018-2019 school year as well as counselors and the IB coordinator. Part of these leaders’ job description actually includes pastoral care of students – caring for their academic, social, and emotional needs – which is one of the main objectives of advisory programs.

The researcher took on the role of assistant grade level leader for twelfth grade during the 2018-2019 school year and participated in this group by providing literature related to advisory programs as well as the results of the needs assessment described in Chapter 2. Some of the grade level leaders have experienced all the different iterations of the advisory program and have provided insight on what has worked and what has not at ISK. Further, this
group had two teachers who have participated in the creation and application of high school advisory programs in other international schools. Also, the experiential learning coordinator participated in this group, as some of the components for the experiential learning component of ISK’s curriculum were covered in some advisory sessions. Finally, the returning high school college counselor provided her expertise on the student body as well as insight on the best way to support students in all relevant areas: academic, social and emotional. All participants of this group expressed their interest and volunteered to participate. Using extant advisory literature, the needs assessment results and ISK’s context, a general plan was created for weekly advisory sessions.

Outline of advisory program

All eleventh and twelfth grade students took part in the redesigned advisory program that took place weekly. The program itself followed a developmental advising format (Crookston, 1994) with an emphasis on “learning-centered advising” (Lowenstein, 2005, p. 72) to ensure not only the fostering of a positive advocacy relationship (Anfara, 2006) between advisor and advisee, but also the development of higher order thinking regarding academics and social endeavors. This addressed the underlying factor of the evolution of schools to meet current student needs. Further, the use of Fauci et al.’s (2006) The Advisory Toolkit, provided structure for the different sessions.

Eleventh and twelfth grade teacher advisors participated in focused (Anwar, 2014) professional development (Gatta, McCabe, & Edgar, 1997) that was focused on developing self-efficacy (Mckim & Velez, 2017), cultural awareness (Tucker & Herman, 2002; Tucker et al., 2005), and skill development (Zwart, Korthagen & Attema-Noordewier, 2015). These sessions started during the in-service week before school began. A follow-up session was held during one Wednesday PD time in September 2018. Teacher advisors went over sessions, practiced skills necessary to build rapport with their advisees and talked through
modifications for the overall plan. These sessions followed Lave’s (1991) situated learning theory and tried to build a community of practice between advisors. This addressed the need to foster secure teacher-student relationships with an emphasis on perceived teacher support as most students reported null levels of it in the needs assessment.

**Overview of advisory sessions**

Although eleventh and twelfth grade students were going through different stages in their ISK journey, there were some similarities. Students from both grade levels dealt with stress levels from the International Baccalaureate (IB) program and the college application process. Eleventh graders started to adapt to the IB program experience and also began to think about college applications. Twelfth graders were in full college application mode while they still dealt with an increase in academic load in most of their classes. Fauci et al.’s (2006) program proposes the creation of a Senior Institute. All sessions for ISK’s high school advisory program fall into one of five major categories: (a) socioemotional well-being, (b) academic support, (c) interpersonal skills, (d) intrapersonal skills, and (e) career planning.

**Senior institute.** The Senior Institute proposed by Fauci et al. (2006) centers around the student’s future and the need to provide them with academic, social and emotional support. The authors propose an “interwoven rather than sequential” (p. 271) curriculum for this program. Further, four major units are covered in this curriculum: (a) team building, (b) college counseling, (c) community and citizenship, and (d) academic support. The first unit focuses on building trust and group norms within the advisory members, laying the foundation for a positive advocacy relationship (Anfara, 2006) between advisees and advisor. The second unit allows students to work on the next step of their academic career, depending on their grade level different activities revolving college selection and application will be conducted. The third unit focuses on connecting students to the school community and building a sense of membership. Finally, the fourth unit focuses on providing students with
structured time to work on different assignments that are dependent on their academic workload. All lessons for ISK’s advisory program followed one of these curricular units and fell under one major category, an example of this is provided in the next subsection.

**Sample lesson.** A lesson that fell under the interpersonal skills of ISK’s new advisory program and that covered the first unit of Fauci et al.’s (2006) curriculum, team building, is the “Headlines” (p. 274) lesson. This 30-minute activity had the objective of showcasing the diversity and connections in each advisory group. This was the first session used with twelfth grade students in August 2018. Students and advisor got five pieces of paper each, tape and markers. All participants were instructed to create three headlines about themselves, which could be related to their identity and/or life experiences. Some headlines were to be general and others specific. The advisor modeled the activity before students started writing. Participants wrote their headlines and posted them around the room. Other participants walked around the room and starred the headlines they identified with. After everyone had starred the headlines, advisors debriefed the activity with students. Advisors guided a reflection making reference to different aspects of the activity like which headlines got starred the most, which ones did not, common threads among headlines, and tried to see if there were any revelations about the group in general. Advisors got a detailed plan of the activity with step-by-step instructions to follow.

**Overview of professional development sessions**

A common thread in the needs assessment findings was that teachers were not sure of what their role as an advisor was. The professional development sessions for teachers that take on the role of advisors focused on specifying the roles and expectations of teacher advisors. Two professional development sessions ran at the beginning of the school year, one with an external consultant and one by the high school assistant principal and the researcher. The first session took place during the in-service week and was conducted by Wildwood’s
Outreach Coordinator, Steve Barrett. Teacher advisors were guided through a reflective process on the justification behind advisory programs and were asked to think of one person who supported them during their own high school, especially the skills they demonstrated. Afterwards, the high school assistant principal and the researcher provided advisors with roles and expectations of advisors in this new program. To finalize the session, advisors were asked to join their teams and discuss the plan for the first month. The grade level leaders who planned the sessions led this last section of the session.

Clear plans were set up for both components of the program, the eleventh and twelfth advisory program and the professional development sessions for teacher advisors. However, it was inevitable that different variables and obstacles affected the program. In the next section potential obstacles are outlined in relation to each of the two components of the intervention.

**Obstacles for program**

There are some obstacles related to the first component of the proposed program, the high school advisory program itself. Although the political climate in Kenya is not as predictable as in other countries and the government issues some holidays, none intervened with the program. The advisory sessions ran on weekly on Tuesdays and biweekly on Thursdays. To ensure that the program continued even when teachers were absent, grade level leaders shared an advisory group and covered for the absent advisor when necessary.

Some obstacles affected the second component of the intervention, the professional development sessions for teacher advisors. An obstacle for this component was that the 2018-2019 school year marks the reaccreditation year for ISK. This was a school wide effort involving most teachers and school leadership team throughout the year, which took preference over any other school initiative. Teacher advisor sessions for the high school advisory program did not happen as often as intended as time sensitive accreditation tasks
were prioritized. However, the high school assistant principal and the researcher found some
time for a second teacher training session and four working sessions for the advisory working
group.
Chapter 4 Overview

This chapter outlines the evaluation of the redesigned advisory program for 11th and 12th grade that was implemented at the International School of Kenya (ISK) during the 2018-2019 school year. The research questions for the study will be presented first as they guided the evaluation of the program. There are questions that will look into the process and outcome evaluation. A logic model and theory of treatment are presented to showcase the theorized connections between the advisory program implemented at ISK and the potential short-term, mid-term and long-term outcomes. These connections are grounded on extant advisory literature. Further, the explanatory sequential design is explained as it guides the evaluation of the new 11th and 12th grade advisory program. This design allowed for the collection and analysis of both quantitative and qualitative data. Qualitative data informed and guided changes to the advisory program after the mid-intervention quantitative data collection. It also deepened the understanding of quantitative findings after the post-intervention data collection. Finally the method for the study is outlined including its participants, measures of instrumentation, data collection and data analysis.
Chapter 4: Intervention Procedure and Program Evaluation Methodology

**Introduction**

The purpose of this study was to evaluate the effectiveness of the new 11th and 12th grade advisory program implemented at ISK during the 2018-2019 school year. The needs assessment conducted during the spring semester of 2017, see Chapter 2 for a full description pgs. 24-41, found that both teachers and students did not believe the program was working effectively. Further, there was a disparity between teacher advisor and student’s perceptions, especially when the former thought they had an influence on students’ life when the latter reported the opposite. In order to make sure that the school offered a structured group advisory program with a focus beyond academics (Crookston, 1994), a working group was created, co-led by the researcher and ISK’s high school assistant principal Mr. Jarrod Dale. This group was composed of all high school grade level leaders, who are responsible of overlooking student’s pastoral care, and other faculty members that have experience or were interested in the advisory program implementation. This group was responsible of structuring the 9-12 grade program, planning sessions, explaining the sessions to teacher advisors and planning professional development sessions for teachers. For the scope of this study, only the new 11th and 12th grade advisory program was evaluated. This evaluation was guided by the following research questions that address both process and outcome evaluation of the study.

**Process evaluation questions:**

- RQ1 Did teacher advisors appropriately implement advisory sessions as planned?
- RQ2 Were students and faculty members satisfied with the new 11th and 12th grade advisory program and advisory training sessions?
- RQ3 Were participants engaged in the advisory sessions and advisory training sessions?

**Outcome evaluation questions:**
• RQ 4 Did the new advisory program increase student’s perceived social support and academic press from their advisors?
• RQ 5 Did the new advisory program increase student’s perceived closeness and influence from their advisors?
• RQ 6 Did the new advisory program influence student’s choice of teacher advisors as part of their attachment network?
• RQ 7 How were student’s perceived social support, academic press, closeness, influence, and attachment network choice moderated by demographic variables (i.e., gender, grade level, age).
• RQ 8 Did the new advisory training sessions increase teacher advisor’s self-efficacy?
• RQ 9 Did the new advisory training sessions and program increase teacher advisor’s frequency of supportive and knowledge of transition activities offered by the school?
• RQ 10 Did the new advisory program increase teacher advisors’ perceptions that the program matched their ideal advisory program?
• RQ 11 How were teacher advisors’ perceptions of self-efficacy, supportive and transition activity knowledge, and ideal match moderated by demographic variables (i.e., gender, age, years of experience as advisor)?

A mixed methods approach was used to assess fidelity of implementation as well as short-term outcomes as proposed in both the Logic Model (LM) (Appendix F) and the Theory of Treatment (ToT) (Appendix G). Conducting mixed methods research is not a straightforward task, as it bridges the disparate paradigms of quantitative and qualitative research (Onwuegbuzie & Leech, 2006). To visualize the proposed intervention, a logic model was created to provide a “roadmap describing the sequence of related events” (Kellogg Foundation, 2004, p.3). The theory of treatment was created to showcase the connection between the different type of advisory sessions and short, mid and long-term outcomes. The
logic model highlights the relationships between the resources that the researcher had access to, the activities that were done, and the expected outcomes.

**Process Evaluation**

To ensure that the program performed appropriately throughout its application (Rossi, Lipsey, & Freeman, 2004) a variety of indicators needed to be measured. The indicators that were measured during the implementation of the new 11th and 12th grade advisory program were: (a) attendance, (b) adherence, (c) engagement, and (d) satisfaction.

**Attendance.** The program proposed was dependent on students and teacher advisors attending the different sessions. Teacher advisors needed to attend the professional development sessions to ensure they were aware of what the advisory program they were running was going to cover. Following school policy, students needed to attend 80% of the sessions of any class, including advisory. If participants didn’t attend, possibility of occurrence of the outcomes proposed in both the LM (Appendix F) and theory of treatment (ToT) (Appendix G) would have been hindered. Attendance for students was collected by the teacher advisors at the beginning of each advisory session following school wide procedures using PowerSchool’s attendance website. Attendance records for Tuesday socioemotional sessions were obtained from the high school office for evaluation purposes. Records for Thursday session attendance could not be obtained as they included assembly and class meeting attendance and could not be differentiated. Teacher advisors signed in when attending the PD sessions; the researcher collected the attendance log for evaluation purposes.

**Adherence.** As there were 14 different advisory groups running at the same time, adherence to the advisory session plan was extremely important so that session objectives were met, that all students received a similar program, and that fidelity of implementation was achieved (Mowbray, Holter, Teague, & Bybee, 2003). Teacher advisors received a
detailed lesson plan for each of the sessions that included objectives, step-by-step activities and exit procedures. ISK’s high school principal and assistant principal engaged in walk throughs during the program to ensure advisory sessions running, however, no concrete data was collected.

**Engagement.** This indicator was measured for both students and teacher advisors. This indicator is key to the participant responsiveness measure (Dusenbury, Brannigan, Falco, & Hansen, 2003). If teacher advisors were not engaged in the training sessions and students did not engage with the topics being covered in their own sessions, the proposed outcomes in the LM and ToT might have been affected. The researcher noted participation in activities during both training sessions for advisors; however, no observational data were collected about student engagement in the program. (Observations were not performed because it was feared that such observations would be intrusive and actually interfere with the development of close, productive student-teacher advisor relationships.)

**Satisfaction.** Satisfaction of participants is another indicator of participant responsiveness as proposed by Dusenbury et al. (2003). Based on the session objectives, students and teacher advisors reported their level of satisfaction as part of an exit ticket. The grade 11 team collected student satisfaction data for the first month of activities while the grade 12 teams collected satisfaction data monthly during the first semester of the 2018-2019 academic year. (Both teams decided to discontinue it as it took too much time from the session.) On the exit ticket, respondents were asked to rate their satisfaction on a 5-point scale ranging from not satisfied at all (1) to very satisfied (5). A comment box was provided after the scale. This was all collected via an online form per grade level (Appendix H). Teacher advisors had students go to the Google Form to complete their exit tickets at the end of the advisory session. The PD facilitator prompted teacher advisors to complete their online exit ticket (Appendix I). If teacher advisors were satisfied with the PD sessions they would
probably try and apply what was learned in the advisory program ensuring that the short-term outcomes in the ToT and LM were achieved. If students were satisfied, they would probably keep attending sessions and their buy-in, a mediating variable in the ToT, for the program would have increased.

**Outcome Evaluation**

An explanatory sequential design as proposed by Creswell and Plano (2011) was used to evaluate the outcomes of the new 11th and 12th grade advisory program in the International School of Kenya. In this design, both quantitative and qualitative data is collected to answer the different outcome evaluation questions (Creswell & Plano, 2011). The authors describe this mixed methods design as one that is interactive, with two phases: (a) quantitative and (b) qualitative.

In order to answer the questions posed above, a longitudinal study was conducted during the 2018-2019 school year at the International School of Kenya. The explanatory sequential design was chosen as the evaluation design as it is interactive and very straightforward (Creswell & Plano, 2011). This design allowed answering the research questions for the study using both formative and summative evaluation approaches (Newcomer, Hatry, & Wholey, 2015). Students completed surveys pre, mid, and post intervention for the quantitative portion of the study. Teacher advisors completed surveys pre and post intervention.

---

**Figure 4.1.** Adapted from Explanatory Sequential Design by Creswell, J. W., & Clark, V. L. P. (2007). *Designing and conducting mixed methods research.* Thousand Oaks, Calif.: Sage.
Following the explanatory sequential design, the quantitative data collected after the mid intervention survey informed the qualitative data collection of students regarding the program and what was working and what was not. Students participated in focus group style interviews. This information was used to modify the program for semester two. Finally, after the post intervention survey was completed after the last session of the new advisory program, a second student focus group and teacher semi-structured interviews were conducted to make sense of quantitative results and to expand on participant’s experiences (O’leary, 2014). These interviews, paired with the post intervention survey data, acted as the summative evaluation of the new 11th and 12th grade advisory program (Newcomer et al., 2015).

Method

Participants

There were two categories of participants for the evaluation of the new 11th and 12th advisory program at the International School of Kenya: (a) students enrolled in 11th and 12th grade and (b) teacher advisors of the 11th and 12th grade advisory groups. There were 67 students enrolled in grade 12 and 98 students enrolled in grade 11. There were six advisory groups for grade 12, two of them had co-advisors, which meant that eight faculty members were involved with this grade level. The researcher acted as one of the grade 12 co-advisors with the grade level leader. Further, there were eight advisory groups for grade 11; two of them had co-advisors, which meant that 10 faculty members were involved with this grade level. There were a total of 18 faculty members involved in the new 11th and 12th advisory program. As the program is a school program, all students and faculty members participated in it.

Participation for the evaluation of the program was completely voluntary. The researcher used the first faculty meeting to explain the research study to faculty members and
the first assembly to explain it to students. Afterwards, participants were recruited using an
email script for faculty members (Appendix J) and one for parents and students (Appendix
K). Informed consent from all faculty participants (Appendix L) was required before any data
collection could take place. Parents provided written permission for their child participation
in the study (Appendix M) and students assented to their participation before each of the
surveys and interviews were conducted (Appendix N).

Thirteen students (about 8% of the schools’ 165 eleventh and twelfth graders)
participated in the quantitative portion of the evaluation study, five twelfth graders and eight
eleventh graders. Of those 13, ten agreed to participate in the focus groups interviews, three
twelfth graders and seven eleventh graders. Seven teacher advisors agreed to participate in
the quantitative portion of the evaluation study, five twelfth grade advisors and three eleventh
grade advisors. Four teacher advisors agreed to participate in individual semi-structured
interviews, three twelfth grade advisors and one eleventh grade advisor.

**Measures of instrumentation**

Similar to the needs assessment study, which is described in detail in Chapter 2, two
different surveys were used to collect quantitative data on the experience of both students
(Appendix O) and teacher advisors (Appendix P) in the new advisory program.

