Summer 2022

Restructuring the Role of Faculty in the Advising Process at a Community College

Michael Wayne Mabe
Gardner-Webb University, mmabe1@gardner-webb.edu

Consultancy Project & Report

Organization:	Gardner-Webb University College of Education
Project Title:	RESTRUCTURING THE ROLE OF FACULTY IN THE ADVISING PROCESS AT A COMMUNITY COLLEGE
Candidate:	Michael Wayne Mabe
Consultancy Coach:	Dr. Jeffrey Hamilton
Defense Date:	July 1, 2022
Authorized by:	Masonne Sawyer, Vice President of Student Success Services

Approval

This consultancy project was submitted by Michael Wayne Mabe under the direction of the persons listed below. It was submitted to Gardner-Webb University College of Education and approved in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Doctor of Education at Gardner-Webb University.

_____ _____

Dr. Jeffrey Hamilton, Faculty Advisor Date
Gardner-Webb University

_____ _____

Masonne Sawyer, Site Advisor Date
Vice President, Student Success Services

Acknowledgements

I would like to thank my project host, Masonne Sawyer, for helping to frame this project. Her insight into the organizational changes within the college was instrumental in developing this project. I also want to thank the faculty and staff at Forsyth Tech who worked with me by providing information, joining committees, and listening to my recommendations.

I also want to thank my project sponsor, Dr. Jeffrey Hamilton, and Gardner-Webb University. Dr. Hamilton's support, comments, and suggestions on this work have been greatly appreciated.

Lastly, I want to thank my family for their support. My wife, Jaclyn, has been extremely supportive and positive through this process. She continually encouraged me through this program even when she had to watch the kids while I was writing on the weekends or out of town. I am grateful for her support.

Abstract

RESTRUCTURING THE ROLE OF FACULTY IN THE ADVISING PROCESS AT A COMMUNITY COLLEGE. Mabe, Michael Wayne, 2022: Consultancy Project, Gardner-Webb University.

My goal in this project was to restructure the faculty's role in student advising by developing a faculty-student mentorship program. I focused on three areas within the study: determining the role of faculty as mentors, describing how students would be assigned to faculty, and determining how to train faculty in the new role. I conducted a mixed methods study to gauge faculty views on advising and mentoring. Results showed that faculty supported mentoring of students, which has been shown to improve student academic performance. I recommended that faculty meet with their mentees three times throughout the academic year. Faculty and students could meet more often if both agreed. This recommendation allows for a mix of structured meetings (the three mandatory meetings) and flexibility (for students who want to meet more frequently). The number of mentees per faculty member should be no more than 15. Some mentees may not take advantage of the program, but the number of assigned mentees is small enough that if all did seek mentoring, the faculty would be able to provide adequate support. Faculty should record their mentoring meetings in the appropriate electronic program. To best serve students, communication between faculty mentors and advisors is key; therefore, faculty should be diligent in recording their meetings so students can be supported by both mentor and advisor.

Keywords: community college, mentorship, advising, restructuring, faculty

Table of Contents

1. Introduction

1.1 Project Purpose

I conducted this study to restructure the advising model at Forsyth Technical Community College (Forsyth Tech). The college is amid several changes, and a focus at the college is advising. One of the main challenges is advising within the arts and sciences division. This is the largest division within the college. The focus of this project was to develop a faculty mentoring program within the arts and sciences division.

The faculty's role in advising had been to assist students with registering for classes and planning the next semester or two. Due to several changes occurring within the institution, registration and class planning were assigned to student success advisors. I was asked to work on a faculty mentoring model where faculty would act as mentors to students instead of advisors. This means the role of faculty would be to assist students with transfer and career questions. This way students would have a contact to help them navigate the college and prepare for life after completing the associate degree.

1.2 Project Qualification

I began finding a project by reaching out to contacts I had at a couple of community colleges. I have had an interest in academic advising and was hoping to improve my understanding of the process, as well as develop skills in consulting in that area. I partnered with Forsyth Tech because they were in the process of redesigning advising and needed assistance with part of the redesign. After discussing what the college needed assistance with, I had my focus on the faculty's role within the new advising redesign.

The college was able to meet the criteria of having a project in several ways. First, they had a tentative start and end date for the project. The dates mostly aligned with my enrollment at Gardner-Webb. As discussed above, the focus on the faculty's role in advising was the main focus of the project. There were resources provided to me for the project, mainly time and staff. I was given names of individuals who would be working on the project, thus giving me the opportunity to practice coordinating and leading a project. Finally, I needed to work with other departments and college leadership in developing the new faculty role in advising. In this project, I had to discuss my ideas for faculty mentoring without formal leadership within the institution, so I had to learn how to use resources to support my suggestions to senior leadership.

1.3 Project Complexity and Impact Assessment

I worked with Masonne Sawyer at Forsyth Tech to determine the complexity and impact of the project on the college. After discussing her views on what the project should focus on, I was able to use the project impact assessment and project complexity matrices to determine the size of the project. I concluded that this was a medium project.

1.3.1 Project Complexity

To determine project complexity, I considered six criteria. The criteria were delivery timescale, how long it would take to provide this new model; stakeholders, who would be impacted by this change; operational change, would restructuring of the organization

be required; contract complexity, would contracts need to be developed for the new advising model; in-house expertise, had the current staff engaged in similar work before; and dependencies, are other projects directly affected by this project.

