

Learning advisors should be doing individual consultations differently: Why is that and what should we be doing instead?

Mark Bassett

Auckland University of Technology, Auckland, New Zealand

mark.bassett@aut.ac.nz

Abstract

Individual consultations have long been seen as core to the tertiary learning advisor (TLA) role, but the traditional individual consultation needs to change. In this perspective paper, through a combination of reflection and the discussion of selected research findings, three factors influencing the TLA role are discussed: equitable teaching and learning practices, the need to demonstrate the impact of our work, and the institutional adoption of generative artificial intelligence (GenAI) and third-party writing feedback providers. These factors present challenges and opportunities to the traditional individual consultation as well as the ongoing existence of the TLA role itself. The research findings are drawn from TLA and lecturer perspectives collected within a larger doctoral study of TLA and lecturer collaborations to embed academic literacy development at an Aotearoa New Zealand university. Findings include perceived benefits and weaknesses of individual consultations, the institutional perspective of TLAs as providers of individual support, and disagreements amongst TLAs about the best use of their time. The paper calls for change in TLA practices in order that we teach students using culturally appropriate equitable practices, provide robust evidence of the impact of our work on student academic success, and clearly differentiate our contributions from those of GenAI and third-party providers.

Keywords: individual consultations, embedded academic literacy, online resources, equity, educational impact, GenAI

I would like to pose a question to all tertiary learning advisors (TLAs): How many individual consultations should we really be doing?

My response is that, in their traditional form, we probably should not be doing that many individual consultations. In explaining my response in this perspective paper, I refer to data collected as part of my doctoral research (Bassett, 2022) that presents a time capsule of the perspectives of TLAs and lecturers at my institution, Auckland University of Technology (AUT), on the prominence that they thought can and / or should be given to individual consultations (also known as one-to-one appointments) in comparison with other strands of TLA work: specifically, embedding academic literacy development in the curriculum and online resource creation. These data were collected at a time when the AUT TLA team was at an early stage of its transition away from a focus on individual consultations, and there were considerable differences of position among us about how many individual consultations we should be doing. In explaining my position in this perspective paper, I discuss the historical positions of my colleagues with reference to the following current factors influencing the TLA profession:

- equitable teaching and learning provisions (in Aotearoa New Zealand, indigenising institutions and their learning environments is a priority),
- the need to demonstrate the impact of TLA work (funding and budgets continue to shift), and
- the increasing adoption of third-party providers such as Studiosity, as well as the rapid integration of generative artificial intelligence (GenAI) into teaching and learning.

Thinking back to 2013 when I started my TLA role at AUT, I spent the bulk of my time seeing students in individual consultations of thirty minutes. Most of these involved me providing some form of feedback on the students' current written assessments. As I have interacted with TLAs at other institutions in Aotearoa New Zealand over the years, it has become clear that individual consultations are central to the work of most TLA teams. This centrality can be traced back to the 1960s when, along with other provisions such as counselling (Brailsford, 2011), student services emerged as institutions started to recognise the importance of student success and retention (Breen & Protheroe, 2015; Manalo et al., 2010). This explains why so much of my work used to have such a heavy focus on individual interactions with students, and I would like to make clear that I find working with students individually to be a highly engaging

and rewarding experience. Just like 87% of the TLAs ($n = 92$) who responded to Cameron's (2018) survey of TLAs in Aotearoa New Zealand, I find individual consultations to be a strong source of job satisfaction because of the relational aspects of the interactions and a tangible sense of making a difference to a student's academic success.

However, in alignment with Lea and Street's (1998) academic literacies approach, the root causes of many of the academic issues experienced by individual students are actually in the systems and discourses of the institution, not the students themselves. Many TLAs are keenly aware of the gaps between the ways lecturers articulate how they expect students to engage with the curriculum and demonstrate their learning in assessments... and what actually makes sense to students. At AUT, several members of the TLA team wanted to work with faculties more to help bridge those gaps. Gradually, since around 2018, we have transitioned away from a focus on individual consultations provided to students while they work on their assessments – most of these were student-initiated, but some came via referrals from lecturers or student services. Our team transitioned to a focus on embedding academic literacy development in the curriculum and online resource creation, along with generic workshop teaching (e.g., workshops on academic writing that students from all disciplines can attend) and some individual consultations.