**Students.** The student survey was adapted from the version used in the needs
assessment study. The following variables were measured using the survey: (a) student
perceived social support, (b) student perceived academic press, and (c) student’s attachment
network. Student’s perceived social support was measured using Phillippo and Stone’s
(2013) *Student Survey* items: Teacher Support and Malecki and Demaray’s (2000) *Child and
Adolescent Social Support Scale: Teacher Support Scale*. Student perceived academic press
was measured using Phillippo and Stone’s (2013) *Student Survey* items: Teacher academic
press. Student’s attachment network, including perceived influence and perceived closeness,
was measured using Van Ryzin’s (2010) *Long-Term Effects of Learning Environments* survey: Influence items and Trinke and Bartholomew’s (1997) *Attachment Network questionnaire*. A full description of the scales can be found in Chapter 2 of this dissertation, pgs. 29-30. Demographic variables (gender, age, grade level, and nationality) were also collected in the pre, mid, and post intervention surveys.

**Teachers.** The teacher survey was also adapted from the version used in the needs assessment study. The following variables were measured: (a) self-efficacy, (b) frequency of supportive activities, and (c) knowledge of transition activities. Teacher advisor self-efficacy was measured using Phillippo and Stone’s (2013) *Teacher Survey* items: Efficacy. Knowledge of supportive activities was measured using items adapted from Mac Iver and Epstein’s (1991) *Practices, Programs, Policies and Staff in the middle grades questionnaire*: Use of supportive activities items. Knowledge of transition activities was measured using items adapted from Mac Iver and Epstein’s (1991) *Practices, Programs, Policies and Staff in the middle grades questionnaire*: Organization of the Transition items. A full description of the scales can be found in Chapter 2 of this dissertation, pgs. 30-32. Demographic variables (gender, age, grade level, years of experience as an advisor, nationality) were also collected in the pre and post intervention surveys.

**Secondary data on twelfth grade advisory program outcomes.** The grade twelfth level leaders created a survey based on the objectives set forth for the advisory program during the May 2018 pullout session of the advisory working group. This survey (Appendix AA) consisted of nine questions, five of which measured confidence levels on college applications, future transition experiences, creation and execution of an action plan, and knowledge of drugs and alcohol on a 5 point scale ranging from not confident at all (1) to very confident (5). Four questions measured agreement levels on students’ ability to meet
deadlines, manage stress, and feeling prepared for IB exams on a 5 point scale ranging from strongly disagree (1) to strongly agree (5).

**Procedure**

Following a pre intervention-post intervention design for the quantitative portion of the explanatory sequential design (Creswell & Plano, 2011), a pre intervention survey was conducted during the first month of the new advisory session. Students were instructed to refer to their previous advisory experience when answering this survey. This provided the researcher with baseline data for each student. Each student’s post-intervention responses were later compared to these pre-intervention responses to measure change from the beginning to the end of the study. In the pre intervention survey, entire student variables were collected: (a) student perceived social support, (b) student perceived academic press, (c) student’s attachment network, and (d) student previous advisory experience. The first three being the outcome variables and the fourth being a control variable as different experiences in advisory could influence students’ experience in the new program. Teacher variables, their nationality and years of experience as advisors, were also collected in the pre intervention survey during the first professional development session for the new program. These variables could have a moderating effect on outcome variables.

After the first semester of the new advisory program, a mid intervention survey was used to collect data on student experiences in the new program. During this first phase of the explanatory sequential design, quantitative data was collected and analyzed. This analysis was followed up with qualitative data collection and analysis. The qualitative data helped the researcher make sense of the quantitative data first collected (Creswell & Plano, 2011). Students participated in a focus group style interview (Appendix Q) after the mid intervention survey. Students expressed their interest to participate in the interview process in the parental permission form. The process described before was repeated at the end of the intervention
with the addition of individual semi-structured interviews with teacher advisors (Appendix R). Teachers expressed their interest in participating in the interview through their informed consent form. A post intervention survey and follow-up focus group and personal interviews were conducted as a summative evaluation of the program.

**Data Collection.** The proposed design to answer the research questions presented above used both formative and summative evaluation approaches (Newcomer et al., 2015). Student participants completed the survey described in the Measure of Instrumentation section (pg. 80-81) pre, mid and post intervention, while teacher participants completed the survey pre and post intervention. Before the new program was implemented, quantitative data was collected from participants so they could act as their own control group. During the pre intervention data collection, participants were prompted to think about the 2017-2018 advisory program before answering. After the first semester of the new program’s implementation, a formative assessment (Newcomer et al., 2015) of the program took place using the same survey from the pre-intervention data collection. Following the explanatory sequential design, some participants were asked to participate in a student focus group or individual teacher advisor semi-structured interviews. Finally, after the second semester of the program the scales were completed again during the last week of the 2018-2019 academic year. A second round of student focus group and a first round of teacher advisor interviews took place to collect qualitative data from participant’s experiences in the program.

The researcher was responsible to collect all pre, mid and post intervention data from participants. For the pre-intervention survey, students were asked to attend a session at the Staff Lounge during an academic advisory session as all other spaces were being used to host the advisory program groups. For the mid and post intervention survey students were given the option of filling the survey and participating in a focus group interview during the last week of the Fall semester and the Spring semester. Surveys and focus groups were completed
in a standard ISK classroom as other spaces were being used for final exams. Parent permission forms were sent out and collected before any student was allowed to participate in the study. Students assented to their participation each of the three times they completed a survey. The researcher created a 3-digit code for each student that participated in the study to ensure anonymity of the data to everyone except himself. Teacher advisors that participated in the study were asked to stay behind at the conclusion of professional development sessions to fill out the pre-intervention survey. Each participating teacher completed the post-intervention survey at the end of the spring semester. Teachers who agreed to participate in the semi-structured interviews scheduled a time with the researcher during the final week of the 2018-2019 academic year. All interviews were conducted in a standard ISK classroom. All teacher participants completed an informed consent form prior to any survey completion. Participating teacher advisors chose a particular alias to ensure anonymity of their data.

Interviews and focus groups were audio recorded and transcribed for analysis purposes, parents of participating students and teachers indicated their interest to participate in the qualitative portion of the study in their respective informed consent forms.

**Data Analysis**

**Quantitative.** The data collected during the pre, mid and post intervention surveys and described in the Measure of Implementation section (see pg. 80-81) was analyzed using SPSS by running descriptive and inferential statistical tests. These tests showed relationships between the variables measured in the surveys, between surveys, and with demographic variables (Schutt, 2015) collected. Cronbach’s alpha of all scales were calculated to estimate the internal consistency reliability of each scale. Paired T-tests were used to analyze the change in these measures over time. Further, ANOVA tests were conducted to test the statistical significance of associations between participant’s demographic variables and their responses on each scale from the different surveys.
**Qualitative.** In line with the explanatory sequential design (Creswell & Plano, 2011), after the quantitative data collection, follow up interviews were conducted with a voluntary sample of participants to assess their experience qualitatively (Schutt, 2015). These interviews were audio recorded and transcribed. Inductive content analysis was used to identify common themes in the interviews and relationships between the different interviews were drawn (Elo & Kyngäs, 2007). Further, this provided the opportunity to build upon or find an alternative explanation to what was found quantitatively (Creswell & Plano, 2011). Having different types of data allowed the researcher to triangulate the results of all of them and increase the validity and reliability of the measures and conclusions drawn (Schutt, 2015).

**Secondary data on twelfth grade advisory program outcomes.** Advisors were emailed the link to the survey. All students were instructed to answer the online survey at the end of an advisory session in September, December, and April. Paired sample T-tests were used to analyze the change in the different measures (confidence on transition, confidence to adhere to deadlines, confidence to control stress, perceived knowledge for IB exams, perceived skills for IB exams, confidence to create and execute action plans, knowledge on drug and substance abuse).

**Summary Matrix**

Table 1 highlight the connection between the different research questions that guided this study, presented at the beginning of this chapter, with the different indicators being measured. It also presents an overview of both quantitative and qualitative data sources collected, with what frequency and the data analysis used.
Table 4.1

Summary Matrix for process and outcome evaluations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Research Question</th>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Data Source(s)</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Data Analysis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Did teacher advisors appropriately implement advisory sessions as planned?</td>
<td>Delivery of advisory sessions</td>
<td>Teacher advisor interviews</td>
<td>Posttest</td>
<td>Qualitative: Summary of interviews</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Were students and faculty members satisfied with the new 11th and 12th grade advisory program and advisory training sessions?</td>
<td>Participant satisfaction</td>
<td>Exit tickets</td>
<td>After advisory sessions</td>
<td>Quantitative: Descriptive statistics of satisfaction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Did the new advisory program increase student’s perceived social support and academic press?</td>
<td>Perceived social support</td>
<td>Phillippo and Stone’s (2013)</td>
<td>Pre intervention, mid intervention, post intervention</td>
<td>Quantitative: Paired sample t-tests and descriptive statistics</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

89
from their advisors?

Malecki and Demaray’s (2000) Child and Adolescent Social Support Scale: Teacher Support Scale

After the program’s implementation change (Post – Pre) and the % of students showing a positive change

Qualitative: Narrative analysis of interviews

Academic Press

Phillippo and Stone’s (2013) Student Survey items: Teacher interviews after the mid intervention, Post intervention, and the % of students showing a positive change

Quantitative: Paired sample t-tests; descriptive statistics

Qualitative: Narrative analysis of interviews
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Perceived Influence</th>
<th>Methodology</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Did the new advisory program increase student’s perceived influence from their advisors?</td>
<td>Perceived Influence</td>
<td>Van Ryzin’s (2010) Long-Term Effects of Learning Environments survey: Influence items</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Pre intervention, mid intervention, Qualitative: Paired t-tests</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How were Gender, grade Self-report</td>
<td></td>
<td>After the Student Interviews program’s implementation Qualitative: Narrative analysis of interview</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Gender, grade</td>
<td>Post intervention Qualitative: descriptive statistics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question</td>
<td>Method</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>student’s level, age perceived social support, academic press, closeness, influence, and attachment network choice moderated by demographic variables?</td>
<td>Comparing means of different groups via ANOVA tests; Describing correlations</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Did the new advisory training sessions increase teacher advisor’s self-efficacy?</td>
<td>Self-efficacy Phillippo and Stone’s (2013) Teacher Survey Teacher Survey items: Efficacy</td>
<td>Pre- and post-intervention After the program’s implementation Quantitative: Paired sample t-tests; Descriptive statistics Qualitative: Narrative analysis of interview</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question</td>
<td>Methodology</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Did the new advisory training sessions and program increase teacher advisor’s frequency of supportive activities offered by the school?</td>
<td>Frequency of supportive activities: Mac Iver and Epstein’s (1991) Practices, Programs, Policies and Staff in the middle grades questionnaire: Use of supportive activities items. Quantitative: Paired sample t-tests; Descriptive statistics. Qualitative: Teacher Interviews Narrative analysis of interview.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Did the new advisory program increase teacher advisor’s knowledge about transition activities offered by the school?</td>
<td>Knowledge of transition activities: Mac Iver and Epstein’s (1991) Organization of the Transition items. Quantitative: Paired sample t-tests; Descriptive statistics. Qualitative: Teacher Interviews Narrative analysis of interview.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Qualitative:</td>
<td>program’s implementation</td>
<td>Narrative analysis of interview</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How were teacher advisor’s self-efficacy, supportive and transition activity knowledge, and ideal match moderated by demographic variables?</td>
<td>Gender, age, years of experience as advisor</td>
<td>Self-report Pretest Quantitative:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Comparing means of different groups via ANOVA tests;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Describing correlations</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Chapter 5 Overview

This chapter provides a detailed description of the findings of the evaluation study of the redesigned advisory program implemented during the 2018-2019 academic year at the International School of Kenya. It details the process of implementation by providing an in-depth look at the creation of the advisory working group, the creation of advisory sessions, and the training sessions for advisors. Further, it presents the findings of the evaluation study answering the different research questions presented in Chapter 4. Reliability measures for the different scales created are presented followed by quantitative and qualitative findings for both process and outcome evaluation questions. A discussion of the results follows connected to the literature, theoretical frameworks, and the researcher’s professional practice. Finally, this chapter closes with a description of the identified limitations of the study and recommendations for moving forward.
Chapter 5: Findings and Discussion

Introduction

The International School of Kenya (ISK) implemented a redesigned advisory program during the 2018-2019 academic year. This chapter will provide a detailed explanation of the three major components the advisory program had and the evaluation study conducted to measure its effectiveness. It will highlight the different findings of the study related to the research questions presented in Chapter 4, which will lead to different conclusions being drawn. Further, a discussion will be presented in light of relevant literature and theoretical frameworks presented in Chapter 1 and 3 as well as implications for current and future educational practice. Finally, it will present the limitations of the study and recommendations for moving forward.

Process of Implementation

During the 2018-2019 academic year the High School team at ISK made the advisory program and the provision of social-emotional support to students one of its two yearly priorities. This program had three major components: (a) the advisory working group, (b) the advisory sessions, and (c) the advisor training sessions. The program was a high school wide initiative and the researcher conducted the evaluation study with students and teacher advisors that agreed to participate in it.

Advisory working group

In preparation for the overhaul of the advisory program, the researcher and the high school assistant principal led the Advisory working group. This group brought together the grade level leaders and assistant grade level leaders who were tasked with the responsibility of creating the advisory sessions for their grade level. The counselors attended the group’s
sessions when needed. Further, four teachers who expressed interest in the advisory program redesign and had experience with similar programs attended the first and last session.

In May 2018, the grade level leaders had a pull out day to determine key aspects of the program. In preparation for this meeting all advisors were required to read portions of the *The Advisory Toolkit* (Fauci et al., 2006) and *The Advisory Guide* (Poliner & Lieber, 2004). The researcher and the high school assistant principal presented them with ISK’s 2013 Advisory rationale (Appendix S). This rationale was updated by the grade level leaders and approved by the leadership team (Appendix T). After this was updated, the roles and responsibilities of advisors, counselors, grade level leaders, and the leadership team were presented (Appendix U) and updated (Appendix V) to embody the needs of ISK students. This was done with the intention of having clear expectations from the get go to ensure that everyone in the high school knew what they were responsible for with the hope of ensuring their buy in (Cole, 1994). After a short break, the Grade 11 team was joined by one of the high school counselors while both the IB coordinator and the second high school counselor joined the Grade 12 team. Each team created specific outcomes for their grade level (Appendix W). Once the outcomes were created, and following backwards design theory, each team came up with a big picture plan for the first semester of the school year, including mandatory sessions from the IB program and the college-counseling program. Each team was provided with a planning document that would be shared with all advisors for planning and transparency purposes (Appendix X). Two parents attended this session and shared their thoughts on what they would expect this program to cover.

The second session for this working group was held in February 2019. All grade level leaders, the high school assistant principal, and the researcher attended this session. This half-day working session centered on discussing the first semester of the program. An hour was dedicated to the discussion of what had worked and what needed to be changed moving
forward. Grade levels that had collected data from their students brought that up and used it to think on possible changes that needed to be made for the second half of the year. With the help of the IB coordinator and one of the counselors, grade level leaders scheduled necessary sessions related to the IB program and drug/substance education. Each team had time to plan the remaining sessions of the school year. As a closing activity, the discussion turned to the inclusion of the added advisory responsibilities to the grade level leader job description to ensure transparency moving forward.

The third session took place in May 2019. This was a half-day session where outgoing and incoming grade level leaders attended. The main objective of this meeting was to focus on the vertical articulation of the high school advisory program. All grade level leaders reviewed the sessions they had during the school year and assigned one of ISK’s educational aims to it. From this, the working group was able to identify four major strands in the content of the program. The major strands identified were: (a) drug education, (b) digital citizenship, (c) self-direction, and (d) advocacy. Advisors then turned to the first two of the major stands as these are two that tend to be complicated to address and are usually complimented by the work of counselors and technology integration specialists. Participants agreed on the need for the school to determine the number of sessions needed for each of these strands and the need for more training and guidance for teachers related to drug education. Goals for each grade level were established and shared with the leadership team. Then, the discussion turned to the need to protect academic advisory just like socioemotional sessions were protected, especially trying to honor the commitment of having bi-weekly sessions. An additional session was scheduled for exam week as the working group expressed their need to front load planning for next school year.

The fourth and last session of the academic year took place during final assessment week in June 2019. Incoming grade level leaders, some outgoing grade level leaders, advisors
who expressed interest and experience in socioemotional support, the high school assistant principal, and the researcher attended this session. Vertical articulation on the four major stands continued, especially focused on digital citizenship. The technology integration specialist advised on the school’s plan for a number of sessions to be integrated into the advisory program for grade level leaders to consider in their scheduling. Further, grade level leaders planned the advisory schedule for the 2019-2020 academic year taking into consideration the necessary drug education and digital citizenship sessions. The first planning session for advisory working group for the 2019-2020 academic year was set for August 7, 2019 to consider advisor training and further session planning.

Advisory sessions

Each grade level team, grade level leader and assistant, were tasked with creating the different sessions for their section of the advisory program. All sessions were to be connected to one of the outcomes. Grade level leaders had access to different resources to aid them in the creation of the individual sessions. The program consisted of a weekly session on Tuesdays with a socioemotional focus and a biweekly session on Thursdays with an academic focus. The former were protected from any other initiative to ensure it did not become a dumping ground like it had been in the past, however the latter was at times moved around to accommodate class meetings or assemblies.