I expected the delivery timescale to be around 1 year. I expected 1 year because that was the initial goal from the college. I was focused on maintaining that 1-year timeline.

1.3.2 Project Impact

This project directly impacts one strategic goal at the college, which is student success. I determined the return on investment to be 2-3 years. It would take some time for the college to see the direct impacts of the advising redesign on student success. Since this is a community college, students can typically complete their program of study within 2 to 3 years; therefore, we should start to see an impact of the new advising model within 2 to 3 years of implementation. Finally, this project should directly impact one area of the college, advising. The focus of the project was on the faculty's role in advising, specifically those in arts and sciences, so we should see a direct impact on one division within the college.

1.4 Project Charter Information

A project charter is used to start the project. I used the project charter to identify what the project would accomplish, who the key stakeholders were, milestones, and deliverables. It was written at a high level with only general ideas of the nature of the project. The project charter was modified as work progressed.

The main stakeholders in the project were the faculty of the arts and sciences division, students, student success services (e.g., advising), and enrollment services.

The purpose of the project was to restructure the faculty's role in advising at the college. The focus was on arts and sciences because of the unique student body that enrolls within the division. Because there are so many potential pathways for transfer students, we need a new model of advising to meet the mission of the college. Faculty were responsible for registering students in classes and preparing the students' subsequent semesters. However, I worked to restructure the faculty's role so that mentoring was the focus instead of advising. Since there have been changes to the organizational structure of the college, advising has been assigned to student success advisors. This has opened up time for faculty to be able to focus on mentoring.

The institution provided resources, such as staff and the development of committees, to help with the development of the mentoring model. Having staff from various functions within the college was helpful when developing this model. The main goal was to provide the new role of arts and sciences faculty in the mentoring model, to determine the best way to assign students to faculty, and to determine the relationship between advising and faculty mentors (see Appendix A).

2. Project Objectives

The main goals of this project were to

- define the role of faculty as mentors
- define how students would be assigned to faculty
- determine a training method for faculty

Personally, I was looking to improve my understanding of advising and mentoring in a college setting. Also, I wanted to learn about how to implement a change within an organization and develop interpersonal skills. Lastly, I worked on developing an understanding of project management.

The success of the project would entail a functioning faculty-student mentor model. Ideally, this model would be something the institution would be able to implement based on the recommendations of this document.

2.1 Outline of Partnering Organization's Objectives

2.1.1. Objectives

This project focused on the role of the college transfer faculty in student advising. Previously, the role of faculty in advising was to meet with their advisees, discuss the current semester, and plan/register for future classes. This project was started to move that responsibility to professional advisors and change the role of faculty to mentors. Faculty, for the purpose of this project, can be divided into those in the technical programs (e.g., those teaching in specific Associate of Applied Science programs) and those teaching college transfer courses (e.g., Associate in Science, Associate in Arts, etc.). Since faculty in the technical programs will have fewer students and they tend to see the same students semester after semester, faculty mentoring will be structured differently between those in both types of programs. The focus of this project was specifically on the transfer faculty.

There has been an initiative from the executive leadership to provide mentoring to students. That initiative was going to be provided to students completing Associate of Applied Science, Associate in Science, Associate in Arts, etc. programs, but the structure and function of mentoring were not known; therefore, the significant issue this project was to resolve was the process of faculty mentoring to students in the college transfer curricula (e.g., Associate in Science, Associate in Arts, etc.).

There have been significant changes around the college over the past couple of years. One of the main focal points has been student success. Mentorship was suggested as a way to improve student success; therefore, this project, while focusing on one aspect of student success, was integral to the new vision of the college.

2.1.2 Success Criteria

The partnering organization (PO) was looking for a working mentoring model that could be implemented. The PO was looking for items such as how mentors would be assigned to mentees, how many mentees per mentor, how often meetings should take place, etc. If recommendations for a working mentor model are presented, the PO would view this as a success.

2.2 Student's Personal Leadership Objectives

2.2.1 Objectives

First, I wanted to improve my emotional intelligence. Early in the program, we studied emotional intelligence and completed a self-assessment to understand our baseline emotional intelligence. My self-awareness and social awareness scores were low, showing those were areas on which to focus. Research has shown that emotional intelligence is directly related to high-performing individuals in all job types (Bradberry & Greaves, 2009). According to Bradberry and Greaves (2009), of high job performers, 90% had high emotional intelligence; therefore, emotional intelligence is important to those working in leadership positions.

Second, I wanted to improve my response to conflict. I know there are times when conflict will develop, but my general response to conflict is to either avoid it if possible or try everything possible to negotiate a solution. This is an important area for development because, according to DuBrin (2016), approximately 20% of a leader's time is devoted to conflict management.

Third, I wanted to work and interact with those outside my department more frequently. Extraversion has been shown to increase the efficiency of leaders (DuBrin, 2016). Also, according to Senge (2006), learning organizations need to utilize systems thinking. In systems thinking, an organization utilizes an interdisciplinary approach so departments can learn from each other and adapt as needed (Senge, 2006). I have improved this aspect of leadership by moving into a coordinator position and by accepting and winning a nomination for faculty senate cochair.