Since the transition, individual consultations account for only a small proportion of our work time, and we do not give feedback on students' current assessments. Instead, for student-initiated consultations, we give help with unpacking assessment tasks and recommend relevant online resources and generic workshops. At AUT, feedback on current assessments is provided by peer mentors, Studiosity, and a variety of GenAI tools. Also, lecturers can request individual consultations for their students after marking their work. We analyse the student's writing and use the lecturer's feedback to design a bespoke lesson for the student focused on one or two points. We meet with them once or twice. We then report back to the lecturers on what was taught and to provide any recommendations for further learning options. We also conduct this process with small groups of students from the same cohort if there are common issues. At present, the team is noticing an increase in demand in requests from neurodivergent students and students with English as an additional language. In order to be responsive to this we are re-assessing our service design. For neurodiverse learners in particular, it may be that we look to the

possibility of appointing specialist staff with the requisite training in psychology as well as learning, which most TLAs do not possess.

This gradual transition that has helped keep the TLA team at AUT relevant and valued in the eyes of senior leaders, as well as proactive in attempting to anticipate future changes at sector, institutional, and department levels. After all, TLAs are not strangers to the threat of restructures (Cameron, 2018), the sense that we are misunderstood or undervalued by our institutions (Malik, 2021), or the traumatic experiences of having our roles disestablished, such as is occurring in 2025 for those in the vocational education sector in New Zealand (Hanly, 2025; Wilson, 2025). Moreover, TLAs are also still doing their work in the context of present-day factors including the need to indigenise our practices so that we meaningfully include the worldview of Māori learners (Ormond & Reynolds, 2025), demonstrate the impacts of our work (Bassett & Macnaught, 2024; Macnaught et al., 2022), and embrace as well as differentiate TLA work from the outputs of GenAI (Kelly et al., 2024).

In this perspective paper, I present doctoral findings about what my TLA and lecturer colleagues at AUT had to say specifically about the individual consultation strand of the TLA role at a time in 2018 when the TLA team had just begun a transition away from focusing on that strand. As readers will see, there was not an agreement on this transition, and some participants were clearly in support of it while others were opposed to it. It is my perspective that the controversy over the prominence of individual consultations in the TLA role apparent in the contrasting positions of my colleagues in 2018 is resonant of current debates among TLAs across our profession about how we should be doing our work to scaffold student success and justify our existence. In discussing these findings in the context of the present-day factors of indigenisation, demonstrating our impact, and GenAI, it is my opinion that TLAs need to have similar debates in their own teams and set institutionally relevant team plans for transitioning their practices if they are to enhance their contribution to student success and help ensure their ongoing relevance in the eyes of senior leaders.

Summary of the Doctoral Study's Methods and Approach Taken in This Paper

This article draws on data from my PhD (Bassett, 2022) which investigated TLA work to embed academic literacies (ethics approval numbers: 0197999 & 020422 [University of Auckland]; 17/360 & 18/18 [AUT]. My PhD was a two-phase mixed methods study. The first phase involved a focus group of the TLA team at AUT in 2018, with eight of the 10 members of the team (excluding me) participating. The second phase comprised case studies of embedding collaborations between three TLAs, three lecturers, and two information literacy librarians. Individual interviews were conducted with all of the participants in the second phase, and the three TLAs also participated in a focus group. Other data collection methods were a questionnaire for all lecturers at AUT and the analysis of teaching and learning materials created through the embedding collaborations. All focus group and interview data were analysed using constructivist grounded theory methods (Charmaz, 2006) to constantly compare emerging codes and to generate categories. Full details of the doctoral study's methodology are provided in the thesis. Those details are not provided here for conciseness and because the intent of this paper is to share a perspective on our profession informed by a narrow portion of the study's data.

In this article, I focus specifically on what TLA and lecturer participants said about individual consultations during the focus groups and interviews. While not the focus of my doctoral research, individual consultations naturally arose during the focus groups and interviews as one of the strands of TLA work alongside embedded teaching, generic teaching, and online resource creation.

I acknowledge that my doctoral research data were collected in 2018, which could be considered too far in the past to be of current significance to TLA work in 2025. However, these TLA and lecturer perspectives are just as relevant now as they were in 2018, and many TLA teams, including mine are still today grappling with similar experiences.

Summary of Findings about Individual Consultations

The findings presented in this section comprise perspectives shared by lecturer and / or TLA participants. They are organised into four groups: 1) benefits of individual consultations, 2) weaknesses of individual consultations, 3) institutional and TLA perspectives on the TLA role,

and 4) the optimal uses of TLA time. These findings are presented to show the considerable variation in perspectives on the place of individual consultations in the TLA role amongst only a small TLA team and just three of the lecturers with whom they collaborated at the time.

Lecturers and TLAs perceived several benefits of individual consultations – these are shown in Table 1. The most commonly stated benefit by TLAs was that they could gain insight into student challenges. This point was initially made by one TLA in the first focus group, and they expanded on it by saying that creating resources, by contrast, did not enable TLAs to identify student challenges. However, another TLA countered in saying that embedding collaborations with lecturers also facilitated the identification of student challenges.