Following advisory programs best practices (Fauci et al., 2006; Poliner & Lieber, 2004), grade level leaders were provided with a an advisory session template (Appendix Y) in which they would include the objective(s) of the session, a step-by-step procedure for advisors to follow, the time allocated per task, and possible issues that could arise. The plans were to be sent out in advance of each session to ensure advisors had sufficient time to familiarize themselves with the content of the sessions. Following the needs assessment findings presented in Chapter 2 of this dissertation, advisors had the freedom to personalize
the session as long as they met the objective(s) of the week. Grade 11 planned 35 socio-emotional sessions and 13 academic sessions while Grade 12 planned 29 socio-emotional sessions and 11 academic sessions. Most often than not, the sessions were planned proactively, however there were a few instances in which grade level leaders had to be reactive and respond to a particular situation students were going through (e.g. debunking the idea of senior privilege).

**Advisor training sessions**

Two training session during the first semester. None during second semester which goes against effective PD literature. Focus turned to planning and implementing sessions. For the first one, outside consultant Steve Barrett from Wildwood schools Skyped in and covered the topic of “WHY advisory”. After, the researcher and the assistant principal covered the nuts and bolts of the program, the roles and responsibilities of advisors, counselors, and principals were shared. The structure of the program was outlined, specifically the difference between Tuesday and Thursday sessions. Finally, the how of the program including the planning documents were introduced to teacher advisors.

The second session was built upon the feedback from teacher advisors and grade level leaders and focused on practicing skills needed when having conversations with students. Advisors sat in grade level teams and provided feedback to their grade level leaders about the successes and challenges of the program’s first month. Further, following good practice on advisor training (Fauci et al., 2006; Poliner & Lieber, 2004; Tucker et al., 2005) a role play exercise was undertaken in which advisors were split into groups of three: one acted as the advisor, one as the student, and one as an observer. Teacher advisors were given three different scenarios of hard conversations they could face with a student and they rotated the scenarios. To finish the session, advisory grade level planned the future advisory sessions of the semester.
Evaluation of program

The evaluation study consisted of both quantitative and qualitative data collection strategies. Students and teacher advisors were invited to participate in this study. Thirteen students completed pre, mid, and post program surveys (Appendix P) in August 2018, December 2018, and May 2019. Of those 13 students, seven agreed to participate in the mid-program focus group and six in the post-program focus group. Seven teachers completed the pre and post-program survey (Appendix Q) and four of them participated in individual semi-structured post-program interviews. A detailed description of the evaluation study can be found in Chapter 4 of this dissertation.

Findings

Reliability of instruments

Most of the constructs in this study were measured by multi-item scales. The reliabilities of the different scales were calculated for the pre, mid, and post-program student surveys and for pre and post-program teacher surveys. Table 5.1 shows the constructs measured by each student survey scale and the scale’s reliability at different measurement occasions. Table 5.2 shows similar information for scales from the teacher survey.

Table 5.1

Constructs and reliability measures for Student Surveys

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Construct</th>
<th>Pre</th>
<th>Mid</th>
<th>Post</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Perceived closeness to advisor</td>
<td>.853</td>
<td>.845</td>
<td>.889</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perceived influence from advisor</td>
<td>.802</td>
<td>.786</td>
<td>.800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perceived support from advisor 1</td>
<td>.758*</td>
<td>.839</td>
<td>.665*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perceived academic press from advisor</td>
<td>.643</td>
<td>.752</td>
<td>.732</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perceived support from advisor 2</td>
<td>.894</td>
<td>.927</td>
<td>.941</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Importance of advisor support</td>
<td>.804</td>
<td>.752</td>
<td>.870</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* only 8 out of 9 items were included in the calculation because one item showed no variability.
Table 5.2

Constructs and reliability measures for Teacher Surveys

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reliability Measures: Teacher Survey (Cronbach’s alpha)</th>
<th>Pre</th>
<th>Post</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Teacher advisor self-efficacy</td>
<td>.886</td>
<td>.895</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knowledge of supportive activities</td>
<td>.938</td>
<td>.906</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knowledge of transition activities</td>
<td>.595</td>
<td>.582</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advisor’s ideal match</td>
<td>.915*</td>
<td>.653*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* one item of the original scale was left out as it did not correlate well with the other items.

**Process Evaluation**

**RQ1 Did teacher advisors appropriately implement advisory sessions as planned?** All teacher advisors got detailed plans from the grade level leaders for all sessions of the academic year. Following the needs assessment’s results, all teacher advisors were given the option to personalize the sessions depending on their group’s needs as long as they met the objective set forth for the session. However, through interviews with students and teachers, it is clear that not all sessions were implemented consistently in all advisory groups. In the Grade 11 focus groups, some students reported that, “[their] advisor did not believe in the activity and did not want to talk about feelings” so they decided to let students just work on any assignments they had. In teacher interviews, one teacher mentioned in his post-program interview that “students would, at times, be confused when I asked about an activity because they had not done it in their group.” It was also identified by another one of the teachers in their post-program interview that “more consistency throughout the advisory groups is necessary to achieve the outcomes of the program.”

**RQ2 Were students and faculty members satisfied with the new 11th and 12th grade advisory program and advisory training sessions?** Students’ satisfaction was measured for first semester in both Grade 11 and Grade 12 sessions at different rates. Grade 11 advisory groups completed the exit ticket during the first month of activities while Grade 12 advisory groups completed the satisfaction exit ticket (Appendix I) once a month during the first semester of activities. Grade 12 students were asked to consider the month’s
activities when responding. Each grade level decided to discontinue the use of the satisfaction exit ticket as it was taking too much time out of the limited time they had with their advisory group.

For the data collected in the Grade 11 exit tickets, 98 responses were collected which represented five of the advisory groups assessing their satisfaction for the first five sessions of semester one. Compiled data of the sessions showed that 46.9% of students reported being somewhat satisfied and 27.6% reported being very satisfied with the activities. For the data collected in the Grade 12 exit tickets, 179 responses were collected which represented all advisory groups assessing their satisfaction at five different times during semester one of the program. Compiled data showed that 47.5% of students reported being somewhat satisfied and 32.4% reported being very satisfied.

RQ3 Were participants engaged in the advisory sessions and advisory training sessions? Attendance data was drawn from PowerSchool for the Tuesday socioemotional sessions as the Thursday sessions were mixed with assemblies and class meetings. During semester one of the program, Grade 12 had an attendance record of 92.88% while Grade 11 had an attendance record of 93.72%. During semester two, Grade 12 had an attendance record of 93.13% while Grade 11 had an attendance record of 94.74%.

All 18 teacher advisors for Grade 11 and 12 attended and participated actively in the first training session with the external consultant and during the planning session. All advisors participated in the feedback session of the first month’s activity, providing grade level leaders actionable feedback. Fifteen teacher advisors completed the exit ticket (Appendix J), the researcher did not complete the exit ticket. 26.7% of participants were very satisfied with the first training session, 53.3% were somewhat satisfied, 13.3% were neutral about it, and only 6.7% were somewhat unsatisfied. No teacher reported being very unsatisfied with the session. One of the teachers interviewed post-program reported this
session had been “a solid step, but did not cover anything I didn’t already know, however it is necessary to get everyone on the same page.” Another teacher who participated in the session, reported in the exit ticket to have “enjoyed the consultant” especially because he is “an expert” while another teacher was appreciative of the inclusion “of the why” about our advisory program. Teacher advisors asked to “see examples of lessons”, “the schedule for advisory and detailed plans for sessions”, “training sessions on active listening skills”, and “planning time”.

For the second training session, three advisors did not attend as they were teaching the Higher Level extended block, which took place at the same time as the session. Two of these advisors were the grade level leaders for Grade 11 while one of them was a Grade 12 advisor. One of the members of the Advisory Working Group took over the planning section of the session for Grade 11 in lieu of the Grade Level Leaders. All attendees participated in the role-playing activity about having hard conversations with students. During one of the post-program teacher interviews one of the teachers mentioned that the role-playing exercise “helped to see how others would address a situation I hadn’t encountered.”

**Outcome Evaluation**

Table 5.3 presents the results of Paired Sample T-tests conducted for each of the variables addressed in the following research questions. For the student survey, data was collected pre, mid, and post participation in the advisory program. All of the changes reported in Table 5.3 were positive, but none of these changes were statistically significant.
Table 5.3

Changes from Pre-Program to Post-Program on Students’ Survey Measures (N=13 students, df =12)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>Pre-Program</th>
<th>Post-Program</th>
<th>Change (Post - Pre)</th>
<th>Paired Sample T-Test Results</th>
<th>Positive change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>Unstandardized</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Closeness to Advisor</td>
<td>3.50</td>
<td>1.54</td>
<td>3.85</td>
<td>1.75</td>
<td>.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perceived Influence From Advisor</td>
<td>2.30</td>
<td>.88</td>
<td>2.53</td>
<td>.90</td>
<td>.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perceived Support From Advisor 1</td>
<td>.64</td>
<td>.19</td>
<td>.70</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td>.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perceived Academic Press from Advisor</td>
<td>2.17</td>
<td>.38</td>
<td>2.24</td>
<td>.44</td>
<td>.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perceived Support from Advisor 2</td>
<td>3.26</td>
<td>.79</td>
<td>3.50</td>
<td>1.06</td>
<td>.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perceived Support from Advisor Importance</td>
<td>1.96</td>
<td>.31</td>
<td>2.02</td>
<td>.42</td>
<td>.06</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Δ expresses change in standard deviation units. Specifically, Δ = (Post-Program Mean – Pre-Program Mean)/(Pre-Program SD).

RQ 4 Did the new advisory program increase student’s perceived social support and academic press from their advisors? Advisor support was computed using the adaptation of the Phillippo and Stone (2013) scale by including the “Unsure” option in between the “Yes” and “No.” There was no significant change, however 61.54% of respondents did show a positive change in the perceived support from their advisor. With most students either reporting they were “Unsure” of the support provided or “True”. The second measure of perceived support from their advisor, was computed using the adapted version of the Malecki, Demaray, and Elliot (2000) scale. There was no significant change, however 61.54% of respondents also showed a positive change in this measure, having most
student report that their advisors supported them some or most of the time. Grade 12 students reported during their post-program focus groups that “as the year went by, the support became more consistent, even after the program ended my advisor would ask me how I was doing in the hallway during IB exams.” One student in the grade 12 post-program focus group also recognized that their “advisor would provide different support depending on the student in their group as some people are more open to it.” On the contrary, some grade 11 students reported in their mid-program focus group, “not feeling supported, especially when I don’t know my advisor and when they don’t actually do anything to get to know me either.”

A Grade 12 advisor reported during his post-program interview to differentiating his approach to academic advising, making sure “to check up on students who say everything is fine but are still a concern when I check back in.” While another grade 12 advisor recognized in her post-program interview that she is “in need of more training on how to support students socioemotionally with a less confrontational style.”

The importance of advisor support reported by students was measured with the second section of Malecki et al.’s (2000) scale. No significant change could be identified, however, 46.15% of student respondents reported a positive change in how important it is for them to be supported by their advisor, going from not important to important.

Perceived academic press from advisors was measured through an adapted version of Phillippo and Stone’s (2013) scale. 53.84% of respondents showed a positive change in their responses, however most students still disagreed that their advisor pressed them academically. During post-program interviews with teachers, there was a general consensus about academic advisory, with one teacher mentioning that “academic advisory still needs a better structure, as that is when [the advisor’s] role was not as clear and the lesson’s were more open-ended.” Grade 11 students reported in their post-program focus group that they
felt more academic guidance from “my advisor if they were also my teacher” as they knew what assignment we had to complete.

**RQ 5 Did the new advisory program increase student’s perceived closeness and influence from their advisors?** Perceived closeness to advisor was computed including and averaging two items from Van Ryzin’s (2010) scale. The reported perceived closeness increased from pre to post program surveys with 46.15% of student respondents showing a positive change. However, perceived closeness was still below the “Neutral” option and closer to the “Not at all close option”. Grade 12 students reported in their focus groups that “as the year went by, I could speak to my advisor more openly”, however some grade 11 students reported in their post-program focus group that some “advisor[s] did not want to build a relationship with us, we were even told they were not our therapist and that they did not do feelings.” Other grade 11 students reported that their advisors tried to really “take an interest in the social emotional aspect of the program.” Teacher advisors reported in their post-program interviews that as the weeks went by and we “got to know our advisees better, it was easier to speak to them about socio-emotional and academic issues.”

Perceived advisor influence was computed including 10 items from Van Ryzin’s (2010) influence scale. There were 69.23% student respondents that showcased a positive change, which brought student closer to the “Disagree a little” option rather than the “Disagree” option.

**RQ 6 Did the new advisory program influence student’s choice of teacher advisors as part of their attachment network?** Student’s choice of teacher advisors as part of their attachment network was measured using an adapted version of Van Ryzin’s (2010) scale where students got to choose from a list of people rather than having an open response question. Table 5.4 summarizes the results of the changes between the pre and post program surveys. There was a positive change in every question, except the “Think of the person you
can ACTUALLY count on to always be there for you and care about you no matter what.”

that showed a negative change. However, only the change for the “Think of a person you
would WANT to go to, to help you feel better when something bad happens to you or you
feel upset, whether or not you actually go to them” was statistically significant. By the end of
the program, student results in two questions resembled Van Ryzin’s (2010) results where
40% of participants reported this advisor as a secondary attachment figure. Thirty-one
percent of the respondents in this study chose their advisor when asked to “Think of a person
you would WANT to go to, to help you feel better when something bad happens to you or
you feel upset, whether or not you actually go to them” and 38% chose the advisor in
response to: “Think of the person you would LIKE to be able to count on to always be there
for you and care about you know matter what.”

Table 5.4

Changes from Pre-Program to Post-Program in Students’ Attachment to Advisor (N=13
students, df =12)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dichotomous Measure*</th>
<th>Pre-Program Mean</th>
<th>Post-Program Mean</th>
<th>Change</th>
<th>( t ) (df=12)</th>
<th>Sig. (2-tailed)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Think of a person you would WANT to go to, to help you feel better when something bad happens to you or you feel upset, whether or not you actually go to them.</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.31</td>
<td>.31</td>
<td>2.31</td>
<td>.040</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Think of the person you ACTUALLY go to, to help you feel better when something bad happens to you or you feel upset.</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>1.48</td>
<td>.165</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Think of the person you would LIKE to be able to count on to always be there for you and care about you know matter what.</td>
<td>.31</td>
<td>.38</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.562</td>
<td>.584</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Think of the person you can ACTUALLY count on to always be there for you and care about you no matter what.</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>-.08</td>
<td>-1.00</td>
<td>.337</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Think of the person that is important for you to see or talk with regularly.</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.23</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>1.48</td>
<td>.165</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Note. Each measure is coded “0” if the student did not think of the advisor or “1” if the student did think of the advisor.

**RQ 7 How were student’s perceived social support, academic press, closeness, influence, and attachment network choice moderated by demographic variables (i.e., gender, grade level, age, gender match).** Some demographic variables proved to moderate the results found. For the pre-program survey, grade level rendered a significant effect on perceived advisor influence. Student respondents in grade 11 reported a lower (M=1.88) influence from their advisor compared to grade 12 students (M=2.98) [F(1,11)=7.483, p<.019)]. These two variables showed a significant positive correlation (r=.635, p<.05), whereby the higher the grade level, the higher the advisor influence. As this corresponded to the baseline data, this could be indicative of the nature of the experience they had the previous academic year in their respective advisory program. Grade 12 students participated in a program with a similar premise of the one presented in this dissertation, while Grade 11 students participated in the Work Experience Program which focused less on socioemotional or academic support.

For the mid-program survey, gender match rendered a significant effect on perceived academic press. Students whose gender matched with that of their advisor (M=2.650) reported higher academic press than those who did not have a gender match (M=1.97) [F(1,11)=16.349, p<.002)]. These two variables showed a significant negative correlation (r=−.773, p<.01). Students who had an advisor of their own gender would report higher levels of perceived academic press after one semester of the program, however both groups still reported closer to the “disagree” option.

For the post-program survey, gender rendered a significant effect on the importance for advisor support. Female students (M=2.20) gave advisor support higher levels of importance as compared to male students (M=1.61) [F(1,11)=9.22, p<.011)]. These two variables showed a significant positive correlation (r=.675, p<.05). Further, age rendered a
significant effect on perceived advisor influence. Sixteen year old students (M=1.20) reported less influence from their advisors as compared to 18 year olds (M=3.12) [F(1,11)=5.991, p<.019]. There was a significant positive correlation between these two variables (r=.717, p<.01). This was recognized by a grade 12 student in the post-program focus group where she mentioned that “relationships between teachers and students grow as the years progressed, freshmen tend not to speak to their teachers but our relationship with them has evolved over the last four years of high school.”

Grade level rendered a significant effect on three different variables. It rendered an effect on perceived advisor influence, where grade 12 students (M=3.20) reported higher levels of influence compared to grade 11 students (M=2.11) [F(1,11)=6.60, p<.026]. There was a significant positive correlation (r=.612, p<.05). Just as age had a positive relationship with perceived advisor influence, as students grow and move from grade level to grade level, the perceived influence from their advisor grows. However, both groups are still on the negative side of the scale.

Grade level also rendered an effect on the first measure of perceived social support, where grade 12 students (M=.844) reported higher levels of perceived social support from their advisors as compared to grade 11 students (M=.604). There was a significant positive correlation between these variables (r=.713, p<.01). Grade 11 students were more likely to be unsure if their advisor provided them with support as opposed to grade 12 students. Grade level also rendered an effect on the second measure of perceived social support. Following a similar trend, grade 12 students (M=4.28) reported higher levels of perceived advisor support as compared to grade 11 students (M=3.02). There was a significant correlation between these two variables as well (r=.595, p<.05). Grade 12 students were more likely to perceive support from their advisor most of the time, while grade 11 only some of the time.
Table 5.5 presents the results of Paired Sample T-tests conducted for each of the variables addressed in the following research questions. For the teacher survey, data was collected pre and post participation in the advisory program. There was one statistically significant change, teacher’s frequency of supportive activities during advisory.