2.2.2 Success Criteria

To improve emotional intelligence, I made conscious efforts to understand and confront my emotions when possible. I also, when possible, tried to pay closer attention to verbal and nonverbal communication from others. This was made difficult due to the COVID-19 pandemic, which was declared a few months after I wrote my personal growth objectives.

I was able to work on conflict resolution midway through the project due to a promotion to coordinator and being elected as cochair of the faculty senate. In both positions, I had to think of the best way to address disagreements or conflicts.

Recently, I have been able to work on my third objective for development. I have been on several inter-departmental committees which have led to meeting and interacting with many individuals outside my department. My new roles and working on large committees have helped me improve this area of my development.

3. Project Scope

3.1 Definitive Scope of Work

The final scope of the project was to focus on the mentor role of the arts and sciences faculty, providing information for the new advising document, and providing a working definition of mentoring. Since there are several variations on the definition of mentoring (Campbell & Campbell, 1997; Crisp, 2010; DeAngelo et al., 2016; Holba, 2012; Long et al., 2010), I decided to research these various definitions to develop a unique definition that would be useful to the organization. The working definition of mentoring that was adopted for Forsyth Tech is,

> Mentoring is the support and care of the entire student by a faculty member. The faculty member should support the student by discussing academic progress, possible career/transfer opportunities, and the holistic support needed by the student to successfully navigate the college setting.

I developed the definition above using the literature, cited above, to compare and contrast the definition of mentoring other colleges and universities have used. I then used the research to develop the working definition shown above.

There were other goals that ended up outside the scope of the current project. A couple of examples are the role of student success staff in pairing students to faculty mentors and providing a specific method for assigning students to faculty.

3.2 Project Benefits

I developed an evidence-based method for faculty to act as mentors to students and not just advisors. Since the college was moving in the direction of faculty mentoring for students, this project was important for providing the details of what that should look like. This has provided the administration with a suggestion on what the arts and sciences faculty should be responsible for in mentoring.

3.3 SMART Goals

Three SMART goals guided this project. The first was an online faculty survey. This survey was used to gauge the faculty's views on mentoring. This included topics on the number of students who could be mentored effectively, what the definition of mentorship is, and if mentoring would be beneficial to the students. The second was a document outlining the expectation of faculty around mentoring. This included timelines, expected behaviors, and a working definition of mentorship for this institution. The third was the training of faculty in mentorship. This document contained more detail about what mentorship would look like and the expectations of faculty during their meetings with students.

Goal	Description
Online faculty survey.	The survey was used to gauge the views of faculty on student mentoring.
Define the new role of faculty.	This document showed the role of faculty in the mentoring process based on a literature review.
Training faculty in new role.	This document showed discussed what faculty will be responsible for and described the timeline for mentoring.

4. Disciplined Inquiry

4.1 Introduction and Theoretical Framework

The purpose of this methodology was to understand the community college faculty's views on advising and mentoring. I utilized a mixed methods approach to understand the faculty's views on mentoring. The quantitative survey ranked responses on a 4-point Likert scale, and the qualitative survey used semi-structured interview questions. These data were analyzed to develop an understanding of the faculty's views on advising and mentoring and to compare the data with other studies.

4.2 Hypothesis

I hypothesized that faculty will want to maintain aspects of advising, such as discussing upcoming classes, registration deadlines, and pathways to complete associate degrees, but faculty will want to include mentorship activities in their advising duties. For example, they will want to have conversations about transfer opportunities, degree programs, etc.

4.3 Research Questions

I developed a mixed methods study to determine if faculty

- would want to continue advising students according to the current method,
- would want to include mentorship in their normal job duties, or
- could effectively mentor the same number of students they used to advise.

The survey I provided to the faculty was used to answer the questions above and to help develop a model for faculty mentoring based on faculty feedback.

4.4 Literature Review

I used the literature review to work on developing a working definition for mentoring, to determine the effectiveness of mentoring programs on undergraduate student academic performance, and to evaluate various mentorship programs at universities and community colleges. From the literature review, I analyzed three themes. First, I noticed that the literature would define mentor in various ways (Crisp & Cruz, 2009; Holba, 2012; Long et al., 2010). There were many variations of the definition of mentoring within the literature (Campbell & Campbell, 1997; Holba, 2012; Long et al., 2010). In one example, a mentor was simply an experienced individual providing guidance and support to an unexperienced individual (Campbell & Campbell, 1997). In another example, mentoring was to care for the individual both professionally and personally (Long et al., 2010). Holba (2012) described mentoring as teaching moral behavior to a less-experienced individual. Since there is variety

in the definition of mentorship as shown in the literature, I decided to look for similarities to develop a unique working definition specific to the college. This definition was listed in Section 3.1.

The second theme was the effects of mentoring on student performance. I found in the literature that mentorship has a positive effect on student academic performance (Campbell & Campbell, 1997; Hoffman & Wallach, 2005; Livingston, 2018; Salinitri, 2005). Most of the studies I found focused on university students (Campbell & Campbell, 1997; Livingston, 2018; Salinitri, 2005), but some focused on community college students (Crisp, 2010; Hoffman & Wallach, 2005). Community college students have different experiences than those at universities, which can create difficulties for students (Crisp, 2010), but when community college students received mentoring, a positive effect was found on their academic performance (Hoffman & Wallach, 2005).

