



**TIDEWATER  
COMMUNITY COLLEGE**

From here, go anywhere.™

**Student Success Governance Committee Meeting  
Portsmouth Campus, Room E126  
September 18, 2015  
10:00 – 12:30**

**MINUTES**

**In Attendance:** Veronica Cianetti, Nikki Duncan-Talley, Tracee Gobel, Tiffany Ramos, Tiffanye Sledge, Azam Tabrizi, Sonya Tardy, Elizabeth Vihnanek

**Respectfully Absent:** Emily Hartman, Marilyn Hodge, Cecilia Johnson, Joshlyn Whitehead

Call to Order

The meeting was called to order at 10:03

Minutes Approval

There were no minutes to approve as this was the first meeting for the academic year.

Introductions of Committee Members

We all introduced ourselves and got acquainted/reacquainted and we welcomed Nikki Duncan-Talley and Tiffany Ramos as new student representatives from the Virginia Beach campus. We also welcomed Elizabeth Vihnanek as a the LRC representative.

Logistics: Participation and Attendance

The meeting schedule was discussed. Meetings are scheduled to occur at regular intervals on the second Friday of each month from 10:00 AM until 12:30 PM. The only exception was the first meeting

For those that cannot make the meeting physically, and to also ensure that the meetings are captured, Blackboard Collaborate will be used for each meeting. The meetings will be recorded via Collaborate, and the committee was also reminded

that there is a call in number for all Collaborate sessions such that participants that must attend virtually

### Old Business

The committee discussed the outcomes of the faculty senate meeting from May 2015 and decided that the concerns raised by the Senate would be addressed as we focused on new business given the feedback from Dr. Summers.

It was also mentioned that the committee is still in need of a representative from Counseling as we do not have anyone.

### New Business:

Before the decision to accept the charge, the committee discussed that several concerns have been raised about retention and HOW we will advise based on the expected course load for faculty. Several committee members presented some ideas and specific concerns that need to be addressed before we delve into crafting or readdressing the faculty training aspects of the proposal:

- a. the possibility of manuals for each discipline
- b. most students come into college completely green and clueless regarding the policies
- c. check out "AVID" (Advancement Via Individual Determination) – a Virginia Beach Public Schools program that might provide a good baseline for how tutors in that program are trained to work with the students
- d. possible outreach to the public schools to be proactive (students who intend to enroll at TCC would engage with Career Coaches and/or a faculty advisor prior to graduating from high school
- e. possible outreach to new students as to what to expect by current students who have already been through advising for at least (period of time to be determined) and are currently successfully navigating the system.
- f. Exploring programs and services that already exist that are not being utilized (maybe address it in the SDV classes); the idea here is that there are resources that are being underutilized or ignored altogether that may be useful in the advising process
- g. The question was raised as to whether SDV teachers may be advisors (and that is the case with many counselors currently), but the same question would apply with faculty advisors (would faculty also need to teach the SDV course during the term in which they are accepting new advisees and how would that work)
- h. We may need to add a requirement that faculty are familiar with the programs at transfer schools
- i. Do we lump orientation into this (a member mentioned that Dr. Summers has tasked the provosts and deans of student services with revamping orientation)

- j. Do we approach this as an “orientation week” (daily orientation sessions) where advising will occur instead of an ongoing process throughout the term
- k. How might faculty advisors and their advisees be able to use technology and other new ways to do this

#### Review the charge in detail

The committee reviewed the charge in detail and there were several preliminary recommendations on how to proceed. Largely, those that were present agreed to accept the charge based on the committee’s recommended conditions below. A formal vote will be presented to what will hopefully be more committee members at the October meeting.

In sum, the committee agreed that with Dr. Summers’ assessment and concerns regarding the reasonableness of faculty involvement given the current requirements in the pilot proposal that was presented to Faculty Senate in May 2015. It was further agreed that the charge and justification he provided were very thorough and the committee recognized a possible way to effectively address those concerns by focusing on faculty advising instead of mentoring and advising.