Other benefits related to the relationship between individual consultations and embedding. Some TLAs saw individual consultations as a potential starting point for embedding collaborations with lecturers. Lecturers and TLAs – as part of existing collaborations – saw value in working with some students individually (or in small groups) after teaching a whole class for further guidance / clarification of academic literacy content. Furthermore, TLAs and lecturers expressed how lecturers value the availability for their students of individual relationships with TLAs – usually as a further provision after a whole-class embedded teaching session.

Table 1. *Lecturer and TLA perspectives on benefits of individual consultations*

Codes	Occurrences
Individual consultations enable TLAs to identify student challenges	3 TLAs
→ and creating resources does not do that	1 TLA
→ but embedding also enables TLAs to identify student challenges	1 TLA
Individual consultations are a potential route to embedding	2 TLAs
Individual consultations are beneficial to some students after whole-class embedding	1 lecturer, 2 TLAs
Lecturers want to collaborate with TLAs on being responsive to students after whole-class embedding	2 lecturers
Lecturers value individual relationships with TLAs for their students	2 lecturers, 2 TLAs
Individual consultations enable TLAs to guide students with creatively meeting assessment expectations	1 TLA

One weakness of individual consultations raised by one TLA related to equity. As shown in Table 2, there was a concern that students who stand to benefit most from individual consultations are not the students who access them. Instead, it was this TLA's experience that students who come to individual consultations would likely be successful with or without doing so. This point was made in the first focus group during discussion about what the TLAs saw as the most effective ways of doing their work and whether some strands of the role could be prioritised over others. The point about individual consultations being inequitable was countered by another TLA who stated that embedding is also inequitable because it is not possible for a team of TLAs to teach in all courses at an institution. Instead, the TLA argued for embedding in courses that have been identified as having low success rates as a means of prioritisation and that this form of embedding should also include individual consultations.

Another weakness of individual consultations raised by two TLAs was that they were rooted in a deficit approach that sees students as problematic and lacking required skills. This

they saw as limiting the LA's role to addressing only foundational academic literacy knowledge (e.g., sentence structure and referencing styles) instead of making more impactful contributions to student success for example, as shown in Table 1, one TLA observed that individual consultations enabled time and interaction to guide students with meeting assessment expectations in creative ways that were authentic to those students.

Table 2. *TLA perspectives on weaknesses of individual consultations*

Codes	Occurrences
Individual consultations are not equitable because students who can get most benefit do not come to them	1 TLA
→ but embedding is not equitable because it is not possible to teach in every course – so, TLAs should focus on courses with low success rates including individual consultations as part of embedding	1 TLA
Individual consultations are often deficit oriented and focus on basic skills	2 TLAs

The perception of TLAs as providers of individual support appeared to be a common one. As shown in Table 3, one of the lecturers and two of the TLAs thought that this is how TLAs are seen by institutions. One TLA, having recently attended the 2018 ATLAANZ Conference, observed how central to the TLA role individual consultations were for TLAs at other institutions compared with AUT:

It was noticeable... that a lot of other institutions in New Zealand are doing a lot of individual consultations still, and not so much embedding... From the sessions I went to, they can't imagine giving up their individual consultations. Like we used to do them six to eight people a day, they can't imagine what would their students do.

This contrast in how many individual consultations TLAs do in different institutions was also observed by three of the TLAs in how TLA work was being done at AUT at that time. While the team had begun its transition from an individual consultation focus to embedding and

online resource creation, there was considerable variation in how the embedding was being done (for a detailed account of these variants, see Bassett, 2022). One key difference was the inclusion of individual consultations. Some TLAs only provided whole-class teaching, whereas others also provided individual consultations during class time. The former approach involved one TLA teaching in a class, whereas the latter involved multiple TLAs. Some TLAs saw value in the latter approach because they could work with students as they worked on their assessments while a lecturer was also present. However, other TLAs expressed concerns about the sustainability of that approach given how many TLAs were involved in one class.

Table 3. *Institutional and TLA perspectives on the TLA role*

Codes	Occurrences
Institutions view TLAs as providers of individual support	1 lecturer, 2 TLAs
Many TLAs see individual consultations as their main or only role	1 TLA
In 2018, TLAs at AUT were providing inconsistent services	3 TLAs

The limited resource of TLA time – and how to make the best use of it – was the most frequently mentioned issue in relation to individual consultations. As shown in Table 4, embedding that involved a combination of whole-class and individual teaching was seen as desirable by some TLAs and one lecturer, but other TLAs thought this was too time intensive for the TLA team.

Also, in light of the TLA team’s recent increased focus on online resource creation, there was disagreement among TLAs about whether that was the best of use of their time or whether they should instead use it for individual consultations. Those who saw greater value in online resource creation stated that the team’s previous focus on individual consultations meant that they never had enough time to create online resources.