The third theme of my literature review focused on mentoring programs. Most of the studies I found focused specifically on university students and mentoring (Campbell & Campbell, 1997; DeAngelo et al., 2016, Livingston, 2018; Long et al., 2010; Salinitri, 2005; Santos & Reigadas, 2005; Ssemata et al., 2017). Most of the focus of these papers was on the effects of mentoring on students rather than focusing on the mentoring program implemented by the institution (Crisp, 2010; DeAngelo et al., 2016; Pope, 2002); therefore, I worked to piece together parts of the programs that seemed to be useful within my community college.

Specific recommendations will be presented in Section 10 of this document. For the full literature review, please see Appendix B.

4.5 Methodology

For the qualitative analysis of my project, I decided to use semi-structured interview questions administered via an online survey, using Qualtrics. The interview questions were used to gauge the faculty's views on advising and mentoring, the main focus of this project. Faculty were allowed to explain their answers, thereby providing more insight than could be ascertained by quantitative analysis.

For the quantitative analysis of this project, I used a 4-point Likert scale for each of the quantitative questions. The scale ranged from strongly disagree, disagree, agree, to strongly agree. This prevented ambiguous answers such as neither agree nor disagree. Chi square analysis was used on the data to determine if the observed data matched my expected results.

For a more detailed explanation of the methodology, please see Appendices C and D.

5. Continuous Improvement Systems

5.1 Continuous Improvement Planning

The PO is planning to implement faculty mentoring in the arts and sciences division by the fall semester of 2022. There has been a committee assembled to work through the specifics of what the new mentoring model will look like. I have been asked to serve on the committee as well so I can provide insight into my study and provide recommendations. The details of

the implementation may differ some from my study, but the basic framework looks to be based on this study.

5.2 Continuous Improvement Actions

I have given a few presentations to leadership and have provided my slides to the institution's leadership. An outline of my slides has also been provided in Appendix E. That information has been used to develop an outline of how the PO wants faculty mentoring to look. The committee I mentioned above will work through the details of what faculty mentoring will look like within the arts and sciences division. Again, this may differ from the current study, but the basic framework is the same.

5.3 Continuous Improvement Feedback

In full implementation, faculty within the various departments should meet to discuss what went well or what could improve. This will be important feedback for the first year of the new mentoring model. This should be done after each of the formal mentoring sessions with students. This would be two or three times per academic year. The results of those discussions should be noted and used to improve subsequent sessions. At the end of the academic year, there will be a survey of faculty and students to evaluate how the mentoring model worked.

5.4 Continuous Improvement Implementation

The information received from both faculty and students will be vitally important to continuously improve the mentorship program. Data will need to be collected annually so revisions to the program will be implemented over the summer for the following academic year. Ideally, any changes will be somewhat small. I do not want this to become burdensome on faculty or students, so by focusing on one or two items for improvement each year, continuous improvement will be possible without a huge burden placed on faculty or students.

6. Deliverables

6.1 To Partnering Organization from Candidate

I provided a document, in the form of a PowerPoint to the organization, specifically to the Student Success Committee. I shared that document as well as discussed the document and my views of the framework. This document also contained the working definition of mentoring for our new model. To see the details of this document, please see Appendix E.

6.2 Deferred Deliverables

The training checklist has been deferred for the short term, so I will be working with a committee to finalize and share the training document.

I had planned to provide information for the advising document at the college. This document would be shared as a summary of what the new advising model would include. The individual who maintained the document left the organization, so the same information will be shared but in a different way.

7. Communications Plan

7.1 Communications Plan Development

The communication plan I drafted was to ensure that everyone within the college associated with the new mentoring model was being contacted and receiving relevant information related to their position. Information obtained from Kloppenborg et al. (2019) was used in developing the communications plan. I used my knowledge of the institution and communication with the mentoring committee to develop the stakeholder list and relevant information.

The information needed by various stakeholders was dependent on their position within the college. Those in executive leadership roles need to understand the general progression of the project. Divisional leadership was interested in the timeline of various milestones. Faculty were interested in how the new mentoring model would affect their day-to-day work. Students would just need to know the contact information of their advisor and mentor.

In all cases, except for students, this information could be delivered via email or a meeting. Email tended to be the preferred communication method. The frequency of the communication was dependent on the individual's role within the college (Kloppenborg et al., 2019). Faculty were the ones affected most by the change, so communication of expectations was needed on a regular basis. The same was true of divisional leadership because they are directly involved with faculty. Executive-level leadership did not need to be communicated with as frequently because their view of the project was at a much higher level; therefore, they needed less frequent communication focused on general trends. For the table showing the various stakeholders and information needed, please see Appendix F.

7.2 Stakeholder Engagement Plan

I identified the stakeholders based on those who would be directly impacted by the project, those who would be directly associated with the impacted individuals, those who would need to understand the process to help students, and members of executive leadership, as discussed by Kloppenborg et al. (2019). After the identification of stakeholders, I was provided with a team of a few individuals. These individuals were my main contacts throughout the planning process. I communicated to these individuals either through email or regular meetings. The information I provided was then communicated to other stakeholders either through the team or, when invited, by me at various meetings. The team members were important to the project and communication because they were able to provide information from other parts of the college I had not considered. Their insight helped me provide better information to the stakeholders. For the full stakeholder engagement plan, see Appendix G.