Table 5.5

Changes from Pre-Program to Post-Program on Teacher’s Survey Measures (N=7 teachers, df =6)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>Pre-Program</th>
<th>Post-Program</th>
<th>Change (Post - Pre)</th>
<th>Paired Sample T-Test Results</th>
<th>Positive change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>Unstandardized</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-efficacy</td>
<td>3.50</td>
<td>.61</td>
<td>3.71</td>
<td>.62</td>
<td>.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supportive Activities</td>
<td>2.62</td>
<td>1.07</td>
<td>3.56</td>
<td>.91</td>
<td>.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transition Activities</td>
<td>2.08</td>
<td>.44</td>
<td>1.88</td>
<td>.36</td>
<td>-.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ideal Match</td>
<td>1.57</td>
<td>.66</td>
<td>1.86</td>
<td>.57</td>
<td>.29</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Δ expresses change in standard deviation units. Specifically, Δ = (Post-Program Mean – Pre-Program Mean)/(Pre-Program SD).

RQ 8 Did the new advisory training sessions increase teacher advisor’s self-efficacy? Teacher self-efficacy regarding their role as advisors, was measured using Phillippo and Stone’s (2013) Teacher efficacy scale. 85.71% of teachers showed a positive increase in their self-efficacy as shown in Table 5.5. The change was not statistically significant. Teachers reported in the exit ticket and post-program interviews that training sessions allowed them to understand the “why of the advisory program and their specific role” and introduced them to what “other people would do in a certain situation, through the role playing exercise.” Teachers reported in their post-program interviews to feeling more comfortable with their group as the year went on but still would want “more training and guidance on how to deal with mental health issues” and “the line of communication when issues beyond the scope of advisors come up.”
RQ 9 Did the new advisory training sessions and program increase teacher advisor’s frequency of supportive activities and knowledge of transition activities offered by the school? Frequency of supportive activities was measured using Mac Iver and Epstein’s (1991) Use of supportive activities section of their Practices, Programs, Policies and Staff in the middle grades questionnaire. 71.43% of teachers showed a positive increase in their frequency of supportive activities they engage in during advisory. This change was statistically significant as shown in Table 5.5. During teacher post-program interviews, teachers reported to being able to provide more “consistent support as everyone knew where they had to be during that specific block of time on Tuesday.” Teachers also asked for more guidance on supporting students “academically, as those sessions were a more open-ended and the role was not as clear as the socio-emotional support one.”

Knowledge on transition activities was measured using an adapted version of Mac Iver and Epstein’s (1991) Organization of the Transition items. The “Unsure” option was added to this scale and coded using a 3, “Yes” was 1, and “No” was 2. The negative change seen in the means reported by teachers indicate that they are less unsure of what is being done at ISK, however, most teachers reported, that to their knowledge, the activities presented in the survey are not taking place.

RQ 10 Did the new advisory program increase teacher advisor’s match with what they consider to be their ideal advisory program? Finally, the teacher perception of the advisory program as an ideal match to what they would want in a program was surveyed through the use of Mac Iver and Epstein’s (1991) scale. 57.14% of teachers showed a positive increase in their ideal match between what ISK is doing for transition purposes of student’s through the advisory program and beyond. However, the change was not significant. One of the grade 12 advisors recognized in her post-program interview that even though “we have looked more this year at how students transition out of ISK during senior week with the
cooking class, the CPR training, and the counselor sessions, we still need to look at the how we support students coming in or leaving ISK during the school year in other grade levels.”

RQ 11 How were teacher advisors’ self-efficacy, supportive and transition activity knowledge, and ideal match moderated by demographic variables (i.e., gender, age, years of experience as advisor)? Only two demographic variables had an effect on two of the collected variables. Age on perceived self-efficacy during the pre-program survey and gender on ideal match during the post-program survey.

Age rendered a significant comparison, the youngest participants (M=2.41) reported less self-efficacy than the older participants (M= 4.06) [F(1,5)=261.743, p<.047]. These two variables showed a positive correlation (r=.626) which indicates that the older the participant, the higher the perceived self-efficacy in the new role of advisor.

Gender rendered a significant comparison when measuring the ideal match between the participants ideal advisory program and the one offered at ISK. These two variables showed a significant negative correlation (r=-.855, p<.05) which indicates that female respondents (M=1.33) reported less of a match between their ideal advisory program and what ISK is providing students, especially when it comes to transitioning into ISK compared to male respondents. (M=2.25) [F(1,5)=13.647, p<.014), with most advisors’ evaluation being around a weak or fair match.

Secondary data on twelfth grade advisory program outcomes. Table 5.6 presents the results of Paired Sample T-tests conducted for each of the variables addresses in the survey created by ISK’s twelfth grade level leaders to measure the outcomes of the program objectives. Data was collected pre, mid, and post participation in the advisory program. Only Confidence on Transition proved to be statistically significant. The survey was completed by 62% (N=41) of the senior class.
Table 5.6

Changes from Pre-Program to Post-Program on School’s Grade 12 Outcome Survey (N=41 students, df =40)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>Pre-Program</th>
<th>Post-Program</th>
<th>Change (Post - Pre)</th>
<th>Paired Sample T-Test Results</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>Unstandardized</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Confidence on Transition</td>
<td>3.21</td>
<td>1.20</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>.866</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Confidence to adhere to deadlines</td>
<td>3.88</td>
<td>.68</td>
<td>3.61</td>
<td>1.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Confidence to control stress</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>.95</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perceived knowledge for IB exams</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>.69</td>
<td>3.73</td>
<td>.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perceived skills for IB exams</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>.95</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Confidence to create and execute action plans</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>.90</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knowledge on drug and substance abuse</td>
<td>4.44</td>
<td>.74</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>.78</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Δ expresses change in standard deviation units. Specifically, Δ = (Post-Program Mean – Pre-Program Mean)/(Pre-Program SD).

Every variable measured showed an increase between the pre and post program survey, except for confidence to adhere to deadlines which could be explained by the increase in work load between the beginning of the school year and a month before IB examinations. This can be paired with the slight increase in confidence to control stress levels. There was a significant increase in student’s confidence on their upcoming transition, this could be indicative of the students completing their college applications and getting accepted into college between the pre and post survey.
Discussion

Advisory program best practices are proposed by Poliner and Lieber (2004) in their *Advisory Puzzle*. Looking at the results presented in the section above, it is clear that the advisory program at ISK needs to continue working on making sure their advisory puzzle comes together.

One of the puzzle pieces proposed by Poliner and Lieber (2004) is professional development for teacher advisors. It became clear that the PD provided for teacher advisors was a good first step especially to present a clear and cohesive why for the program. Continued transparency around the goals and outcomes of the program (Ladson-Billings, 1995; Watson et al., 2014), along with clear roles and expectations (Phillippo & Stone, 2013) of all stakeholders will increase the buy-in of the program moving forward (Cole, 1994).

Teachers interviewed considered the PD offered to be a “solid step, especially to have everyone on the same page”, however it might be important to differentiate the training provided as some advisors might not need the same amount of guidance or support as one teacher stated that the PD offered “did not cover anything” new. However, others reported that they “enjoyed the consultant” that provided expert advice. As future PD is planned, the format and timing of these would be important as some teachers praised part of it like the role playing exercise that allowed teachers to “see what others do in situations I hadn’t encountered” while others mentioned that the nuts and bolts of the program were presented in “a dry and boring manner.”

Providing teacher advisors with professional development is key (Phillippo & Stone, 2013), especially if the advisors want to keep developing their self-efficacy in this new role. Although the change was not statistically significant in the small sample of advisors surveyed, most advisors reported a positive change in their self-efficacy. Through being an advisor this school year and the PD opportunities, advisors were able to learn by doing
Advisors were able to change some of their beliefs about advisory, some of them even reporting that “this advisory program has been the best one we have had in the last couple of years.” Following Bandura’s (1986) reciprocal determinism theory, with advisors’ beliefs changing, they will be more prone to change their behavior and the environment they provide students.

If advisors are able to change their behaviors, they could potentially become advocates for each of their advisees (Anfara, 2006). An advisory program has to provide a structure that fosters consistent support from advisors to advisees. This support could potentially lead to the formation of a secure attachment (Ainsworth, 1989) in what could potentially be a four-year relationship. Although the positive change in perceived social support was small and statistically insignificant, students recognized that some advisors were trying to provide students with support inside and outside the advisory period. Some advisors were able to create a supportive, trusting, and caring environment (Ladson-Billings, 1995) in which students felt comfortable speaking up during discussions, especially when the structure and expectations of discussions were shared with them. If this support were to continue, maybe there would be higher reports of students actually going to their advisors when something bad happens rather than just wanting to go to them as reported in the attachment network questions.

However, this would not be the case for all students, as some students did not experience a supportive or trusting environment. This hindered the formation of positive relationships between advisors and advisees, which led to a negative view of the program from students. This points to another one of Poliner and Lieber’s (2004) advisory puzzle pieces: accountability. Even when teacher advisors had a detailed plan provided by the grade level leaders, which some teachers praised in their post-program interviews as being “detailed enough to easily understand them”, some advisors did not follow the plan provided or fulfill
the objective of the lesson. Holding advisors accountable will ensure that all students receive consistent support and that a true personalized experience (McClure et al., 2010) can be achieved. Further, it would create what Lave (1991) called a community of practice where students could receive support and ideas from both their advisor and fellow advisees. Again, some students reported this to be the case, especially in grade 12, however others barely spoke to the people in their group or their advisor.

Some of the statistically significant differences in the findings shown in the previous section are helpful to ensure that a personalized experience is provided to all students (McClure et al., 2010). This would be important to consider when working on the Content, themes, formats advisory puzzle piece (Poliner & Lieber, 2004). Female students gave more importance to advisor support, which could lead advisors to ensure they provide more support to female students. Further, students in grade 12 reported higher influence from their advisor, as the relationship builds and students recognize the influence of their advisor, advisors could potentially provide added support or guidance, as it will be received more openly. Taking into consideration the cultural diversity of ISK’s student population and the fact that most of the students enrolled are third culture kids (Pollock & Van Reken, 2004), advisors need to tailor their support thinking about cultural nuances. This will only happen if advisors are able to provide students with an open, caring, and trusting environment (Ladson-Billings, 1995) in each of their advisory groups.

Limitations

This ten-month-long longitudinal study provides insight into student and teacher advisor experience in a redesigned high school advisory program and highlights what could be done in an international school to provide consistent social, emotional, and academic support for all students. However, due to the small sample size it is hard to generalize the few statistically significant changes that were identified in the findings section above to other
international schools. A larger sample would have provided a deeper look at the student and teacher experience and could have rendered more statistically significant results. The lack of observation data to ensure sessions were applied consistently across advisory groups hinders the working group’s ability to focus on specific advisors who might need more personalized guidance and support in this new role. More consistent training sessions need to be offered so advisor’s skills and self-efficacy keep increasing. Further, the discontinuation of satisfaction surveys limited the working group’s ability to address concerns on specific advisory sessions.

Recommendations

ISK has shown its commitment to its students and their well-being by making the provision of social, emotional, and academic support to its students a priority. The redesigned high school advisory program is a strong first step for the consistent provision of support for all students. However, the work on the advisory program is far from done. Social, emotional, and academic support needs to be vertically aligned PreK-12, taking into consideration that this support cannot happen in isolation only in advisory, it is imperative to have a social emotional learning embedded in every activity done in school, inside and outside of the classroom (Frey, Fisher, & Smith, 2019).

As the redesigned advisory program goes into its second year, it's important to keep in mind that teacher advisor training needs to be ongoing, consistent, and valuable. A focus on how to talk to students and how to hold the dual teacher-advisor role needs to permeate all PD sessions. As ISK prepares to host a Professional Learning Institute on social emotional learning with a focus on the advisory program, grade level leaders and other advisors should be sponsored to attend. This has the potential of increasing teacher advisor buy-in (Cole, 1994). Further, as the program grows it might be necessary to consider providing release time for grade level leaders who plan the sessions or establishing a Social Emotional Learning/Wellbeing Coordinator who overlooks the continued improvement of the program,
especially the vertical alignment of the content and how to address different topics at
different grade levels. ISK should continue, as they did this recruitment season, informing
new hires of the school’s commitment to social emotional learning and its advisory program.

As the advisory working group continues its work to improve the program that started
in the 2018-2019 academic year, they should consider students’ voice as they move forward.
The working group should consider bringing in students to their meetings, as well as other
stakeholders, to get first-hand knowledge of what needs to be addressed in the program’s
sessions. As proposed by one student in the focus group, the separation of academic and
socioemotional sessions might look good on paper, however, most times students’
socioemotional issues stem from academic concerns or an increased workload. The advisory
working group should consider finding ways of balancing the academic and socioemotional
focus that will work for ISK students. Effective ways of collecting data on the student and
teacher advisor experience need to be designed to ensure the advisory working group has
reliable and valid data to make decisions regarding the program’s future. It would be
important to ensure that data is collected on the different outcomes set forth for each of the
grade levels as the grade 12 team did this year. All grade level leaders should ensure that they
are collecting data to inform future steps of the program. This could continue as a
professional learning community exercise or as part of the formal evaluation that students
complete at the end of each semester.

ISK’s leadership team should ensure there are systems in place that allows them to
identify advisors who are not fulfilling the objectives of the advisory sessions. Students
should be getting similar experiences in their advisory groups and the support being given
should be valuable for the student’s learning journey at ISK. Finally, ISK’s leadership team
should continue guarding the Tuesday sessions as they have done this academic year to
ensure that the advisory program does not become a dumping ground for non-advisory-related activities as it had been in the past.
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Appendix A

Student Survey for Needs Assessment

**Gender:** M / F  
**Age:** _____  
**Grade level:** _____  
**Nationality:** ___________________  
**Advisor:** ___________________

**Part I. Your past and future transitions**

How many countries have you lived in since birth?

1  2  3  4  5 or more

Do you plan to stay in Kenya after high school graduation (e.g., for college, university, or work)?

Yes  No

If “no,” in which country do you think you might spend your first few years after high school graduation?

_________________________________

Name of country

**Part II. Your relationship with your advisor**

2.1 **Directions:** For the following questions, please circle one and only one of the options regarding the closeness of your relationship with your advisor.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Relative to all your other relationships (both same and opposite sex), how would you characterize your relationship with your advisor?</th>
<th>Not at all close</th>
<th>Extremely close</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Relative to what you know about other people's relationships with their advisor, how would you characterize your relationship with your advisor?</th>
<th>Not at all close</th>
<th>Extremely close</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2.2 **Directions:** For each statement, please fill in the appropriate value based upon your experience with your advisor. If you didn’t spend any one-on-one time, put zeros in the blanks.

During the past week, what is the average amount of time (per day) that you spend interacting one-on-one with your advisor AT SCHOOL?

______ hour(s) _____ minute(s)
During the past week, what is the average amount of time (per day) that you spend interacting one-on-one with your advisor OUT OF SCHOOL (i.e., telephone, email, etc.)?

______ hour(s) ______ minute(s)

Compared with the “normal” amount of time that you spend interacting one-on-one with your advisor, how typical was this past week? (Check one)

______ typical ______ not typical…if not, why not? ______________________

2.3 Directions: Which of the following activities have you and your advisor undertaken over the past week? Only include those activities that involved only you and your advisor. (Check all that apply)

______ went for a walk
______ talked about a school issue
______ emailed one another during out-of-school hours
______ played cards or a board game of some kind
______ talked about the future
______ checked out an interesting Web site
______ ate a meal
______ worked together on a school project
______ talked about a personal problem
______ cleaned up our work area
______ talked about sports, politics, or other news
______ did some cleaning or repairs in the school
______ played a sport or game outdoors or in the gym
______ planned a group activity, field trip, or project
______ talked on the phone during out-of-school hours
______ listened to some music
______ looked for some books or materials in the library
2.4 Directions: The following questions concern the amount of influence that your advisor has on your thoughts, feelings and behavior. For each statement, circle the response that best describes how true that statement is for you. Please circle one and only one option for each statement.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th><strong>My advisor influences the way I spend my free time.</strong></th>
<th><strong>Strongly agree</strong></th>
<th><strong>Agree a little</strong></th>
<th><strong>Neutral</strong></th>
<th><strong>Disagree a little</strong></th>
<th><strong>Disagree</strong></th>
<th><strong>Strongly disagree</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>My advisor influences the way I spend my free time.</td>
<td>Strongly agree</td>
<td>Agree a little</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>Disagree a little</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>Strongly disagree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>My advisor does not influence which friends I choose to see.</td>
<td>Strongly agree</td>
<td>Agree a little</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>Disagree a little</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>Strongly disagree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>My advisor influences the way I feel about myself.</td>
<td>Strongly agree</td>
<td>Agree a little</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>Disagree a little</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>Strongly disagree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>My advisor does not influence how I spend my money.</td>
<td>Strongly agree</td>
<td>Agree a little</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>Disagree a little</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>Strongly disagree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>My advisor influences the way I feel about the future.</td>
<td>Strongly agree</td>
<td>Agree a little</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>Disagree a little</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>Strongly disagree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>My advisor does not influence the opinions I have of other people in my life.</td>
<td>Strongly agree</td>
<td>Agree a little</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>Disagree a little</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>Strongly disagree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>My advisor influences how hard I work in school.</td>
<td>Strongly agree</td>
<td>Agree a little</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>Disagree a little</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>Strongly disagree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>My advisor does not influence the type of career I will have.</td>
<td>Strongly agree</td>
<td>Agree a little</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>Disagree a little</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>Strongly disagree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>My advisor influences the basic values that I hold.</td>
<td>Strongly agree</td>
<td>Agree a little</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>Disagree a little</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>Strongly disagree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>My advisor does not influence the way I behave out of school.</td>
<td>Strongly agree</td>
<td>Agree a little</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>Disagree a little</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>Strongly disagree</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Part III. What I perceive from my advisor.