In addition, one lecturer perceived that TLAs face the same constraints as lecturers in only being able to work with students individually in a very limited capacity. Also, some of the TLAs acknowledged that the team’s shift away from individual consultations had meant there

was now time for working more at scale, including embedding across entire programmes as well as in individual courses, which they saw as a more sustainable way of working.

Table 4. *Lecturer and TLA perspectives on the optimal uses of TLA time*

Codes	Occurrences
Individual consultations can be done during class time in addition to whole-class embedding, but it is TLA time intensive	1 lecturer, 5 TLAs
TLAs spending time on individual consultations is more valuable vs TLAs spending time on online resource creation is more valuable	3 TLAs
Focusing on individual consultations means there is no time to create online resources	2 TLAs
Not focusing on individual consultations means there is time to work more at scale by embedding, which is more sustainable	1 TLA
TLAs cannot see students individually at scale, which is the same for lecturers	1 lecturer

In summary, while participants identified several benefits of individual consultations (identifying student challenges, starting embedding collaborations, further academic literacy teaching after whole-class embedding, providing individual relationships for students, and guiding students with creatively meeting assessment expectations), they also identified weaknesses (inequitable student access, a deficit orientation, and a focus on basic skills). Furthermore, the profile of TLAs at institutional level and among many TLAs appeared to be strongly associated with the provision of individual support, but that view was not consistent across all TLAs, with some valuing a stronger focus on embedding and online resource creation enabled through a reduced focus on individual consultations.

Discussion

The findings summarised in the previous section are discussed here with reference to literature on equitable TLA work, the sustainability of TLA work, evidencing the impact of TLA work, and the growing adoption of third-party writing feedback providers and GenAI. These factors are all manifestations of long-standing opportunities and threats to established TLA practices, and the following discussion of them also integrates relevant examples of how the AUT TLA team has responded. The Discussion begins with a brief consideration of differing perspectives on the best of use of TLA time.

A Long Debate About the Best Use of TLA Time

The debate reported in the previous section among TLAs at AUT about the best of use of TLA time (more of a focus on individual consultations or more of a focus on embedding and online resource creation) was recorded in 2018. Seven years on, that debate is still going on across our whole profession. Recent literature includes calls to redefine our role in the face of constrained funding and lack of institutional understanding of TLA work (Briggs, 2025), to reduce our focus on individual consultations and other elements of our role in the face of AI's rapidly growing adoption in tertiary education (Kelly, 2024), and to systematically embed academic literacies in the curriculum so that our provisions for students are relevant, inclusive and equitable (Hakim & Wingate, 2024; Murray, 2022). At the same time, an entire 2025 special issue of the *Journal of Academic Language and Learning* is dedicated to individual consultations, with the authors of the editorial article claiming that members of our profession “likely share... a sense that individual consultations are important to what we do and why we do it – or to put it another way, a sense that individual consultations are at the heart of what we do” (Bak & Grossi, 2025, p. 1).

Individual consultations were absolutely at the heart of my team's work when I started my current TLA role in 2013. However, since transitioning to focus more on embedding and online resource creation, individual consultations are now more at the periphery of what we do and why we do it. We are still a small team working across the institution for the academic success of students, and we still identify student challenges and respond to them. We just do that

on a larger scale, emphasising collaboration with faculty staff to embed our teaching and online resources multi-modally in students' courses (e.g., see Bassett, 2022; Bassett & Wattam, 2024; Macnaught et al., 2022).

As the debates reported in the summarised findings indicate, the change in our team's approach was controversial. As some of the TLAs noted, individual consultations enable TLAs to identify student challenges, which is a point made often in the literature (e.g., Berry et al., 2012; Campitelli et al., 2019; Chanock, 2007; Hamilton & Bak, 2025; Huijser et al., 2008). However, it is also possible to identify student challenges in embedding collaborations by discussing them with lecturers and analysing student writing (Bassett, 2022; Macnaught et al., 2022; Economou, 2021; Murray, 2022; Thies, 2016; Wingate, 2015). Although it was a controversial change in approach for our team, it was a decision motivated by wanting to increase the equity, sustainability, and impact of our work on students.

Equitable TLA Work

A reason for providing individual consultations that has long been cited is to address inequities among students (Chanock, 2013; Iranmanesha & Taouk, 2025; Manalo et al., 2010). Unfortunately, the provision of individual consultations typically relies on students self-accessing them, usually by having to go outside of their learning environments, which – as identified by TLAs in this research – can position students as deficient (Henderson & Hirst, 2007), and can have a stigmatising effect (Turner, 2004). This aligns with the experience of one TLA in this research that the students who stand to benefit most from attending individual consultations are not the ones who actually do so.