8. Risks

8.1 Mitigation and Contingency

Risk Description	Mitigation Plan (what to do to avoid the risk occurring)	Contingency Plan (what to do if the risk occurs)	Impact (what the impact will be to the project if the risk occurs)	Likelihood of occurrence (e.g., %, or high/medium/ low)
Faculty do not support project.	Work with small groups of faculty to provide context and information regarding mentoring. They could help provide information to other faculty members.	Try to determine the lack of support. Work to find root cause and solve that issue.	This could reduce the effectiveness of the project.	High
Student-Faculty meetings do not occur.	Require documentation of meetings so that there is accountability.	Gain support from leadership to promote the need to meet with students.	The mentor model will not work without meetings between faculty mentors and students.	High
Insufficient communication between faculty and staff	Layout specific guidelines on how to document communication with students.	Have meetings with faculty and staff members to determine how to improve communication.	The goal of the project could still be accomplished, but there would be a more positive impact on the student if successful communication occurs.	Medium
Administration does not support the program.	Keep communication open so that everyone knows what to expect.	Meet with leaders to determine what can be done to gain support.	If administrators do not support the project, then the project will not be implemented.	Medium

8.2 Constraints

The main constraint during the project was the use of Navigate for communication and scheduling meetings. Navigate is a fairly new system for my PO, so there was a bit of a learning curve. The bulk of the conversation around setting up meetings should be done in Navigate. The advantage is that the faculty mentor and the academic advisor will be able to write notes regarding a student, and the notes will be visible to the entire team. The idea is to be as transparent about the status of a student as possible. Since communication between the mentor, advisor, and student was a focus of the project, time was allocated to discussing and setting up the faculty mentoring functionality of Navigate. We made progress in developing

our part of Navigate; however, our main contact at the college moved to another organization. A new team has been assembled to focus on Navigate and its use in faculty mentoring.

9. Budget

Deliverables	People	Cost/Hour	Time (Hr)	Subtotal	Total
Arts & Sciences Faculty Role Document					$6,560
Project Manager - Development of document	1	$40	40	$1,600	
Student Success - Review of document	2	$30	8	$480	
Deans - Review of document	6	$60	8	$2,880	
Administration - Review of document	2	$100	8	$1,600	
Training Checklist					$3,520
Project Manager - Develop checklist	1	$40	16	$640	
Deans - Review/discussion of checklist	6	$60	8	$2,880	
Decision-Making Diagram					$4,000
Project Manager - Work with Student Success	1	$40	40	$1,600	
Student Success - Develop diagram	2	$30	40	$2,400	
Mentorship Definition					$8,340
Project Manager - Review of literature, definition	1	$40	120	$4,800	
Student Success - Review and feedback	3	$30	24	$2,160	
Deans - Review and discussion	6	$60	3	$1,080	
Administration - Review and discussion	1	$100	3	$300	
Forsyth Tech Advise Information					$2,680

Project Manager - Contribution to document	1	$40	40	$1,600	
Student Success - Review and feedback	3	$30	12	$1,080	
Project Total					$25,100

10. Analysis and Recommendations

My focus of this project was to recommend a new faculty advising model with an emphasis on mentoring students. I began by looking for a workable definition of mentorship. Based on a review of the literature (Campbell & Campbell, 1997; Crisp & Cruz, 2009; Holba, 2012; Long et al., 2010), I developed the following definition of mentorship:

> Mentoring is the support and care of the entire student by a faculty member. The faculty member should support the student by discussing academic progress, possible career/transfer opportunities, and holistic support needed by the student to successfully navigate the college setting.

This definition is recommended for use in the new advising redesign. I developed the new definition by reviewing the literature related to mentorship within higher education (Campbell & Campbell, 1997; Crisp & Cruz, 2009; Holba, 2012; Long et al., 2010). For the full literature review and list of relevant literature, please see Appendix B. The survey results from faculty gave similar definitions of mentoring as the literature review. It seems that the above definition will work best for providing a common, useable framework for the new advising model. See Appendix H for the survey.

The next focus in the literature review was student academic performance with and without a mentor. There seems to be a consensus in the literature that students perform better academically when paired with a faculty mentor (see Appendix B; Campbell & Campbell, 1997; Hoffman & Wallach, 2005; Livingston, 2018; Salinitri, 2005).

The mentorship programs I found in the literature tend to be focused on a specific subset of students and the number of students per faculty member is usually fairly small (see Appendix B; Campbell & Campbell, 1997; Hoffman & Wallach, 2005; Livingston, 2018; Salinitri, 2005). This seems to align with the free response questions I sent to the faculty to gauge their views on mentorship (see Appendix H). Since mentoring will take more time and effort than academic advising, the faculty surveyed responded that fewer students would need to be assigned to each faculty member so mentoring could be effective (see Appendix H).