One major concern raised by Dr. Summers was the fact that the current proposal has many outcomes, and that his desire is to have the committee:

“focus this new proposal on what can reasonably be accomplished by full-time faculty advising and/or mentoring, given the amount of time expected by faculty. Therefore, **my charge to the Committee this year is to work on the refinement of this proposal such that a faculty training program is developed that more specifically defines what the faculty are expected to do and accomplish as advisors or mentors.**” (M. Summers, personal communication, August 24, 2015). The further discussion around program selection, faculty incentives, and assessment raised in the memorandum will be included as these are all essential aspects of the faculty training piece.

The committee noted that the formal charge was not the only place that referenced some concern with faculty functioning as mentors and advisors. Several committee members highlighted the preceding paragraph in that memorandum where Dr. Summers inquired about whether full time faculty have the time or expertise to address all of the goals. The committee thusly agreed to focus on advising (with the understanding that a second conversation would accompany a formal vote at the October meeting).

Based on the concerns raised by Dr. Summers as well as those of faculty from the May 2015 Senate meeting and current and former committee members, the committee also addressed concerns raised in the charge regarding the outcomes presented in the original final document. **Because of the intended refocus on**

**advising only, the 13 outcomes have been reduced to 6 that were identified as advising-specific.**

The outcomes and corresponding responsible entities were determined. Those items that were deemed as advising-specific are the focal outcomes if the committee agrees to focus only on advising. The other areas include SDV, Counseling, or Student Mentoring (if this particular aspect is brought into the discussion as part of a comprehensive advising model):

- Assist the student in:
  - developing an academic plan - **ADVISING**
  - class scheduling/course selection - **ADVISING**
  - course sequencing, prerequisites, and graduation requirements - **ADVISING**
  - academic preparation - **ADVISING**
- Help the student to:
  - develop and/or refine their personal goals - **SDV or Counseling**
  - discover their own interests, skills, values, and abilities – **SDV or Counseling**
  - understand how to deal with barriers and challenges - **SDV or Counseling**
  - identify resources and pathways towards their goals - **ADVISING**
  - develop crucial planning skills valuable beyond their academic career – **Student or other form of mentoring**
  - make informed educational, social, and career decisions
    - the committee recommended splitting this out into separate items:
      - make informed educational decisions - **ADVISING**
      - make informed social decisions – **Student Mentoring**
      - make informed career decisions – **potentially SDV or other system/resource; this is the focus of the QEP and hence may not be addressed extensively under the advising program if there is a separate system identified in the prep and execution of the QEP. The other concern raised in that it may be likely that students might not be advised by a faculty member in their intended field or transfer degree program.**
  - improve organizational skills, academic planning, and preparation – **SDV or Counseling**
  - ~~develop self-confidence~~ – this is not a “SMART” objective as it cannot be measured. The committee suggested that this should occur by way of the development and successful execution of the academic plan, but we cannot include it as an outcome since outcomes should be able to be assessed in some way

- ~~achieve personal enrichment~~ same as above (Not a SMART objective)
- ~~develop critical thinking skills~~ – this is also not a SMART objective  
UNLESS assessed in the classroom (potentially SDV)
- acquire traits such as self-accountability, follow through and persistence – **Mentoring (student or other)**
- personal development **Mentoring (student or other)**
- Engage in reflective discussion in the student's area of study –  
**Classroom/SDV**
- Learn what the day-to-day work experiences are for those in the student's desired field - **Mentoring**

#### Action Plan for Next Meeting

- l. ALL – identify specific activities attached to each outcome (6 total)
- m. ALL – what do we envision the role that mentoring will play
- n. Nikki – investigate how first year success actually works
- o. Elizabeth – look into what adjunct faculty are permitted to do
  - i. Proportion of adjunct versus full time faculty
  - ii. Research on what others are doing with developing academic plans
- p. Veronica – meet with one of the programs that are successfully advising
- q. Find out how many and what proportion of total our full time faculty represent

#### Adjournment

The meeting adjourned at 12:31