Regarding the Aotearoa New Zealand context specifically, equitable teaching and learning for Māori and Pacific students is a priority in tertiary education. This is due to long-standing gaps in success, such as course completion rates between Māori (75%), Pacific (72%) and all other groups of students (European – 86%; Asian – 86%; Other – 82%) (Ministry of Education, 2024). Among a *kete* (te reo Māori term for basket) of institutional provisions, the standard form of individual consultations provided by most TLAs is probably not particularly effective in helping address these gaps. According to Mayeda et al.'s (2014) study of 90 high-

achieving Māori and Pacific students, support provisions specific to their respective ethnicities were most highly valued. Furthermore, Ormond and Reynolds' (2025) study of four young Māori students as they started tertiary education reported negative experiences caused by deficit-based institutional support provisions "based on majority-held stereotypes about who will be successful" (p, 15). This suggests that individual consultations – or perhaps group ones that acknowledge the collective orientation of Māori and Pacific learners – may be best provided by TLAs who have the requisite cultural knowledge, which implies the need for TLAs who are of those ethnicities as well as for other TLAs to engage with relevant training.

Sustainable TLA Work

As noted by a TLA and a lecturer in this research, it is not possible for TLAs to see many students individually. The ratio of TLAs to students could never accommodate it – as an indication, it is one TLA for every 2,696 students at AUT. Indeed, it has been understood for decades that individual consultations cannot be provided to all students (Skillen et al., 1998), and this was a key motivation for the AUT TLA team to focus more on embedding and online resource creation.

Of course, sustainability is as much a reality in embedding as it is in individual consultations, which one of the TLAs in this research noted in 2018 when pointing out that we cannot teach in all courses. Subsequently, and as reported in Macnaught et al. (2022), the embedding approach at AUT has been shown to be sustainable through the gradual handover of academic literacy teaching from TLAs to lecturers over one or more cycles of collaboration and the embedding of online resources in the lecturers' courses in the learning management system. Furthermore, the AUT TLA team has employed user-experience (UX) methods to co-design our online resources with students over the last several years (see Bassett et al., 2023 and Bassett & Wattam, 2024). These methods have enabled a sustainable approach to online resource creation, with resources that continue to meet student expectations of relevance and ease of use.

Evidence of the Impacts of TLA Work

Even though the TLAs who participated in my doctoral research could articulate some benefits to whichever approach they took to doing their work, how those could be evidenced did not get mentioned. Indeed, over the decades, TLAs have put forward precious little evidence of our impact. Various authors (Bak & Grossi, 2025; Breen & Protheroe, 2015; Campitelli et al., 2019; Chanock, 2007; Huijser et al., 2008; Ma, 2019; Stevenson & Kokkin, 2009) have acknowledged the weak evidence base for the impacts of individual consultations. The evidence for impacts of embedding is not strong either. A systematic review (Bassett & Macnaught, 2024) of 20 studies that reported empirical evidence of the impacts of embedding found that 56% of the data comprises perceptions of students and staff, just 27% relates to changes in academic performance, and much of the perceptions data is not triangulated with other data types. And, while conducting the literature reviews for both phases of AUT's UX research into the design and positioning of academic literacy online resources, no meaningful evidence of impact was included in that literature. This dearth of evidence is damaging to any cases we might make about the relevance and contribution of our profession to student academic success.

One impact reported by both TLA and lecturer participants in this study of TLA work at AUT was how TLAs were perceived. As stated by the participants in my research in 2018, TLAs were perceived by our institution as providers of individual support to students. In the subsequent years, this perception has not changed that much, and this has spurred the AUT TLA team into several courses of action. In addition to collecting evaluative feedback from students and staff, we also gather usage statistics – all of which are used to inform our strategic planning and promote our impact to the wider institution. In 2024, our online resources were viewed 304,150 times by 18,560 unique students, which is two thirds of the institution's entire student cohort. We also know that all faculties and student ethnicities are well represented in that total. Our video content was viewed 39,154 times by 14,680 unique viewers (comprising AUT students and staff). Also in 2024, we taught 213 embedded classes to a total of 6,450 students, taught 314 generic workshops to 3,117 students, and saw 99 students in individual consultations. These statistics show that our online resources have a long reach and that we teach more than double the number of students in embedded classes compared with generic workshops – and in

just under two thirds the number of teaching events. We promote this information across the institution and use it to inform prioritisation of work streams.

In addition, the AUT TLA team have also reported internally on positive changes to academic performance over progressive cycles of embedding collaborations with lecturers on courses. One example was published in Macnaught et al. (2022), who found reductions in resubmission rates. Currently, our team is engaged in two research projects in collaboration with lecturers and student success staff to investigate the impacts of embedding on students and staff by triangulating multiple data types, including student and staff perceptions, student writing samples, grade distribution data, usability testing of online resources, and online activity statistics.