Professional Recommendation 1. Mentoring should be focused, and there should be a small number of students assigned to faculty (Campbell & Campbell, 1997; Livingston, 2018; Salinitri, 2005). Mentoring should be used to help students adjust to college and become prepared for transfer or careers. Most of the literature on faculty-to-student mentorship focused on a specific group of students, such as students from a particular socioeconomic background, those with limited experience with college life, and those within a particular academic discipline (see Appendix B; Campbell & Campbell, 1997; Hoffman & Wallach,

2005; Livingston, 2018; Salinitri, 2005). Also, most studies on mentorship assigned small numbers of students to each faculty member participating in the program (Campbell & Campbell, 1997; Livingston, 2018). Faculty in the Campbell and Campbell (1997) study mentored between one and four students, while the Livingston (2018) study focused on a single department within a university. In the cases I have read (Campbell & Campbell, 1997; Livingston, 2018), each faculty mentor had a small number of students to mentor. The studies (Campbell & Campbell, 1997; Livingston, 2018) focused on students at universities. Since I am focused on developing a mentorship program at a community college and, according to Crisp (2010), community college students experience different challenges than those at universities, the number of mentees assigned to each faculty member should be adjusted. I suggest 15 students be the maximum number of mentees for each faculty member. Because community colleges are inherently different from 4-year institutions and community college students face different challenges from their university counterparts (Crisp, 2010), I expect not all 15 students would attend mentoring sessions.

Professional Recommendation 2. The current advising model has faculty meeting with their advisees twice per year: once in October to discuss classes and register for the spring semester and once in March to discuss classes and register for summer and fall semesters. My proposal is to change the number of official meetings per year to three instead of two. Because one of the main goals here is to build relationships with students, an additional meeting is required to meet and get to know each other. Campbell and Campbell (1997) did not place a requirement on the number of meetings between faculty and students; however, since community college students can face challenges not seen by traditional university students (Crisp, 2010), I decided to recommend required meetings. This would provide students with a schedule, and it would not significantly change what the faculty are accustomed to doing each semester. This meeting should occur a little earlier in the academic year than our current first meeting with students; therefore, this first meeting should occur by the end of September. After introductions and a discussion around the areas for support of the student, the next meeting should be scheduled for the first half of November. This meeting should focus on one of the three areas listed in the working definition of mentoring that was described earlier. The focus should be on the student's needs. The last meeting should occur sometime in the first half of March. Ideally, once a student has a mentor, the student will work with the same mentor throughout their studies at the college unless they change to a program drastically different from their mentor's specialty. This aligns with the mentorship model at East Tennessee State University described by Livingston (2018). My goal is that a meaningful relationship between the student and mentor can lead to meetings outside of the three official meetings so further academic development can occur. Thus, I am integrating the unstructured mentorship model described by Campbell and Campbell with the challenges experienced by community college students (Crisp, 2010) and providing stability so the student always has the same mentor (Livingston, 2018).

Professional Recommendation 3. Document official and unofficial meetings in the college-approved system. I have focused on the faculty mentoring part of the advising redesign at the college, but other areas are changing as well. Once the teams are in place, students should have an advisor and mentor. This team will need to be in communication to ensure the student's needs are being met; therefore, documentation of mentoring meetings should be

kept transparent so those on the advising team (advisor and mentor) know what has been discussed and what help or support the student needs. From the mentoring side, the focus will be on academic support, transfer/career support, and/or holistic support (i.e., transportation, school supplies, etc.). Campbell and Campbell (1997) had each faculty mentor keep notes on mentorship meetings. Ssemata et al. (2017) discussed one barrier to mentorship was the lack of documentation. The transparency will allow for quick communication within the advising team.

11. Reflection

11.1 Professional Learning

Over the course of this project, I have gained many professional experiences and skills I did not have prior to the project. It has become clear how important communication is during a project. While I understood this prior to this project, I have seen that while managing a project within an organization, timely and abundant communication is key. There have been times when I thought everything was clear but then realized that not everyone understood what I was trying to do. In those cases, abundant, clear, and concise communication was needed to clear misunderstandings.

Allowing everyone to be heard is also important. People at different positions within an organization have varying perspectives and can provide useful insight when working on a new procedure. As leaders, we need to understand that while we may know the big picture of where the organization is going, others have important information regarding what is and is not feasible to implement. We must not think we have all the answers, and we should be willing to admit when we are unsure of something.

The importance of mixed methods research has become apparent. Prior to this project, I had only used quantitative methods. Having gone through this process has allowed me to see the importance of qualitative data. Qualitative data has the ability to provide insight that quantitative data alone cannot. Qualitative data, such as survey responses, can provide information about a hypothesis that cannot be described using only quantitative analysis.

It is always important to develop future leaders. This is a concept I had not considered prior to this program. We need to act as mentors to others so we are preparing people for advancement and leadership. Creating a succession plan is important for the sustainability of an organization.

11.2 Personal Development

This program has taught me the importance of emotional intelligence. Prior to the program, my focus was solely on technical ability. I considered soft skills to be less important than hard skills. I developed an understanding that leadership is highly interpersonal. It is important to be able to read a room and understand the mood of those with whom we interact. Developing emotional intelligence allowed me to learn about myself so I could be a more effective leader.