3.1 Directions: For each of the following items, please choose either true, false, or unsure.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th><strong>My advisors cares about me.</strong></th>
<th><strong>True</strong></th>
<th><strong>False</strong></th>
<th><strong>Unsure</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>My advisor listens to what I have to say.</td>
<td>True</td>
<td>False</td>
<td>Unsure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>My advisor cares whether or not I come to school.</td>
<td>True</td>
<td>False</td>
<td>Unsure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>My advisor is willing to work with me after school.</td>
<td>True</td>
<td>False</td>
<td>Unsure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>My advisor gives me a lot of encouragement.</td>
<td>True</td>
<td>False</td>
<td>Unsure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>My advisor praises my efforts when I work hard.</td>
<td>True</td>
<td>False</td>
<td>Unsure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>My advisor cares about the grades I achieve.</td>
<td>True</td>
<td>False</td>
<td>Unsure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>My advisor shows me respect.</td>
<td>True</td>
<td>False</td>
<td>Unsure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>My advisor knows my strengths as a student.</td>
<td>True</td>
<td>False</td>
<td>Unsure</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3.2 Directions: For each statement, circle the response that best describes how true that statement is for you. Please circle one and only one option for each statement.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>My advisor expects me to do my best.</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>My advisor challenges me to do better in school.</td>
<td>Strongly agree</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>Strongly disagree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>My advisor lets me know when I am doing my best work.</td>
<td>Strongly agree</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>Strongly disagree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>My advisor assigns work that challenges me.</td>
<td>Strongly agree</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>Strongly disagree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>My advisor tells me when I am doing less than my best work.</td>
<td>Strongly agree</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>Strongly disagree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>My advisor encourages me when he/she thinks I can do better.</td>
<td>Strongly agree</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>Strongly disagree</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.3 Directions: You will be asked to respond to sentences about some form of support or help that you might get from your advisor. Read each sentence carefully and respond to them honestly. There are no right or wrong answers.

For each sentence you are asked to provide two responses. First, rate how often you receive the support described and then rate how important the support is to you.

**MY ADVISOR...**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>HOW OFTEN?</th>
<th>IMPORTANT?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Never</td>
<td>Almost Never</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>cares about me.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>treats me fairly.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>makes it okay to ask questions.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>explains things that I don’t understand.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>shows me how to do things.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>helps me solve problems by giving me information.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>tells me I did a good job when I’ve done something well.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>nicely tells me when I make mistakes.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>tells me how well I do on tasks.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>makes sure I have what I need for school.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>takes time to help me learn to do something well.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>spends time with me when I need help.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>understands me.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>listens to me when I need to talk.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>gives me good advice.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>takes time to help me decide things.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Part IV. School attachment network

4.1 Directions: Thinking of anyone in your school setting, answer the following questions with the person you would want to/actually go to/would like to go to when something bad happens. Also, state the relationship this person has to you.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>WHO?</th>
<th>RELATIONSHIP TO YOU?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Whom would you <strong>want</strong> to go to, to help you feel better when something bad happens to you or you feel upset, whether or not you actually go to them?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Whom do you <strong>actually</strong> go to, to help you feel better when something bad happens to you or you feel upset?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Whom would you <strong>like</strong> to be able to count on to always be there for you and care about you no matter what?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Whom do you feel you can <strong>actually</strong> count on to always be there for you and care about you no matter what?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Whom is it important for you to see or talk with regularly?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix B

Teacher Survey for Needs Assessment

Gender: M / F  Age: ___  Grade level Advisor: _____  Nationality: ___________________  Years as an Advisor: ___________________

Part I. Teacher role as advisor
1.1 Directions: For each of the following statements about your role as a teacher and advisor, select the degree to which you either agree or disagree.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Slightly Agree</th>
<th>Slightly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>I must be both a teacher and a counselor to my students.</td>
<td>Strongly</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>agree</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>My primary role is to teach students, not to deal with their feelings and emotions.</td>
<td>Strongly</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>agree</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>I think professionals other than me, such as school counselors and social workers,</td>
<td>Strongly</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>should take primary responsibility for my students’ mental health and well being.</td>
<td>agree</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>I cannot teach my students effectively unless I also consider their social and</td>
<td>Strongly</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>emotional needs.</td>
<td>agree</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>I play an important role not only in my students’ learning, but also in the way they</td>
<td>Strongly</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>feel about themselves and life in general.</td>
<td>agree</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>I frequently think about my students’ mental health and well-being.</td>
<td>Strongly</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>agree</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>I see advisory as a place where students should develop life skills.</td>
<td>Strongly</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>agree</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>The advisory role interferes with my ability to teach my other classes.</td>
<td>Strongly</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>agree</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>The academic and social supports of students are separate, distinct activities.</td>
<td>Strongly</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>agree</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>I see advisory as a place where students should focus on academics.</td>
<td>Strongly</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>agree</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>The advisory role is a central part of my job.</td>
<td>Strongly</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>agree</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>I see advisory as a place where students should receive whatever kind of support</td>
<td>Strongly</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(emotional, academic, social, etc.) they need to succeed in school.</td>
<td>agree</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>One of advisory’s functions is to prepare students for college and/or career.</td>
<td>Strongly</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>agree</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>I have a “big picture” plan for my advisory class.</td>
<td>Strongly</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>agree</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1.2 Directions: For each of the following statements, select your level of confidence to complete the tasks outlined.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Build relationships with individual students</th>
<th>Highly confident</th>
<th>Confident</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Somewhat confident</th>
<th>Not confident at all</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Notice social-emotional troubles in your students</td>
<td>Highly confident</td>
<td>Confident</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>Somewhat confident</td>
<td>Not confident at all</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Start conversations with students when you are concerned about their well-being</td>
<td>Highly confident</td>
<td>Confident</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>Somewhat confident</td>
<td>Not confident at all</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Recognize signs of mental health issues (e.g., depression, trauma)</td>
<td>Highly confident</td>
<td>Confident</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>Somewhat confident</td>
<td>Not confident at all</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Recognize signs of family violence</td>
<td>Highly confident</td>
<td>Confident</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>Somewhat confident</td>
<td>Not confident at all</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Recognize signs of substance abuse</td>
<td>Highly confident</td>
<td>Confident</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>Somewhat confident</td>
<td>Not confident at all</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Recognize signs that a student is suicidal</td>
<td>Highly confident</td>
<td>Confident</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>Somewhat confident</td>
<td>Not confident at all</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Respond to your students when they misbehave in school</td>
<td>Highly confident</td>
<td>Confident</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>Somewhat confident</td>
<td>Not confident at all</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Respond to your students when they tell you about their troubles</td>
<td>Highly confident</td>
<td>Confident</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>Somewhat confident</td>
<td>Not confident at all</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Respond to your students when they are experiencing a crisis</td>
<td>Highly confident</td>
<td>Confident</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>Somewhat confident</td>
<td>Not confident at all</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Connect students with support or resources they might need</td>
<td>Highly confident</td>
<td>Confident</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>Somewhat confident</td>
<td>Not confident at all</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Share concerns about students’ well-being with their parents/guardians</td>
<td>Highly confident</td>
<td>Confident</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>Somewhat confident</td>
<td>Not confident at all</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Collaborate with other teachers in order to support students</td>
<td>Highly confident</td>
<td>Confident</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>Somewhat confident</td>
<td>Not confident at all</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Collaborate with administrators in order to support students</td>
<td>Highly confident</td>
<td>Confident</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>Somewhat confident</td>
<td>Not confident at all</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Collaborate with support staff (counselor, social worker) in order to support students</td>
<td>Highly confident</td>
<td>Confident</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>Somewhat confident</td>
<td>Not confident at all</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Collaborate with parents in order to support students</td>
<td>Highly confident</td>
<td>Confident</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>Somewhat confident</td>
<td>Not confident at all</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Understand when and who to contact when a student needs support.</td>
<td>Highly confident</td>
<td>Confident</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>Somewhat confident</td>
<td>Not confident at all</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Part II. Advisory’s organization

2.1 Directions: Select how frequently the following activities occur during ADVISORY in your grade level?

Use of supportive activities during Advisory

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>HOW OFTEN?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Never</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Meet with individual students about problems</td>
<td>1  2  3  4  5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Give career information and guidance</td>
<td>1  2  3  4  5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Discuss academic problems or issues.</td>
<td>1  2  3  4  5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Discuss personal or family problems.</td>
<td>1  2  3  4  5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Discuss social relationships and peer groups.</td>
<td>1  2  3  4  5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Discuss health issues, e.g. drug use prevention, family planning, etc.</td>
<td>1  2  3  4  5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 Discuss moral or ethical issues and values.</td>
<td>1  2  3  4  5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 Discuss intergroup relations and multi-cultural issues.</td>
<td>1  2  3  4  5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 Develop student self-confidence and leadership</td>
<td>1  2  3  4  5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2.2 Directions: Please choose either YES or NO to state how the school facilitates a smooth transition for new students entering high school.

| Transition activities for new students | Yes | No |
| Older students present information to incoming students | Yes | No |
| New students visit for assembly before enrolling | Yes | No |
| New students attend regular classes before enrolling | Yes | No |
| Orientation is planned | Yes | No |
| Buddy or big brother/sister program pairs new student with older one on entry | Yes | No |
| Communication between student’s new and old teacher | Yes | No |

Other: ______________________________________________________

2.3 Directions: Mention the activities you are aware of that are conducted to ensure seniors have a smooth transition from high school to college.

________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________
2.4 Directions: Rate how well the school’s present practices match your IDEAL program for students' smooth transitions to and from the school? Circle one choice.

EXCELLENT—present practices fit students' needs exactly
GOOD basic practices are in place, minor changes needed
FAIR need to improve or add several practices
WEAK—need to design new practices and major changes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Student transition into ISK at the beginning of the school year.</th>
<th>Excellent</th>
<th>Good</th>
<th>Fair</th>
<th>Weak</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Student transition into ISK at mid-semester.</td>
<td>Excellent</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>Weak</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Student transition into ISK at mid-year.</td>
<td>Excellent</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>Weak</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Senior students being prepared for transition to college.</td>
<td>Excellent</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>Weak</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2.5 Directions: Circle one answer. Would you rather...

PLAN YOUR OWN ADVISORY SESSIONS
OR
HAVE A DETAILED PLAN FOR EACH ADVISORY SESSION
OR
HAVE A SAY IN PERSONALIZING DETAILED ADVISORY SESSIONS
Appendix C

School Climate Survey

1. I am a student in grade
   a. 9
   b. 10
   c. 11
   d. 12

2. My teachers know me as an individual person.
   a. Strongly agree
   b. Agree
   c. Disagree
   d. Strongly disagree

3. I feel I belong at ISK.
   a. Strongly agree
   b. Agree
   c. Disagree
   d. Strongly disagree

4. I am treated with respect at ISK.
   a. Strongly agree
   b. Agree
   c. Disagree
   d. Strongly disagree

5. ISK helps me understand who I am as an individual learner.
   a. Strongly agree
   b. Agree
   c. Disagree
   d. Strongly disagree

6. I receive frequent, constructive feedback at ISK about my learning.
   a. Strongly agree
   b. Agree
   c. Disagree
   d. Strongly disagree

7. I feel inspired as a learner at ISK.
   a. Strongly agree
   b. Agree
   c. Disagree
   d. Strongly disagree

8. ISK is a caring community.
   a. Strongly agree
   b. Agree
   c. Disagree
   d. Strongly disagree

9. The school has a positive public image.
   a. Strongly agree
   b. Agree
   c. Disagree
   d. Strongly disagree

10. Others listen when I have ideas about improving the school.
    a. Strongly agree
    b. Agree
    c. Disagree
    d. Strongly disagree

11. I feel comfortable speaking up and advocating for myself as a learner.
    a. Strongly agree
    b. Agree
    c. Disagree
    d. Strongly disagree

12. ISK encourages me to maintain a healthy lifestyle.
    a. Strongly agree
    b. Agree
    c. Disagree
    d. Strongly disagree

13. I feel safe and secure at ISK.
    a. Strongly agree
    b. Agree
    c. Disagree
    d. Strongly disagree
Appendix D

Student consent form: Needs Assessment

Johns Hopkins University

Homewood Institutional Review Board (HIRB)

Student Assent and Parental Informed Consent

| Title: | Examining the current state of the high school advisory program – International School of Kenya. |
| Principal Investigator: | Dr. Douglas Mac Iver, Professor, School of Education |
| Date: | April 2017 |

**PURPOSE OF DATA COLLECTION:**
The purpose of this data collection is to inform the researcher in the needs assessment of the high school advisory program at the International School of Kenya. Further, it will shed light on the current practices and the student experience of the program itself. It will also examine the student’s perceived social support and attachment networks.

**PROCEDURES:**
Your son or daughter will be asked to set up a time with Mr. Saenz using a sign-up sheet in his classroom to answer a questionnaire that looks at their perceived social support, attachment networks and their perceived effectiveness of the advisory program.

**Time Required:** Your son or daughter will be asked to participate in the collection of survey data for the needs assessment to evaluate the current high school advisory program. They will be asked to complete a questionnaire that will take approximately 30 minutes outside of class time.

**RISKS/DISCOMFORTS:**
There are no anticipated risks to students

**BENEFITS:**
Potential benefits of the collection of data is increasing understanding of the current state of the advisory program as well as your son or daughter’s experiences.

**VOLUNTARY PARTICIPATION AND RIGHT TO WITHDRAW:**
Your child’s participation in this data collection is completely voluntary. You decide if you allow your child to take part, and your child will also indicate if he or she agrees as well. If you choose not to allow your child to participate, or your child does not wish to participate, there will be no penalties involved.

You or your child can stop participation in the data collection at any time, there are no penalties or loss of benefits if this happens. If you want to withdraw your child, or your child
wants to stop participating in the data collection, please contact Mr. Patricio Saenz Flores via phone or email: 0790189931, psaenz@isk.ac.ke.

**CONFIDENTIALITY:**
Any records of the data collection that identify your child will be kept confidential following ethical guidelines and the law. People responsible of making sure the research is being conducted properly, including Johns Hopkins University Homewood Institutional Review Board, Johns Hopkins University EdD program faculty, Dr. Douglas Mac Iver and Dr. Christine Eith, and the leadership team from the International School of Kenya, can review the records. All of these people are required to keep your identity and that of your child, confidential. Otherwise, people working on the data collection and subsequent research study will be the only ones to see the records.

Surveys will be collected electronically in password protected Google Forms. All research data will be stored in Mr. Patricio Saenz Flores’ computer, which is password protected. Original data will be destroyed ten years after collection.

When publishing results, there will be no individual reporting, rather, only group data will be published.

**COMPENSATION:**
Your child will not receive any form of payment or compensation for participating in this needs assessment.

**IF YOU HAVE QUESTIONS OR CONCERNS:**
You and your child can ask questions about this needs assessment at any time by contacting Mr. Patricio Saenz Flores via phone or email: 0790189931, psaenz@isk.ac.ke, or Dr. Christine Eith via email: ceith@jhu.edu.

If you, or your child, have questions about your child’s rights as participants of the needs assessment or feel that you child has not been treated fairly, please call the Homewood Institutional Review Board at Johns Hopkins University at (410) 516-6580.
SIGNATURES

WHAT YOUR SIGNATURE MEANS:

Your signature below means that you understand the information in this consent form. Your signature also means that you agree to allow your child to participate in the needs assessments. Your child’s signature indicates that he or she agrees to participate in the needs assessment. By signing this consent form, you and your child have not waived any legal rights your child otherwise would have as a participant in a needs assessment.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Child’s Name</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Child’s Signature</td>
<td>Date</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Signature of Parent or Legal Guardian</td>
<td>Date</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patricia Gonzales</td>
<td>10/04/2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Signature of Person Obtaining Consent</td>
<td>Date</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Investigator of HIRB-Approved Designee)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix E

Teacher consent form: Needs Assessment

Johns Hopkins University
Homewood Institutional Review Board (HIRB)

Teacher Informed Consent

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Title:</strong></th>
<th>Examining the current state of the high school advisory program – International School of Kenya.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Principal Investigator:</strong></td>
<td>Dr. Douglas Mac Iver, Professor, School of Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Date:</strong></td>
<td>April 2017</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**PURPOSE OF DATA COLLECTION:**
The purpose of this data collection is to inform the researcher in the needs assessment of the high school advisory program at the International School of Kenya. Further, it will shed light on the current practices and the student and teacher experience of the program itself. It will also examine the teacher’s self-efficacy regarding their role as advisors and their planning preferences.

**PROCEDURES:**
You will be asked to set up a time to answer a questionnaire that looks at your experience as an advisor in the high school advisory program.

**Time Required:** You will be asked to participate in the collection of data for the needs assessment to evaluate the current high school advisory program. This will take approximately 30 minutes to complete.

**RISKS/DISCOMFORTS:**
There are no anticipated risks.

**BENEFITS:**
Potential benefits of the collection of data is increasing understanding of the current state of the advisory program as well as your experience in it.