Third-Party Providers and GenAI

Evidencing our impact has perhaps most significance for individual consultations because of the current presence of third-party providers and the immediate future presence of GenAI tools.

Third-party writing feedback providers such as Studiosity are well-established in institutions in Aotearoa New Zealand and other countries, with studies such as Brodie et al. (2021) identifying their positive impact on student confidence with academic writing and understanding of its requirements. In addition to such impacts, third-party providers have fewer overhead costs (e.g., salary and leave entitlements of their employees) compared with institutions who employ TLAs, which may contribute to their potential attractiveness at institutions facing increasing funding constraints. Furthermore, such services can be available to students more immediately than TLA teams can, and they are also now including GenAI driven services that are available 24/7.

At AUT, an AI taskforce has set immediate aspirations for staff adoption of AI to enhance teaching and learning, including academic literacies. To that end, members of our TLA team are involved in several pilots to build agents with Cogniti; for example, one that can partner with students to narrow down a research topic for a specific assessment. Also, there is already a considerable body of literature that indicates GenAI's usefulness as a provider of writing

feedback. For example, Nguyen et al. (2024)'s study of the strategies 10 doctoral students used in partnering with AI found that those students who engaged iteratively and interactively with it achieved better results on a specified writing task than those who used it more as a supplementary resource with less interaction. And, Steiss et al. (2024) compared the quality of formative feedback in 200 pieces of feedback provided by humans and 200 pieces of feedback provided by AI. While they deemed the quality of the human feedback to be higher, the differences were viewed as modest given the overall quality of the feedback and time-savings of the AI feedback. If TLAs are to continue providing individual consultations in their traditional form, we will have to do more than we ever have done to justify that.

Conclusion

In this article, I have shared a time capsule of the debates about the prominence of individual consultations in the work of the AUT TLA team in 2018. I have also shared why our team subsequently transitioned away from focusing on individual consultations with reference to some of the factors that are currently influencing the work of the TLA profession. While TLA roles vary from institution to institution, we are all facing some shared challenges and opportunities to:

1. Engage in culturally appropriate practices with Māori and Pacific students.
2. Evidence the impacts of our work.
3. Integrate our work with AI and third-party providers such as Studiosity.

At the same time, we must clearly articulate how what we do is different from – and/or better than – what AI and third-party providers do. Whether or not institutions view AI and third-party provisions as supplementing or replacing TLAs is absolutely a question that TLA teams ought to be actively helping to answer. From a relational learning perspective, there may be some reason to assume individual interactions with TLAs might still be viewed as necessary. However, from an efficiencies / economic perspective, it would appear somewhat inescapable that AI and third-party providers are both more available to students and cost less money to institutions than employing TLAs who are not available to students so readily, and who have to be paid to take annual / sick leave and to undertake professional development. This all points

firmly to the need for TLA teams to make strong cases that present persuasive triangulated evidence to institutional leaders about the impact of their work on student academic success. I therefore encourage collaboration across the profession to show how we impact positively on students.

References

- Bak, T., & Grossi, V. (2025). Editorial: Special issue on individual consultations and academic language and learning practice. *Journal of Academic Language & Learning*, 19(1), E1–E4. <https://doi.org/10.1080/07294360701494294>
- Bassett, M. (2022). *Learning advisor and lecturer collaborations to embed discipline-specific literacies development in degree programmes* [Doctoral thesis, University of Auckland]. Research Space. <https://researchspace.auckland.ac.nz/handle/2292/58275>
- Bassett, M., Chapman, E., & Wattam, C. (2023). ‘I don’t know the hierarchy’: Using UX to position literacy development resources where students expect them. In T. Cochrane, V. Narayan, C. Brown, K. MacCallum, E. Bone, C. Deneen, R. Vanderburg, & B. Hurren (Eds.), *People, partnerships and pedagogies*. Proceedings ASCILITE 2023. Christchurch (pp. 286–290). <https://doi.org/10.14742/apubs.2023.462>
- Bassett, M., & Macnaught, L. (2024). Embedded approaches to academic literacy development: A systematic review of empirical research about impact. *Teaching in Higher Education*, 30(5), 1065–1083. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13562517.2024.2354280>
- Bassett, M., & Wattam, C. (2024). ‘We didn’t need to know about everything all at once’: Using UX to give students easy access to relevant assessment resources. In T. Cochrane, V. Narayan, E. Bone, C. Deneen, M. Saligari, K. Tregloan, & R. Vanderburg (Eds.), *Navigating the terrain: Emerging frontiers in learning spaces, pedagogies, and technologies*. Proceedings ASCILITE 2024. Melbourne (pp. 23–33). <https://doi.org/10.14742/apubs.2024.1081>
- Berry, L., Collins, G., Copeman, P., Harper, R., Li, L., & Prentice, S. (2012). Individual consultations: Towards a 360-degree evaluation process. *Journal of Academic Language and Learning*, 6(3), A16–A35. <https://journal.aall.org.au/index.php/jall/article/view/213>
- Brailsford, I. (2011). ‘The ha’porth of tar to save the ship’: Student counselling and vulnerable university students, 1965–1980. *History of Education*, 40(3), 357–370. <https://doi.org/10.1080/0046760X.2010.529833>
- Breen, F. G., & Protheroe, M. (2015). Students and learning advisors connecting? Does our practice affect student retention and success? *ATLAANZ Journal*, 1(1), 77–92. <https://doi.org/10.26473/atlaanz.2015.1.1/005>
- Briggs, S. (2025). Redefining the role of Learning Development practitioners. *Journal of Learning Development in Higher Education*, 33. <https://doi.org/10.47408/jldhe.vi33.1203>