I have learned that it is fine to not know all the answers. I understand now that that is why it is important to hire well-qualified, competent individuals. Hiring individuals who have varying strengths creates a robust team so no one individual needs to know everything. It is important to know everything related to a particular industry, so hiring those who complement each other's strengths builds a strong team that will be able to solve most problems.

I have also learned the importance of reading often and including a wide range of disciplines. Prior to the program, I focused most of my reading on my academic discipline. I did not understand the importance of reading a wide variety of subjects. What I have learned is that reading widely allows for connections to be made between topics that may not have been conceptualized otherwise. The books and articles we have read in this program have given me an understanding of and interest in reading about a variety of topics.

Appendix A

Consultancy Project Charter

1. General Project Information			
Project Title:	**Restructuring the Role of Faculty in the Advising Process at a Community College**		
Project Host(s):	**Masonne Sawyer**		
Project Sponsor (GWU):	**Dr. Jeffrey Hamilton**		
Project Manager:	Wayne Mabe	Date: 06/24/2020	
Project Description	There is a need to restructure the advising process at Forsyth Technical Community College. This project will focus specifically on the role academic division faculty (Math, Science, and Technology; Humanities and Social Sciences) in the new advising model. The goal is for faculty to act more as mentors than a traditional academic advisor. Developing what will be needed from faculty to achieve this is the goal of this project.		

2. Project Participants and Roles (add or delete lines as needed)				
	Name	Role	Telephone	E-mail
Project Manager:	Wayne Mabe	Project Manager		
Team Members:	Masonne Sawyer	Functional Manager		
	Katina Barksdale	Core Team Member (HSS)		
	Ping Liang	Core Team Member (HSS)		
	Jennifer Bryant	Core Team Member (MST)		
	Shelton Charles	Core Team Member (MST)		
	Andrea Doub	Core Team Member (MST)		
	Heather Azzu	Subject Matter Expert		
	Carrie Blaskowski	Subject Matter Expert		
	Kesa Jessup	Subject Matter Expert		
	Jessica Long	Subject Matter Expert		
	Martha Todd	Subject Matter Expert		
	Stacy Waters-Bailey	Subject Matter Expert		
	Victoria Burgos	Subject Matter Expert		

3. Stakeholders *(e.g., those with a significant interest in or who will be significantly affected by this project)*
Forsyth Technical Community College

Faculty and staff of the Math, Science, and Technology Division (MST) and the Humanities and Social Sciences Division (HSS)
Incoming students to the college
Student Success Center and Recruiting & Enrollment Department
Enrollment Services

4. Project Purpose Statement

Project Purpose *Describe the need this project addresses*

The MST and HSS Divisions have a unique challenge in advising students because students in those divisiosn have a wide array of goals and aspirations. Since faculty in the two divisions come from a wide variety of backgrounds, it will be beneficial to have them work in a mentor role with students. This project aims to define what that means and the responsibilities the faculty will have in that capacity.

Resources *Describe the resources made available by the project host for this project*

The host has allowed me to work with the Student Success Services staff as a resource regarding student advising. The project host has also invited me to advising redesign committee meetings. I have been invited to information meetings and given informative documents.

Project Deliverables *List the high-level "products" to be created (e.g., improved xxxx process, employee manual on yyyy)*

1. New role of faculty in the advising process
2. Determine how to assign students to faculty
3. Determine how Student Success Services staff will be paired with faculty to mentor and support students

Project Milestones *Project significant accomplishments anticipated over the life of the project with estimated timeline*

1. Provide a draft of faculty's new role in advising – December 1, 2020
2. Determine faculty's role and how students will be assigned to faculty – May 1, 2021
3. Students will be advised with the new model – October, 2021
4. Assess the results of the advising – December, 2021
5. Next group of students advised using the new model – March, 2022
6. Assess the results of the advising – May 1, 2022
7. Final report, presentation, and closing of project – July, 2022

Project SMART Objectives *Include 3 to 5*

1. Increase the interaction between students and faculty and staff during advising periods
2. Increase the percentage of students being mentored by faculty during advising periods
3. Facilitate collaboration between faculty, Student Success Services and Recruiting and Enrollment staff

Major Known Risks (including significant Assumptions) *Identify obstacles that may cause the project to fail.*

Risk	Risk Rating (High, Med, Lo)
Buy-in among those impacted by the changed process.	Med.
Efficient coordination among the various departments involved in the process change.	Low
Communication among all departments involved.	Med.

Constraints *List any conditions that may limit the project team's options with respect to resources, personnel, or schedule (e.g., predetermined budget or project end date, limit on number of staff that may be assigned to the project).*

Time constraints around milestones. Time available to fully develop and implement the project.

External Dependencies *Will project success depend on coordination of efforts between the project team and one or more other individuals or groups? Has everyone involved agreed to this interaction?*

5. Communication Strategy *(specify how the project manager will communicate to the Host, Sponsor, Project Team members and Stakeholders, e.g., frequency of status reports, frequency of Project Team meetings, etc.*

Communication will be done via email and phone. Three status reports per year will be provided to the project sponsor (May 1, July 15, and December 1). This can also be provided to the project host. Communication among the entire team will be done by committee meetings.