**VOLUNTARY PARTICIPATION AND RIGHT TO WITHDRAW:**
Your participation in this data collection is completely voluntary. You decide if you take part in it. If you choose not to, there will be no penalties involved.

You can stop participation in the data collection at any time, there are no penalties or loss of benefits if this happens. By stopping the survey you are withdrawing from it. If you want to stop participating in the data collection, please contact Mr. Patricio Saenz Flores via phone or email: 0790189931, psaenz@isk.ac.ke.
CONFIDENTIALITY:
Any records of the data collection that identify you will be kept confidential following ethical guidelines and the law. People responsible of making sure the research is being conducted properly, including Johns Hopkins University Homewood Institutional Review Board, Johns Hopkins University EdD program faculty and the leadership team from the International School of Kenya, can review the records. All of these people are required to keep your identity confidential. Otherwise, people working on the data collection and subsequent research study will be the only ones to see the records.

Surveys will be collected electronically in password protected Google Forms. All research data will be stored in Mr. Patricio Saenz Flores’ computer, which is password protected. Original data will be destroyed ten years after collection.

When publishing results, there will be no individual reporting, rather, only group data will be published.

COMPENSATION:
You will not receive any form of payment or compensation for participating in this needs assessment.

IF YOU HAVE QUESTIONS OR CONCERNS:
You can ask questions about this needs assessment at any time by contacting Dr. Douglas Mac Iver via email: dmaciver@jhu.edu.

If you have questions about your rights as participants of the needs assessment or feel that you have not been treated fairly, please call the Homewood Institutional Review Board at Johns Hopkins University at (410) 516-6580.

SIGNATURES
WHAT YOUR SIGNATURE MEANS:

Your signature below means that you understand the information in this consent form. Your signature also means that you agree to participate in the needs assessments.

By signing this consent form, you have not waived any legal rights you otherwise would have as a participant in a needs assessment.

Participant Name

Participant’s Signature: 
Date: 11/04/2017

Signature of Person Obtaining Consent
(Investigator of HIRB-Approved Designee)
Situation: Currently, the high school advisory program at the International School of Kenya is not fulfilling its main objective which is to address personal and social concerns of students as well as providing a close guidance relationship between advisor and advisee (International School of Kenya, 2016). Teachers do not feel prepared to be advisors and students do not perceive social support from them.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Inputs</strong></th>
<th><strong>Activities</strong></th>
<th><strong>Outcomes – Impact</strong></th>
<th><strong>Medium</strong></th>
<th><strong>Long</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>New 11th and 12th grade advisory program</td>
<td>Advisory sessions</td>
<td>Increase in student’s self-reports of perceived social support and influence from advisor</td>
<td>Program reputation will change</td>
<td>Culture of advising will shift to be more developmental (Crookston, 1994) prone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stakeholder interviews on actual needs for advisory program</td>
<td>Advisory session plans</td>
<td>Better understanding of advisor role and responsibilities (Phillippo 2010; Phillippo &amp; Stone, 2013)</td>
<td>Student’s expectations will match the type of advising they want to receive (Anderson, Motto, &amp; Bourdeaux, 2014)</td>
<td>Program could impact the 9th and 10th grade programs providing a personalized experience (Noddings, 2005; McClure et al., 2010)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning time with a multidisciplinary team (Shockley, Schumacher, &amp; Smith, 1984)</td>
<td>Planning sessions</td>
<td>Increase in levels of confidence and self-efficacy about being advisors (Yoo, 2016)</td>
<td>Reduce counselors’ workload by providing an extra layer of support for students (Hampton &amp; Graham, 1979; Myrick &amp; Myrick, 1990)</td>
<td>More people will be actively involved in the program (Shockley et al., 1984)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lave’s (1991) situated learning theory</td>
<td>30 minutes professional development sessions</td>
<td>Community of practice will form (Lave, 1991)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bandura’s (1986) self-efficacy theory</td>
<td>Role-playing exercises (Zwart et al. 2015; McKim &amp; Velez, 2017)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11th and 12th grade students</td>
<td>Multidisciplinary team (Shockley, Schumacher, &amp; Smith, 1984)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11th and 12th grade teacher advisors</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Assumptions

- Teachers want to provide students with better care and a personalized experience (Noddings, 2005; McClure, Yonezawa, & Jones, 2010).
- Students want a developmental based (Crookston, 1994) advisory program that fosters a positive advocacy relationship them and their advisor (Anfara, 2006).

### External Factors

- Political climate in Kenya is unstable, public holidays are announced randomly and school is cancelled on short notice.
- ISK can mandate that some activities unrelated to a developmental based (Crookston, 1994) advisory program be covered.

| Increase of buy-in for advisory program (Cole, 1994). |
| Increase in awareness of cultural nuances of students (Tucker & Herman, 2002). |
| Confidently use supportive and transition activities in advisory (Mac Iver & Epstein, 1991). |
| As self-efficacy increases, higher levels of resiliency towards obstacles (Tschannen-Moran & Hoy, 2001). |
| Implementation of new practices and innovation (Ghaith & Yaghi, 1997). |
| Implementation of new ideas to meet student needs (Berman, McLaughlin, Bass, Pauly, & Zellman, 1977). |
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Theory of Treatment

Evaluation
A. 11th and 12th grade student weekly advisory program.
B. Professional Development for 11th and 12th grade teacher advisors.

Moderating Variables
A. Increase in student's self reports of perceived social support and influence from advisor.
B. Better understanding of advisor role and responsibilities; Increase in levels of confidence and self-efficacy about being advisors; Increase in awareness of cultural nuances of students.

Assumptions
A. Students want the support of their advisor. Students have a desire to have more structure and guidance.
B. Teachers want to get trained and provide students with more a positive and close relationship as well as with more structure. Teachers will follow the advisory plan.

SHORT TERM OUTCOMES
A. Increase sense of membership/community.
B. Increase knowledge on how to form community.

POTENTIAL MID TERM OUTCOMES
A. Increased perceived social support from teacher advisor.
B. Increase in perceived self-efficacy of teacher advisor role.

POTENTIAL LONG TERM OUTCOMES
A. Increased perceived social support from school.
B. Shift of advising culture to a developmental based.

TARGET POPULATION
A. 11th and 12th grade students
B. 11th and 12th grade teacher advisors

ADVISORY SESSION TOPICS
- Socioemotional well-being
- Academic support
- Interpersonal skills
- Intrapersonal skills
- Career planning
- Training Sessions

POTENTIAL OUTCOMES
- Intrapersonal skills
- Career planning

Intrapersonal skills
- Career planning

Training Sessions

Potential Short Term
- B. Increased self-efficacy of teacher advisor role.

Potential Mid Term
- B. Shift of advising culture to a developmental based.

Potential Long Term
- A. Increased perceived social support from school.

Training Sessions
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Student’s satisfaction Google Form

11th Grade Advisory Session Exit Ticket

Please fill out all of the questions.

Name

Short answer text

Advisor *
1. Simonet + Charette
2. Wood
3. McGarigal
4. Maxson
5. Hire
6. Sudra
7. Wallbridge
8. Parsons + Sibrian

How satisfied were you with this session? *

☐ Not satisfied at all
☐ Somewhat unsatisfied
☐ Neutral
☐ Somewhat satisfied
☐ Very Satisfied

If you want to, please elaborate on your satisfaction level with this session.

Long answer text
12th Grade Advisory Session Exit Ticket

Please fill out all of the questions.

Name

Short answer text

Advisor *

1. Zents + Saenz
2. Fisher
3. Dibler
4. C. Nicholas
5. Shah + Pappas
6. Redler + Henderson

How satisfied were you with this session? *

☐ Not satisfied at all
☐ Somewhat unsatisfied
☐ Neutral
☐ Somewhat satisfied
☐ Very Satisfied

If you want to, please elaborate on your satisfaction level with this session.

Long answer text
Appendix I

Teacher advisor satisfaction Google Form

Teacher Advisor PD Session: Exit Ticket

Please fill out all of the questions.

Name *
Short answer text

How satisfied were you with this session? *

☐ Not satisfied at all
☐ Somewhat unsatisfied
☐ Neutral
☐ Somewhat satisfied
☐ Very Satisfied

If you want to, please elaborate on your satisfaction level with this session.
Long answer text

What would be helpful to include in the next session? *
Long answer text
Appendix J

Faculty member’s recruitment email

Dear 11th and 12th grade advisors,

As you know, this year we will be implementing a new advisory program in 11th and 12th grade. With this new program, we expect to provide our students with a more personalized educational experience with more comprehensive academic, social and emotional support. We have redesigned this program to address the needs of our students.

As part of my doctoral program at Johns Hopkins University, I will be evaluating the effectiveness of this program. To do this, I want to ask you to participate in a survey about your experience as an advisor at ISK, the training provided for this program, your perceived effectiveness of the new advisory program.

Attached to this email you can find a Consent form. If you agree to participate in this evaluation, please print out, fill the form and hand it in to Ms. Miriam Uhuru in the HS Office or to me in HS classroom N1. Physical forms will also be available in the HS Office and N1.

Some of you will be asked to participate in a focus group at a different time during first semester. If you are interested in participating, please make me aware of this by emailing psaenz@isk.ac.ke or by checking the box in the consent form attached to this email.

Please let me know if you have questions or concerns.

Best,

Patricio Saenz Flores
Dear 11th and 12th grade parents,

My name is Patricio Saenz Flores; I have been the International Baccalaureate Diploma Program and General Psychology teacher at ISK since August 2016.

This year we will be implementing a new advisory program in 11th and 12th grade. With this new program, we expect to provide your son or daughter with a more personalized educational experience with more comprehensive academic, social and emotional support. We have redesigned this program to address the needs of our students.

As part of my doctoral program at Johns Hopkins University, I am conducting a study to evaluate of the effectiveness of ISK’s new advisory program. To do this, I want to survey your child about their social supports and attachment networks at ISK and ask them to rate the effectiveness of the advisory program.

Attached to this email you can find a Parental Consent form. If you agree to allow your child to participate in this evaluation, please print out the form, fill it out and hand it in to Ms. Miriam Uhuru in the HS Office or to me in HS classroom N1. Physical forms will also be available in the HS Office and N1.

Some students will be asked to participate in a focus group interview at a different time during first semester. If you are willing for your child to be interviewed regarding their advisory group experiences in a focus group, please indicate this on the consent form by checking the “focus group interview” box.

Please let me know if you have questions or concerns.

Best,

Patricio Saenz Flores
psaenz@isk.ac.ke
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Teacher Advisor informed consent form: Evaluation Study

Johns Hopkins University
Homewood Institutional Review Board (HIRB)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Teacher Surveys, Advisory Program Session Observation Summaries, and Interviews Informed Consent Form</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Title:</strong> Evaluating the New 11th and 12th Grade High School Advisory Program at the International School of Kenya.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Principal Investigator:</strong> Dr. Douglas Mac Iver, Professor, School of Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Date:</strong> June 29, 2018</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**PURPOSE OF RESEARCH STUDY:**
The purpose of this research study is to evaluate the new advisory program being implemented in the 11th and 12th grades. It will shed light on the effect the new activities have on the student and teacher experience of this program. This study is being conducted by Patricio Saenz Florez, the International Baccalaureate Diploma Program and General Psychology teacher at ISK. We anticipate that approximately 18 teacher advisors will participate in this study.

**PROCEDURES:**
You are being asked to participate in the evaluation of the new 11th and 12th grade advisory program. There will be three different surveys you will be asked to complete. The first survey will be completed during the first training session of advisory in August 2018. The second survey will be completed during the last advisory training session of semester one in December 2018. The third and final survey will be completed during the last advisory training session of the school year (in April 2019 for 12th grade advisors and in May 2019 for 11th grade advisors). Each survey will take approximately 30 minutes to complete. These surveys, composed of open and closed ended questions, will collect information on your experiences as an advisor, your self-efficacy as an advisor, and your perceptions of the effectiveness of the new advisory program and training sessions. Your surveys will be anonymous. (You will choose a unique alias and use that alias rather than your name in filling out each of the three surveys.) You will also be asked to answer an exit ticket that measures your satisfaction with the training sessions. Each exit ticket will take less than 2 minutes to complete and will be collected electronically via a secure Google Form. You will use your Alias to complete this form.

Members of ISK's leadership team or the advisory working group may occasionally observe advisory program sessions as part of their regular duties. If you grant permission, an anonymized summary sheet from each of your
observed advisory program sessions will be shared with Mr. Saenz Flores. The summary sheet will NOT include the name of the observed teacher.

You are also invited to express interest in participating in an individual interview delving into your personal experiences with the new program as well as the training sessions you participated in. Interviews are expected to last about 45 minutes. They will be transcribed and analyzed to identify trends and give recommendations to the advisory working group on how to refine the program.

**RISKS/DISCOMFORTS:**

The risks associated with participation in this study are no greater than those encountered in daily life.

**BENEFITS:**

This study may benefit ISK's current and future high school student body and faculty if the results lead to a better understanding of student and teacher advisors' experience in the advisory program.

**VOLUNTARY PARTICIPATION AND RIGHT TO WITHDRAW:**

Your participation in this study is entirely voluntary: You choose whether or not to participate. If you decide not to participate, there are no penalties, and you will not lose any benefits to which you would otherwise be entitled.

If you choose to participate in the study, you can stop participation at any time, without any penalty or loss of benefits. If you want to withdraw from the study, please contact Mr. Patricio Saenz Flores via phone or email: 0790189931, psaenz@isk.ac.ke.

**CONFIDENTIALITY:**

Your survey responses collected during this study will not include your name. Your responses will be entered into a dataset in which each participant is “identified” only an alias chosen by the participant. (The completed surveys will be stored by Mr. Saenz Flores in a locked file cabinet that is accessible only to him.) All study records that will be kept confidential to the extent possible by law. This informed consent form and other study records may be reviewed by people responsible for making sure that research is done properly, including members of the Johns Hopkins University Homewood Institutional Review Board and officials from government agencies such as the United States Office for Human Research Protections. (All of these people are required to the identities of participants confidential.) Otherwise, study records will be available only to people working on the study; Dr. Douglas Mac Iver and Mr. Patricio Saenz Flores unless you give permission for other people to see the records.

Surveys will be collected on paper. If you choose to participate in an interview, it will be audio recorded, then transcribed. After transcription is completed, the audio recording will be erased. Transcripts will not identify interviewees by name. All research data will be stored in Mr. Patricio Saenz Flores' computer, which is password protected. Original data will be destroyed three years after completion of the research.

When publishing results, there will be no individual reporting, rather, only group data will be published. These group data may be shared with the advisory
program planning committee and the leadership team from the International School of Kenya to assist them in making improvements to the advisory programs at ISK.

**COMPENSATION:**
Your 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 now or at any time during the study, by talking to the researcher(s) working with you or by emailing Dr. Douglas Mac Iver, the director of the study at dmaciver@jhu.edu or Mr. Patricio Saenz Flores via phone or email: 0790 189931, psaenz@isk.ac.ke.

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.

**SIGNATURES**

**WHAT YOUR SIGNATURE MEANS:**
Your signature below means that you understand the information in this consent form. Your signature also means that you agree participate in the study. By signing this consent form, you have not waived any legal rights you otherwise would have as a participant in a research study.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participant's Name</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participant's Signature</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Signature of Person Obtaining Consent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(Graduate Student Investigator, Patricio Saenz Flores, or HIRB-Approved Designee)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

☐ Please check this box if you would be interested in being contacted for a follow-up interview about your experience in the new 11th and 12th grade advisory program and training sessions.

☐ During the course of the 2018-2019 advisory program and training sessions, the high school leadership and/or the advisory working group will be conducting observations of sessions. Please check this box if you agree for them to share anonymized versions of the observation protocols.
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Parent Permission form: Evaluation Study

Johns Hopkins University
Homewood Institutional Review Board (HIRB)

Parental Permission Form

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Title:</th>
<th>Evaluating the New 11th and 12th Grade High School Advisory Program at the International School of Kenya.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Principal Investigator:</td>
<td>Dr. Douglas Mac Iver, Professor, School of Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date:</td>
<td>August 3, 2018</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

PURPOSE OF RESEARCH STUDY:
The purpose of this research study is to evaluate the new advisory program being implemented in the 11th and 12th grades. It will shed light on the effect the new activities have on the student experience of this program. We anticipate that approximately 166 children will participate in this study.

PROCEDURES:
Your son or daughter will be asked to participate in the evaluation of the new 11th and 12th grade advisory program. There will be three different surveys your son or daughter will be asked to complete. The first survey will be completed during the first session of advisory in August 2018. The second survey will be completed during the last advisory session of semester one in December 2018. The third and final survey will be completed during the last advisory session of the school year, April 2019 for 12th grade and May 2019 for 11th graders. Each survey will take no more than 20 minutes to complete. This survey, composed of open and closed ended questions, will collect information on the student’s perceived social support, attachment networks and their perceived effectiveness of the new advisory program. Students will also be asked to answer an exit ticket that measures their satisfaction with the program after each session. Each exit ticket will take less than 2 minutes to complete and will be collected electronically via a secure Google Form. There will be approximately 36 exit tickets throughout the school year.

If you grant your permission by checking the box on the signature page, your child may also be randomly selected to be participate in a “focus group discussion,” an hour-long discussion among students of their perspectives on ISK’s advisory program. We will ask all focus group participants to agree to the importance of keeping the information discussed in the focus group confidential.