- Brodie, M., Tisdell, C., & Sachs, J. (2021). Online writing feedback: A service and learning experience. In H. Huijser, M. Kek, & F. F. Padró (Eds.), *Student Support Services*. University Development and Administration. Springer. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-981-13-3364-4_13-2
- Cameron, C. (2018). Tertiary learning advisors in Aotearoa/New Zealand: Part three: Why do we stay? Rewards and challenges. *ATLAANZ Journal*, 3(1), 44–66. <https://doi.org/10.26473/ATLAANZ.2018.1/004>
- Campitelli, S. T., Page, J., & Quach, J. (2019). Measuring the effectiveness of academic skills individual interventions on university graduate student writing: To what extent are we making a difference? *Journal of Academic Language and Learning*, 13(1), A124–A139. <https://journal.aall.org.au/index.php/jall/article/view/601>
- Chanock, K. (2007). Valuing individual consultations as input into other modes of teaching. *Journal of Academic Language and Learning*, 1(1), A1–A9. <https://journal.aall.org.au/index.php/jall/article/view/1>
- Chanock, K. (2013). Teaching subject literacies through blended learning: Reflections on a collaboration between academic learning staff and teachers in the disciplines. *Journal of Academic Language and Learning*, 7(2), A106–A119. <https://journal.aall.org.au/index.php/jall/article/view/256>
- Charmaz, K. (2006). *Constructing grounded theory*. Sage.
- Coulson, K., Crofts, M., & Thomas, S. (2024). Developing new learning developers: Survey results and roadmap. *Journal of Learning Development in Higher Education*, (32). <https://doi.org/10.47408/jldhe.vi32.1424>
- Economou, D. (2021). One step at a time: Aligning theory and practice in a tertiary embedding initiative. *Journal of University Teaching & Learning Practice*, 18(6), 18–36. <https://doi.org/10.53761/1.18.6.03>
- Hakim, A., & Wingate, U. (2025). Collaborative approaches to embedding academic literacy instruction in the curriculum: Examples from UK universities. *Studies in Higher Education*, 50(8), 1–13. <https://doi.org/10.1080/03075079.2024.2397695>

- Hamilton, J., & Bak, T. (2025). Helping students see the throughline: Exploring the affective dimensions of individual consultations. *Journal of Academic Language and Learning*, 19(1), 21–36. <https://www.journal.aall.org.au/index.php/jall/article/view/983>
- Hanly, L. (2025, July 14). *Te Pūkenga changes: 10 polytechs to return to 'regional governance'*. RNZ. <https://www.rnz.co.nz/news/political/566857/te-pukenga-changes-10-polytechs-to-return-to-regional-governance>
- Henderson, R., & Hirst, E. (2007). Reframing academic literacy: Re-examining a short-course for 'disadvantaged' tertiary students. *English Teaching: Practice and Critique*, 6(2), 25–38. <https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/EJ832186.pdf>
- Huijser, H., Kimmins, L., & Galligan, L. (2008). Evaluating individual teaching on the road to embedding academic skills. *Journal of Academic Language and Learning*, 2(1), A23–A38. <https://journal.aall.org.au/index.php/jall/article/view/61>
- Iranmanesh, L., & Taouk, Y. (2025). Critical hope: Interplay of brief academic literacy workshops and individual consultations in the Clemente program. *Journal of Academic Language and Learning*, 19(1), 5–20. <https://www.journal.aall.org.au/index.php/jall/article/view/975>
- Kelly, A. (2024). *A vision for academic language and learning education in programmatic assessment* [Keynote presentation]. Association for Academic Language and Learning (AALL) Symposium 2024, Online. <https://www.aall.org.au/wp-content/uploads/2024/12/AALL-Symposium-2024-Keynote-A-vision-for-ALL-education-in-programmatic-assessment-Andrew-Kelly.pdf>
- Kelly, A., Strampel, K., & Lynch, A. (2024). Reconceptualising the role of academic language and learning advisers in the artificial intelligence age. *Journal of University Teaching and Learning Practice*, 22(2). <https://doi.org/10.53761/7vvt5q37>
- Lea, M. R., & Street, B. (1998). Student writing in higher education: An academic literacies approach. *Studies in Higher Education*, 23(2), 157–172. <https://doi.org/10.1080/03075079812331380364>
- Ma, L. P. F. (2019). Academic writing support through individual consultations: EAL doctoral student experiences and evaluation. Special Issue: Thesis and Dissertation Writing in a Second Language: Context, Identity, Genre. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 43, 72–79. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jslw.2017.11.006>

- Macnaught, L., Bassett, M., van der Ham, V., Milne, J., & Jenkin, C. (2022). Sustainable embedded academic literacy development: The gradual handover of literacy teaching. *Teaching in Higher Education*, 29(4), 1004–1022.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/13562517.2022.2048369>
- Malik, M. (2021). Core competencies for the practice of tertiary learning advising in New Zealand. *ATLAANZ Journal* 5(1), Article 5.
<https://doi.org/10.26473/ATLAANZ.2021/005>
- Manalo, E., Marshall, J., & Fraser, C. (2010). *Student learning support programmes that demonstrate tangible impact on retention, pass rates & completion* (2nd ed.).
<https://ako.ac.nz/knowledge-centre/student-support-programmes-that-impact-on-retention-and-completion/student-support-programmes-that-demonstrate-tangible-impact-on-retention-and-completion/>
- Mayeda, D. T., Keil, M., Dutton, H. D., & Ofamo’Oni, I.-F.-H. (2014). “You’ve Gotta Set a Precedent”: Māori and Pacific voices on student success in higher education. *AlterNative: An International Journal of Indigenous Peoples*, 10(2), 165–179.
<https://doi.org/10.1177/117718011401000206>
- Ministry of Education. (2024). *Course completion rates – 2023*. New Zealand Government.
<https://www.educationcounts.govt.nz/statistics/achievement-and-attainment>
- Murray, N. (2022). A model to support the equitable development of academic literacy in institutions of higher education. *Journal of Further and Higher Education*, 46(8), 1054–1065. <https://doi.org/10.1080/0309877X.2022.2044019>
- Nguyen, A., Hong, Y., Dang, B., & Huang, X. (2024). Human-AI collaboration patterns in AI-assisted academic writing. *Studies in Higher Education*, 49(5), 847–864.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/03075079.2024.2323593>
- Ormond, A., & Reynolds, M. (2025). Exploring experiences of Māori Youth in tertiary education in Aotearoa New Zealand. *Journal of Applied Youth Studies*.
<https://doi.org/10.1007/s43151-025-00164-3>
- Skillen, J., Merten, M., Trivett, N., & Percy, A. (1998). *The IDEALL approach to learning development: A model for fostering improved literacy and learning outcomes for students*. <https://ro.uow.edu.au/asdpapers/145>

- Steiss, J., Tate, T., Graham, S., Cruz, J., Hebert, M., Wang, J., Moon, Y., Tseng, W., Warschauer, M., & Olson, C. B. (2024). Comparing the quality of human and ChatGPT feedback of students' writing. *Learning and Instruction*, 91, 101894. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.learninstruc.2024.101894>
- Stevenson, M. D., & Kokkinn, B. A. (2009). Evaluating one-to-one sessions of academic language and learning. *Journal of Academic Language and Learning*, 3(2), A36–A50. <https://journal.aall.org.au/index.php/jall/article/view/86>
- Thies, L. C. (2016). Building staff capacity through reflecting on collaborative development of embedded academic literacies curricula. *Journal of University Teaching & Learning Practice*, 13(5), Article 19. <https://ro.uow.edu.au/jutlp/vol13/iss5/19>
- Turner, J. (2004). Language as academic purpose. *Journal of English for Academic Purposes*, 3(2), 95–109. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S1475-1585\(03\)00054-7](https://doi.org/10.1016/S1475-1585(03)00054-7)
- Wilson, M. (2025, July 15). *Toi Ohomai restructure proposal cuts jobs*. SunLive. <https://www.sunlive.co.nz/news/368707-toi-ohomai-restructure-proposal-cuts-jobs.html>
- Wingate, U. (2015). *Academic literacy and student diversity. The case for inclusive practice*. Multilingual Matters.