From August 2018 to May 2019, observations will be conducted by ISK’s leaders and by members of ISK’s Advisory Group planning committee to ensure that the advisory sessions are being conducted as they were planned. We anticipate that
two observations will be conducted every session. The 2 advisory groups chosen to be observed during a given session will be randomly selected. Each observation will last 25 minutes. A summary of each observation (which will include a description of whether the advisory group’s students were engaged and on-task) will be prepared, but no students will be named in the summary. Each summary will be shared with the advisor of the group observed, the advisory planning committee, and the researchers. These summaries will help guide the continued improvement of advisory sessions. The observation summaries will not identify the group of students or teacher observed.

RISKS/DISCOMFORTS:

The risks associated with participation in this study are no greater than those encountered in daily life.

BENEFITS:

This study may benefit ISK’s current and future high school student body if the results lead to a better understanding of students’ experiences in the advisory program.

VOLUNTARY PARTICIPATION AND RIGHT TO WITHDRAW:

Your child’s participation in the surveying and focus groups involved in this study is entirely voluntary: You choose whether to allow your child to participate, and we will also ask your child whether he or she agrees to take part in the study. If you decide not to allow your child to participate, or your child chooses not to participate, there are no penalties, and neither you nor your child will lose any benefits to which you would otherwise be entitled.

If you choose to allow your child to participate in the study, you or your child can stop participation at any time, without any penalty or loss of benefits. If you want to withdraw your child from the study, or your child wants to stop participating, please contact Mr. Patricio Saenz Flores via phone or email: 0790189931, psaenz@isk.ac.ke.

CONFIDENTIALITY:

Any study records that identify your child will be kept confidential to the extent possible by law. The records from your child’s participation may be reviewed by people responsible for making sure that research is done properly, including members of the Johns Hopkins University Homewood Institutional Review Board and officials from government agencies such as the National Institutes of Health and the Office for Human Research Protections. (All of these people are required to keep the identity of your child confidential.) Otherwise, records that identify you or your child will be available only to people working on the study; Dr. Douglas Mac Iver, Mr. Patricio Saenz Flores, the advisory program planning committee, and the leadership team from the International School of Kenya; unless you give permission for other people to see the records.

Surveys will be collected on paper. The study's datasets and focus group transcripts will not include students’ names. Students will be identified only by confidential participant numbers. All research data will be stored in Mr. Patricio Saenz Flores’ computer, which is password protected. Original data will be destroyed three years after the end of the study.
When publishing results, there will be no individual reporting, only group data will be published.

**COMPENSATION:**
Your child 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 study now or at any time during the study, by talking to the researcher(s) working with your child or by emailing Dr. Douglas Mac Iver, director of the study at dmaciver@jhu.edu or Mr. Patricio Saenz Flores via phone or email: 0790189931, psaenz@isk.ac.ke.

If you have questions about your child’s rights as a research participant or feel that your child has not been treated fairly, please call the Homewood Institutional Review Board at Johns Hopkins University at (410) 516-6580.

**SIGNATURES**

**WHAT YOUR SIGNATURE MEANS:**
Your signature below means that you understand the information in this permission form. Your signature also means that you agree to allow your child’s participation in the study.
Your child will have the opportunity to assent to his or her participation in the study before every data collection instance.

By signing this consent form, you have not waived any legal rights your child otherwise would have as a participant in a research study.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Child’s Name</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Signature of Parent or Legal Guardian</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Signature of Person Obtaining Consent</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(Graduate Student Investigator, Patricio Saenz Flores, or HIRB-Approved Designee)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

☐ Please check this box if you would allow your son or daughter to participate in a follow-up **focus group interview** about their experiences in the new 11th and 12th grade advisory program.
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Student assent form: Evaluation Study

Johns Hopkins University
Homewood Institutional Review Board (HIRB)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Study Title:</th>
<th>Evaluation of ISK’s Advisory Program</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Principal Investigator:</td>
<td>Douglas Mac Iver</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doctoral Student Researcher:</td>
<td>Patricio Saenz Flores</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date:</td>
<td>Fall 2018</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

We want to tell you about a research study we are doing. We would like to find out more about your experiences and activities in ISK’s Advisory Program. You are being asked to join the study because your school’s leaders and teachers are making improvements to ISK’s advisory program this academic year and want to know how they are doing. The study is being conducted by Mr. Patricio Saenz Flores, who is the International Baccalaureate Diploma Program and General Psychology teacher at ISK. He is the only one who will see your responses to the survey. Although you will print and sign your name below, your name will not be included in the study’s dataset. Instead your data will be identified by a numeric 3-digit participant ID that Mr. Saenz Flores will assign. Only he will know your participant ID. In the study’s datasets, your responses to this survey (and to two later surveys) will be identified by this confidential participant number rather than by your name.

If you agree to join this study, you will be asked to fill out this survey, which will take no more than 20 minutes. You will also be given the opportunity to fill out two similar surveys later. We are also asking you to consider participating in a focus group later, an hour-long small-group discussion among students during which you will share your perspectives on the new advisory program. If you willing to participate in a focus group, please check the box at the bottom of this form. We ask focus group participants to agree to the importance of keeping information discussed in the group confidential.

We do not know if being in this study will help you. We expect that the study will help us learn more about ways to make 11th and 12th grade advisory programs better at this school.

You do not have to be in this study. It is up to you. You can say OK now and change your mind later. All you have to do is tell us you want to stop. No one will be mad at you if you don’t want to fill out the survey or participate in a focus group or if you agree now and then change your mind and stop.

Before you say yes or no to filling out this survey, we will answer any questions you have. As you fill out the survey, you can ask questions at any time.

If you want to be in this study and fill out the survey, please print your name clearly below, write in today’s date, and sign the form. (And, if you also want to also be in a focus group later, check the box indicating that as well.) Then, turn to the next page and fill out the survey.

Print your name here

Signature

Please check this box if you agree to be in a focus group discussion about the advisory program.
Appendix O

Student Survey for Evaluation study

Name: _________________________  Gender: M / F  Age: ____  Grade level: 11

/ 12

Nationality: ___________________  Advisor: __________________

Part I. Your relationship with your advisor

1.1 Directions: For the following questions, please circle one and only one of the options regarding the closeness of your relationship with your advisor.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Not at all close</th>
<th>Extremely close</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Relative to all your other relationships (both same and opposite sex), how would you characterize your relationship with your advisor?

Relative to what you know about other people's relationships with their advisor, how would you characterize your relationship with your advisor?

1.2 Directions: The following questions concern the amount of influence that your advisor has on your thoughts, feelings and behavior. For each statement, circle the response that best describes how true that statement is for you. Please circle one and only one option for each statement.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>My advisor influences the way I spend my free time.</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Agree a little</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Disagree a little</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>My advisor does not influence which friends I choose to see.</td>
<td>Strongly agree</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Agree a little</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>Disagree a little</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>Strongly disagree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>My advisor influences the way I feel about myself.</td>
<td>Strongly agree</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Agree a little</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>Disagree a little</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>Strongly disagree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>My advisor does not influence how I spend my money.</td>
<td>Strongly agree</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Agree a little</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>Disagree a little</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>Strongly disagree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>My advisor influences the way I feel about the future.</td>
<td>Strongly agree</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Agree a little</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>Disagree a little</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>Strongly disagree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>My advisor does not influence the opinions I have of other people in my life.</td>
<td>Strongly agree</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Agree a little</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>Disagree a little</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>Strongly disagree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>My advisor influences how hard I work in school.</td>
<td>Strongly agree</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Agree a little</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>Disagree a little</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>Strongly disagree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>My advisor does not influence the type of career I will have.</td>
<td>Strongly agree</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Agree a little</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>Disagree a little</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>Strongly disagree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>My advisor influences the basic values that I hold.</td>
<td>Strongly agree</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Agree a little</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>Disagree a little</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>Strongly disagree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>My advisor does not influence the way I behave out of school.</td>
<td>Strongly agree</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Agree a little</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>Disagree a little</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>Strongly disagree</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Part II. What I perceive from my advisor.

2.1 Directions: For each of the following items, please choose either true, false, OR unsure.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>My advisors cares about me.</th>
<th>True</th>
<th>False</th>
<th>Unsure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>My advisor listens to what I have to say.</td>
<td>True</td>
<td>False</td>
<td>Unsure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>My advisor cares whether or not I come to school.</td>
<td>True</td>
<td>False</td>
<td>Unsure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>My advisor is willing to work with me after school.</td>
<td>True</td>
<td>False</td>
<td>Unsure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>My advisor gives me a lot of encouragement.</td>
<td>True</td>
<td>False</td>
<td>Unsure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>My advisor praises my efforts when I work hard.</td>
<td>True</td>
<td>False</td>
<td>Unsure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>My advisor cares about the grades I achieve.</td>
<td>True</td>
<td>False</td>
<td>Unsure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>My advisor shows me respect.</td>
<td>True</td>
<td>False</td>
<td>Unsure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>My advisor knows my strengths as a student.</td>
<td>True</td>
<td>False</td>
<td>Unsure</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2.2 Directions: For each statement, circle the response that best describes how true that statement is for you. Please circle one and only one option for each statement.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>My advisor expects me to do my best.</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>My advisor challenges me to do better in school.</td>
<td>Strongly agree</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>Strongly disagree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>My advisor lets me know when I am doing my best work.</td>
<td>Strongly agree</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>Strongly disagree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>My advisor assigns work that challenges me.</td>
<td>Strongly agree</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>Strongly disagree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>My advisor tells me when I am doing less than my best work.</td>
<td>Strongly agree</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>Strongly disagree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>My advisor encourages me when he/she thinks I can do better.</td>
<td>Strongly agree</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>Strongly disagree</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2.3 Directions: You will be asked to respond to sentences about some form of support or help that you might get from your advisor. Read each sentence carefully and respond to them honestly. There are no right or wrong answers.

For each sentence you are asked to provide two responses. First, rate how often you receive the support described and then rate how important the support is to you.

MY ADVISOR...

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>HOW OFTEN?</th>
<th>IMPORTANT?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Never</td>
<td>Almost Never</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

[Continue to Next page]
Part III. School attachment network

3.1 Directions: For each survey item below, thinking of anyone in your school setting, describe the person you think of when reading that item (e.g., a person you would want to go to, actually go to, or would like to count on when something bad happens.)

1. Think of the person you would want to go to, to help you feel better when something bad happens to you or you feel upset, whether or not you actually go to them. Describe this person below by circling the phrase(s) that apply.

This person is:
- A friend who attends ISK.
- A sibling or other relative who attends ISK.
- My advisor at ISK.
- A counselor at ISK.
- A teacher, learning support teacher, or ESOL specialist at ISK.
- A principal, assistant principal, or director at ISK.
- A librarian.
- A coach or PE staff member.
- Other (Please describe: ____________________________).

2. Think of the person you actually go to, to help you feel better when something bad happens to you or you feel upset. Describe this person below by circling the phrase(s) that apply.

This person is:
- A friend who attends ISK.
- A sibling or other relative who attends ISK.
- My advisor at ISK.
- A counselor at ISK.
- A teacher, learning support teacher, or ESOL specialist at ISK.
- A principal, assistant principal, or director at ISK.
- A librarian.
- A coach or PE staff member.
- Other (Please describe: ____________________________).

[Continue to Next page]
3. Think of the person you would like to be able to count on to always be there for you and care about you no matter what. **Describe this person below by circling the phrase(s) that apply.**

This person is:
- A friend who attends ISK.
- A sibling or other relative who attends ISK.
- My advisor at ISK.
- A counselor at ISK.
- A teacher, learning support teacher, or ESOL specialist at ISK.
- A principal, assistant principal, or director at ISK.
- A librarian.
- A coach or PE staff member.
- Other (Please describe: __________________________

4. Think of the person you feel you can actually count on to always be there for you and care about you no matter what. **Describe this person below by circling the phrase(s) that apply.**

This person is:
- A friend who attends ISK.
- A sibling or other relative who attends ISK.
- My advisor at ISK.
- A counselor at ISK.
- A teacher, learning support teacher, or ESOL specialist at ISK.
- A principal, assistant principal, or director at ISK.
- A librarian.
- A coach or PE staff member.
- Other (Please describe: __________________________

5. Think of the person that is important for you to see or talk with regularly. **Describe this person below by circling the phrase(s) that apply to him or her:**

This person is:
- A friend who attends ISK.
- A sibling or other relative who attends ISK.
- My advisor at ISK.
- A counselor at ISK.
- A teacher, learning support teacher, or ESOL specialist at ISK.
- A principal, assistant principal, or director at ISK.
- A librarian.
- A coach or PE staff member.
- Other (Please describe: __________________________
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Teacher advisor survey for Outcome Evaluation

Alias: ______________________   Gender: M / F   Age: _____ Grade level Advisory: 11 / 12

Nationality: ___________________ Years as an Advisor: ________________

Part I. Teacher role as advisor

1.1 Directions: For each of the following statements, select your level of confidence to complete the tasks outlined.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Task Description</th>
<th>Highly confident</th>
<th>Confident</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Somewhat confident</th>
<th>Not confident at all</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Build relationships with individual students</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Notice social-emotional troubles in your students</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Start conversations with students when you are concerned about their well-being</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Recognize signs of mental health issues (e.g., depression, trauma)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Recognize signs of family violence</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Recognize signs of substance abuse</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Recognize signs that a student is suicidal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Respond to your students when they misbehave in school</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Respond to your students when they tell you about their troubles</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Respond to your students when they are experiencing a crisis</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Connect students with support or resources they might need</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Share concerns about students’ well-being with their parents/guardians</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Collaborate with other teachers in order to support students</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Collaborate with administrators in order to support students</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Collaborate with support staff (counselor, social worker) in order to support students</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Collaborate with parents in order to support students</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Understand when and who to contact when a student needs support</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Part II. Advisory’s organization

2.1 Directions: Select how frequently the following activities occur during ADVISORY in your grade level?

**Use of supportive activities during Advisory**

|  | HOW OFTEN? |  |  |  |  |  |
|---|------------|---|---|---|---|
|  | Never | Few per year | Monthly | Weekly | Daily |
| 1 | Meet with individual students about problems | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 2 | Give career information and guidance | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 3 | Discuss academic problems or issues. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 4 | Discuss personal or family problems. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 5 | Discuss social relationships and peer groups. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 6 | Discuss health issues, e.g. drug use prevention, family planning, etc. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 7 | Discuss moral or ethical issues and values. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 8 | Discuss intergroup relations and multi-cultural issues. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 9 | Develop student self-confidence and leadership | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |

2.2 Directions: Please choose either YES, NO or UNSURE to state how the school facilitates a smooth transition for new students entering high school.

| 1 | Transition activities for new students | Yes | No | Unsure |
| 2 | Older students present information to incoming students | Yes | No | Unsure |
| 3 | New students visit for assembly before enrolling | Yes | No | Unsure |
| 4 | New students attend regular classes before enrolling | Yes | No | Unsure |
| 5 | Orientation is planned | Yes | No | Unsure |
| 6 | Buddy or big brother/sister program pairs new student with older one on entry | Yes | No | Unsure |
| 7 | Communication between student’s new and old teacher | Yes | No | Unsure |

Other: __________________________________________________________

2.3 Directions: Mention the activities you are aware of that are conducted to ensure seniors have a smooth transition from high school to college.

____________________________________________________________________
____________________________________________________________________
____________________________________________________________________
____________________________________________________________________
____________________________________________________________________
____________________________________________________________________
2.4 Directions: Rate how well the school’s present practices match your IDEAL program for students' smooth transitions to and from the school? Circle one choice.

EXCELLENT—present practices fit students' needs exactly
GOOD—basic practices are in place, minor changes needed
FAIR—need to improve or add several practices
WEAK—need to design new practices and major changes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Excellent</th>
<th>Good</th>
<th>Fair</th>
<th>Weak</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Student transition into ISK at the beginning of the school year.</td>
<td>Excellent</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>Weak</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Student transition into ISK at mid-semester.</td>
<td>Excellent</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>Weak</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Student transition into ISK at mid-year.</td>
<td>Excellent</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>Weak</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Senior students being prepared for transition to college.</td>
<td>Excellent</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>Weak</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2.5 Directions: Circle one answer. Would you rather…

PLAN YOUR OWN ADVISORY SESSIONS
OR
HAVE A DETAILED PLAN FOR EACH ADVISORY SESSION
OR
HAVE A SAY IN PERSONALIZING DETAILED ADVISORY SESSIONS
Appendix Q

Student Focus Group Interview Guide

Researcher: First of all, thank you all for agreeing to participate in this Focus Group. In front of you is a Student assent form. This form has a 3-digit code that I have assigned to you. All of the results from your previous participation and this interview are completely confidential. My Johns Hopkins advisor and myself are the only one that get to see raw data. Advisors, the high school leadership, and the advisory working group will only see summaries of the information with no identifiable information.

Please read the Assent Form and sign it before we begin. Remember that you can stop participation at any point with no repercussion. We will be discussing your experience in the advisory program. I will bring up some of the results from the surveys that were completed by your grade level. No individual student will be singled out.

We will begin with our first question and allow everyone that has something to say to answer. Please be respectful of each other’s comments. You can build on other’s people’s comment or state something different. Remember that each of us has a different experience and I want to hear what everyone experienced.

Any one has any questions?

Let’s begin.

Questions:

1. Let’s start by discussing what makes an advisory group a place you want to go to. What were the positive aspects you were able to identify in your group or program this semester/year?
2. What were some things that weren’t that good about your group or program during the semester/year?
3. What were some of the positive aspects your advisor displayed this semester/year?
4. What were some of the aspects your advisor needs to work on this upcoming semester/year?
5. Did you find this program to make you feel more supported? In what ways?
6. What do we definitely need to keep in the program? Why?
7. If you could change some aspect of the program, what would it be? Why?

Discussion points:

1. Advisory group make up
2. Advisory group’s environment
3. Advisor’s ability to foster positive relationships
4. Advisor’s ability to foster a cohesive team environment
5. Advisor’s ability to provide academic support
6. Advisor’s ability to provide socioemotional support
7. Advisor’s ability to provide career guidance
8. Usefulness and application of activities beyond the classroom
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Semi-structured Interview Guide for Teacher Advisors

Researcher: First I wanted to thank you for agreeing to participate in this follow-up interview. In front of you is an Informed Consent form, before we begin please sign it and include the Alias you have used in your other survey participation. All of the results from your previous participation and this interview are completely confidential. My Johns Hopkins advisor and myself are the only one that get to see raw data. The high school leadership and the advisory working group will only see summaries of the information with no identifiable information.

Please read the Consent Form and sign it before we being. Remember that you can stop participation at any point with no repercussion.

We will be discussing your experience in the advisory program. I will bring up some of the results from the surveys that were completed by teacher advisors. No individual teacher advisor will be singled out.

Do you have any questions? Lets begin!

Questions:
1. Let’s start by discussing what makes an advisory program one that you want to be a part of. What were the positive aspects you were able to identify in your group or program this semester/year?
2. What were some things that weren’t that good about your group or program during the semester/year?
3. Was it clear what you had to do as an advisor? Were roles and responsibilities clear?
4. Was the plan for every session clear? Did your Grade Level leaders provide enough guidance?
5. Were the training sessions effective? What were some positive aspects of them? What would you change about them?
6. Did you find that you were able to foster positive relationship with your advisees? In what ways? What strategies did you try?
7. Were you able to provide socioemotional support to your advisees? If so, in what ways? If not, what happened?
8. Were you able to provide academic support to your advisees? If so, in what ways? If not, what happened?
9. What supports from the advisory working group or the high school leadership would you have liked to receive?

Discussion posts:
1. Advisory group make up
2. Feelings of self-efficacy as advisor
3. Knowledge of advisor role
4. Support from Grade Level Leaders
5. Support from advisory working group and leadership team
6. Student’s experience
7. Training sessions
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ISK’s 2013 Advisory Rationale

HS ADVISORY PHILOSOPHY

The high school advisory program creates a caring community for small groups of students within the high school. Facilitated by an adult, advisory is a safe space where students come together as a peer group to support each other's academic and personal goals.

HS Advisory is a clearly articulated program with guided practice provided through modeling and instruction in the areas of social/emotional well-being, academic and career preparation.

GOALS/LEARNING OUTCOMES

The goals of the HS Advisory program are to ensure that all students will be able to:

- create and be part of a community (in a small group of their peers);
- know oneself, one’s dreams, and what needs to be done to make them happen;
- identify their own personal learning style and how it can be used to ensure success; and
- work through life’s obstacles* that might get in the way of their success (including being willing to try new things and fail – being comfortable with being uncomfortable.)

*academic, personal/social, career
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ISK’s 2018 Advisory Rationale

**HS ADVISORY PHILOSOPHY**

The high school advisory program aims to create a caring community for small groups of students within the high school. Facilitated by an adult, who becomes a consistent support and advocate for students, advisory is a safe space that looks at developing a student holistically by personalizing their educational experience. It is a place where students come together as a peer group to develop their interpersonal and intrapersonal skills, and to support each other’s academic and personal goals.

HS Advisory is a clearly articulated program with guidance provided through modeling and support in the areas of social/emotional well-being, academic, and college planning. The program seeks to foster positive relationships, communication, trust, global mindedness, and the skills necessary to have a successful school transition into and out of ISK.

**LEARNING OUTCOMES**

The goals of the HS advisory program are to ensure that all students will be able to:

- understand, respect and contribute to the school community (within a small group of their peers)
- know oneself, one’s aspirations, and what needs to be done to make them happen
- identify effective learning strategies and how these can be used to promote success, and
- problem solve and proactively find solutions through cultivating a growth mindset
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ISK’s 2013 Advisory Roles and Responsibilities

ROLES AND RESPONSIBILITIES

**Advisors’ Roles:**

1. To facilitate a small group of students in an advisory capacity.

2. Create a safe space (within the child safety guidelines) for students to be able to discuss personal, academic and career issues.

3. Positively guide students through lessons and/or activities that support the advisory program

4. Monitor students’ CAS(L) progress

5. Immediately refer issues to counselors which may threaten a student’s safety or well-being

**Counselors’ Roles:**

1. Provide support to advisors on issues that may arise that are beyond the expertise of a given teacher.

2. Provide a framework for advisory sessions

3. Follow up with students who have been referred by the advisors

4. Offer/provide training or professional development in the area of advisory to faculty and staff.
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ISK’s 2018 Advisory Roles and Responsibilities

ROLES AND RESPONSIBILITIES

Advisors’ Roles:

1. To facilitate a small group of students in an advisory capacity
2. Create a safe space (within the child safety guidelines) for students to be able to discuss personal, academic and/or career pathways
3. Positively guide students through lessons and/or activities that support the advisory program
4. Monitor students’ academic and CAS(L) progress by talking to each student monthly
5. Immediately refer issues to counselors which may threaten a student’s safety or well-being

Counselors’ Roles:

1. Provide support to mentors and grade level leaders on issues that may arise that are beyond the expertise of a given teacher.
2. Provide a framework for advisory sessions in collaboration with the GLLs
3. Follow up with students who have been referred by the mentors or GLL’s
4. Offer/provide training or professional development in the area of advisory to faculty and staff.

GLLs’ Roles

1. Shared advisory group so GLL or assistant can drop into other groups
2. Coordinate advisory content, activities and support to grade level mentors.
3. Provide a framework for advisory sessions in collaboration with the counselors
4. Monitor the tracking and review process for ‘students of concern’ and communicate with the appropriate faculty (e.g. the mentor, the SSS team or case manager).

Principals’/APs’ Roles:

1. Give the program sufficient space and time in the school schedule
2. Provide ongoing and appropriate staff development

3. Communicate the importance and purpose of the program to teachers, parents, and community

4. Provide needed materials and resources

5. Exhibit an understanding of the program

6. Demonstrate flexibility and adapt the program according to student needs

7. Provide constant evaluation of the program
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ISK’s 2018 Advisory Grade level Outcomes

2018/2019 Advisory Program's Desired Outcomes

ISK’s mission: ISK inspires and nurtures passion, creativity and ambition in pursuit of a better world.

“Goals and rationales per grade level. Expected outcomes for advisees, advisory group, and school climate and culture. Goals offer purpose and inspiration. They also help the design team to select content and decide on logistics and many other aspects of [advisory]. What goals could help us better achieve the school’s mission?” (The Advisory Guide)

9th Grade
In order for 9th grade students to have a meaningful and positive transition to high school:

1. Students will understand and demonstrate consistent personal responsibility (principled AIM performance area).
2. Students will develop personal well being (balanced/healthy lifestyle, social/emotional awareness).
3. Students will effectively and respectfully communicate (AIM performance area) with teachers and their peers (includes active listening and empathy).
4. Students will develop a growth mindset in order to develop healthy risk taking. (AIM performance area).
5. Students will identify their own learning strengths and limitations, and develop a sense of self worth.
6. Students will learn to problem solve collaboratively (AIM performance area).

Delivery models to achieve the above desired outcomes will include: the design thinking model, experiential educational activities, thinking routines, personal conversations and mindfulness games.

10th Grade
In order for Grade 10 students to be ready for their transition to the IB DP / Gr 11-12 years of high school, the advisory program will help them with:

1. Developing personal well-being and self-awareness (carry on identifying strengths and limitations) (Self Direction, Learn)
2. Developing cultural proficiency (Empathy, Communicate)
3. Understanding and managing social pressures and group dynamics (Empathy, Communicate) (Critical Thinking, Solve)
4. Understanding and managing safety: Digital presence, personal safety, and citizenship (Principled, Act) (Critical Thinking, Solve)
5. Actively showing self-direction by making informed decisions related to academic AND personal goals. (IB choices, career pathways etc) (Self- Direction, Learn)
6. Learning how to **communicate** meaningfully, respectfully and effectively with different stakeholders across the wider community *(Express, Empathize, Interpret, Communicate)*

7. Intentionally using **growth mindset** to identify and use strategies to explore

**11th Grade**

In order for grade 11 students to be successful in their transition to higher level courses and upper level secondary school requirements, the advisory will help them with:

1. Preparation for the college application process
2. Self-advocacy for academic & social well-being
3. Becoming self-directed and independent
4. Selecting & Implementing a variety of study skills
5. Managing of stress
6. Developing an action plan to set and achieve realistic goals (AIM: Learn PA: Self direction)
7. Understanding the consequences of decision making
8. Drug and alcohol safety awareness

**12th Grade**

In order for students to be successful in completion of High School and in their transition to university and/or out of ISK, the advisory will help them with:

1. Completion of college applications
2. Transitioning to university/out of HS (managing increasing independence)
3. Managing stress & deadlines
4. Preparing for IB Exams before Mocks
5. Developing an action plan to set and achieve realistic goals
6. Drug and alcohol safety awareness
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ISK’s 2018 Advisory Planning document

GRADE 12 ADVISORY PLANNING

**HS Advisory Philosophy**

The goals of the HS advisory program are to ensure that all students will be able to:
- understand, respect and contribute to the school community (within a small group of their peers)
- know oneself, one’s aspirations, and what needs to be done to make them happen
- identify effective learning strategies and how these can be used to promote success, and
- problem solve and proactively find solutions through cultivating a growth mindset.

In order for grade 12 students to successfully complete their high school experience and transition to university and/or出路,e:

Students will demonstrate consistent personal responsibility and self-direction by managing and meeting all senior-related and standardized tests (IAA, registration, teacher recommendations, financial aid, etc.).

Students will demonstrate increasing self-direction and independence in their senior year (i.e., classes, with regards to clubs, spaces on campus including the senior study room, library).

**Grade 12 Annual Objectives**

- Students will learn how to identify and manage potential stressors.
- Students will develop an active plan to set and achieve realistic goals (e.g., preparing for standardized tests, college visits, GPA, college application, etc.).
- Students will adopt or create strategies for relevant and meaningful well-being throughout the year.

**Grade 13 Advisory Objectives**

- Students will develop strategies to understand and implement positive feedback (e.g., preparing for standardized tests, college visits, GPA, college application, etc.).
- Students will adopt or create strategies for relevant and meaningful well-being throughout the year.

**Number of SC Sessions**

- 21 sessions
- 22 sessions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Weeks</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Type of Session</th>
<th>Title of Lesson</th>
<th>Performance Area(s)</th>
<th>Overall Objective</th>
<th>Link to Lesson Plan</th>
<th>Additional Resources</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9 Aug</td>
<td>Academic</td>
<td>Introduction to advisory group</td>
<td>Nurturing, development</td>
<td>Knowing oneself, one’s aspirations</td>
<td>Nurturing</td>
<td>[Lesson Plan]</td>
<td>[Additional Resources]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14 Aug</td>
<td>Book isles</td>
<td>Senior year College as a pathway</td>
<td>Knowing oneself, one’s aspirations</td>
<td>Nurturing</td>
<td>[Lesson Plan]</td>
<td>[Additional Resources]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21 Aug</td>
<td>Academic</td>
<td>Senior year College as a pathway</td>
<td>Knowing oneself, one’s aspirations</td>
<td>Nurturing</td>
<td>[Lesson Plan]</td>
<td>[Additional Resources]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22 Aug</td>
<td>Academic</td>
<td>Senior year College as a pathway</td>
<td>Knowing oneself, one’s aspirations</td>
<td>Nurturing</td>
<td>[Lesson Plan]</td>
<td>[Additional Resources]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24 Aug</td>
<td>Academic</td>
<td>Senior year College as a pathway</td>
<td>Knowing oneself, one’s aspirations</td>
<td>Nurturing</td>
<td>[Lesson Plan]</td>
<td>[Additional Resources]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26 Aug</td>
<td>Academic</td>
<td>Senior year College as a pathway</td>
<td>Knowing oneself, one’s aspirations</td>
<td>Nurturing</td>
<td>[Lesson Plan]</td>
<td>[Additional Resources]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28 Aug</td>
<td>Academic</td>
<td>Senior year College as a pathway</td>
<td>Knowing oneself, one’s aspirations</td>
<td>Nurturing</td>
<td>[Lesson Plan]</td>
<td>[Additional Resources]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Check-in Round**

- 9 Aug
- 14 Aug
- 21 Aug
- 22 Aug
- 24 Aug
- 26 Aug
- 28 Aug

**Personal Advocacy (Out)**

- deadlines, academic, what needs to be accomplished
- [Lesson Plan]
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ISK’s 2018 Advisory Session Template

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Session</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strand</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aims</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Title</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**GRADE 12 ADVISORY PROGRAM PLAN**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Purpose</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Time Needed</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activity (Step by Step)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reflection / Exit ticket</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Possible Issues</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Potential modifications</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Percentage Changes in Evaluation variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Negative Change</th>
<th>Stayed the same</th>
<th>Positive Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Closeness to Advisor</td>
<td>23.07% (3)</td>
<td>30.76% (4)</td>
<td>46.15% (6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perceived influence from advisor</td>
<td>38.46% (5)</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>61.54% (8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perceived support from advisor 1</td>
<td>23.07% (3)</td>
<td>23.07% (3)</td>
<td>53.84% (7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perceived academic press from advisor</td>
<td>23.07% (3)</td>
<td>15.38% (2)</td>
<td>61.54% (8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perceived support from advisor 2</td>
<td>7.69% (1)</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>92.31% (12)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perceived support from advisor IMP</td>
<td>53.84% (7)</td>
<td>7.69% (1)</td>
<td>38.46% (5)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Negative Change</th>
<th>Stayed the same</th>
<th>Positive Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Closeness to Advisor</td>
<td>30.76% (4)</td>
<td>15.38% (2)</td>
<td>53.84% (7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perceived influence from advisor</td>
<td>53.84% (7)</td>
<td>7.69% (1)</td>
<td>38.46% (5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perceived support from advisor 1</td>
<td>61.54% (8)</td>
<td>7.69% (1)</td>
<td>30.76% (4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perceived academic press from advisor</td>
<td>53.85% (7)</td>
<td>30.76% (4)</td>
<td>15.38% (2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perceived support from advisor 2</td>
<td>53.85% (7)</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>46.15% (6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perceived support from advisor IMP</td>
<td>7.69% (1)</td>
<td>30.76% (4)</td>
<td>61.54% (8)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

From Pre to Post program (out of 13 respondents)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Negative Change</th>
<th>Stayed the same</th>
<th>Positive Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Closeness to Advisor</td>
<td>30.76% (4)</td>
<td>23.07% (3)</td>
<td>46.15% (6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perceived influence from advisor</td>
<td>30.76% (4)</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>69.23% (9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perceived support from advisor 1</td>
<td>23.07% (3)</td>
<td>15.38% (2)</td>
<td>61.54% (8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perceived academic press from advisor</td>
<td>23.07% (3)</td>
<td>23.07% (3)</td>
<td>53.84% (7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perceived support from advisor 2</td>
<td>38.46% (5)</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>61.54% (8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perceived support from advisor IMP</td>
<td>30.76% (4)</td>
<td>23.07% (3)</td>
<td>46.15% (6)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Teacher Survey:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Negative Change</th>
<th>Stayed the same</th>
<th>Positive Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Self-efficacy</td>
<td>14.28% (1)</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>85.71% (6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supportive Activities</td>
<td>28.57% (2)</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>71.43% (5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transition Activities</td>
<td>57.14% (4)</td>
<td>28.57% (2)</td>
<td>14.28% (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ideal Match</td>
<td>14.28% (1)</td>
<td>28.57% (2)</td>
<td>57.14% (4)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Twelfth Grade Outcome Survey

Name:

Advisor:

1. I feel confident with my progress towards successfully completing my college applications.
   a) Very confident
   b) Fairly confident
   c) Neutral
   d) Somewhat confident
   e) Not at all confident

2. I feel confident transitioning out of ISK to university/gap year/or other.
   a) Very confident
   b) Fairly confident
   c) Neutral
   d) Somewhat confident
   e) Not at all confident

3. I have been able to keep up with deadlines in my classes this academic year.
   a) Strongly agree
   b) Agree
   c) Neutral
   d) Disagree
   e) Strongly Disagree

4. I have been able to control my stress levels this academic year.
   a) Strongly agree
   b) Agree
   c) Neutral
   d) Disagree
   e) Strongly Disagree

5. I feel prepared, knowledge-wise, for mocks and IB exams.
   a) Strongly agree
   b) Agree
   c) Neutral
   d) Disagree
   e) Strongly Disagree

6. I feel prepared, skills-wise, for mocks and IB exams.
   a) Strongly agree
   b) Agree
   c) Neutral
   d) Disagree
   e) Strongly Disagree

7. I feel confident at creating an action plan.
   a) Very confident
   b) Fairly confident
   c) Neutral
   d) Somewhat confident
   e) Not at all confident

8. I feel confident at executing and sticking to an action plan I’ve created.
   a) Very confident
   b) Fairly confident
   c) Neutral
   d) Somewhat confident
   e) Not at all confident

9. I feel confident about/in my knowledge of the challenges of substances such as drugs and alcohol.
   a) Very confident
   b) Fairly confident
   c) Neutral
   d) Somewhat confident
   e) Not at all confident
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