6. Sign-off

	Name	Signature	Date (MM/DD/YYYY)
Project Host	Masonne M. Sawyer	Masonne M. Sawyer	06/24/2020
Project Sponsor			
Project Manager	M. Wayne Mabe	M. Wayne Mabe	06/29/2020

7. Notes

Appendix B

Professional Literature Review

Forsyth Technical Community College is currently redesigning the advising model of faculty. The focus of my project is to define the role of the arts and sciences (formerly math, science, and technologies, and humanities and social sciences) faculty in this new model. The goal of this redesign is for faculty to serve as mentors instead of advisors. There are several divisions that make up the college, but only one houses all the college transfer programs: the Division of Arts and Sciences. All other divisions have specific diploma, certificate, and associate degree programs; therefore, they already have a set way to advise/mentor students. There is a unique challenge in developing a model that will sufficiently meet the needs of the diverse departments within the Division of Arts and Sciences. Through the literature review, I wanted to answer the following questions: What is the definition of mentoring within higher education settings? Are there currently programs focused on mentoring undergraduates? What are best practices regarding mentoring undergraduates within community colleges?

Thirty-two articles were reviewed during this study. The literature search was focused on higher education and community college advising and mentoring. Once I was able to find a few articles that were somewhat related to my topic, I was able to use those and the references to expand my literature search. As I reviewed the literature, themes in the literature became apparent. First, several articles discussed the definition of mentor (Campbell & Campbell, 1997; Crisp & Cruz, 2009; Holba, 2012; Long et al., 2010). While this seems straightforward on its surface, there are several varying definitions for the word mentor (Crisp & Cruz, 2009). I also found a theme regarding student performance in higher education related to mentoring (Campbell & Campbell, 1997; Crisp, 2010; Hoffman & Wallach, 2005; Livingston, 2018;

Salinitri, 2005). Lastly, the mentoring literature discusses some specific instances of mentoring programs in higher education (Campbell & Campbell, 1997; Hoffman & Wallach, 2005; Livingston, 2018; McArthur, 2005; Salinitri, 2005; Ssemata et al., 2017); in other articles, the focus is on general recommendations (Crisp, 2010; DeAngelo et al., 2016; Pope, 2002).

Theme 1: Definition of Mentor

One of the problems in defining mentor is that there are various definitions and uses of the word (Crisp & Cruz, 2009; Holba, 2012; Long et al., 2010). The definition of mentor has included a more-experienced individual providing support to a less-experienced individual (Campbell & Campbell, 1997), as those who take "care of the entire person" (Long et al., 2010, p. 12), and as one who "teaches moral actions, guides another less-experienced individual" (Holba, 2012, p. 2). These definitions, while similar, can create difficulty when trying to develop a mentoring program. Defining the term mentor is important for the development of a faculty mentor program. For the program to work, we need a functional definition that is common across the college to avoid ambiguity.

Theme 2: Mentoring Effects on Student Performance

Mentoring has been shown to improve student performance at the university level (Campbell & Campbell, 1997; Salinitri, 2005). In these studies, incoming students were assigned to a control group (no mentoring) and an experimental group (mentoring; Campbell & Campbell, 1997; Salinitri, 2005). Livingston (2018) showed that introducing a mentoring program in the Digital Media Department at East Tennessee State University had a positive impact on student portfolios at the end of the program. Crisp (2010) discussed the difficulties community college students have. Community college students have some challenges not faced by university students because they are not residential students, usually have outside jobs and obligations, and

are sometimes unable to participate in extracurricular activities on campus (Crisp, 2010). Another study by Hoffman and Wallach (2005) focused on mentoring effects on community college students. In this study, there was an effort to engage students in an out-of-class gardening program (Hoffman & Wallach, 2005). The authors found that this mentoring program positively affected student self-esteem and academic performance (Hoffman & Wallach, 2005).

Theme 3: Mentoring Programs

While I was able to find research related to mentoring community college students (Crisp, 2010; Hoffman & Wallach, 2005; McArthur, 2005; Pope, 2002), most of the research I found focused on how mentoring affects university or 4-year college students (Campbell & Campbell, 1997; DeAngelo et al., 2016; Livingston, 2018; Long et al., 2010; Salinitri, 2005; Santos & Reigadas, 2005; Ssemata et al., 2017). Although most of these studies focus on university students, the information can be modified for community college students. When discussing mentorship, some studies describe what mentoring is, but they do not necessarily go into specific recommendations for a mentoring program within the organization (Crisp, 2010; DeAngelo et al., 2016; Pope, 2002). Some studies focused on specific mentoring processes, but they were specific to a program or institution (Campbell & Campbell, 1997; Hoffman & Wallach, 2005; Livingston, 2018; McArthur, 2005; Salinitri, 2005; Ssemata et al., 2017). Because there are both general recommendations and specific processes within institutions, I am able to utilize this information to form a program that will work within my community college.

From this literature review, we can see that it is important to define the term mentor for a particular institution based on the various definitions already present (Campbell & Campbell, 1997; Crisp & Cruz, 2009; Holba, 2012; Long et al., 2010); therefore, a functional definition of mentor will be constructed for the community college with which I am working. Mentoring,

defined by various studies slightly differently, has been shown to have positive effects on student persistence, retention, and academic performance within community colleges and universities (Campbell & Campbell, 1997; Hoffman & Wallach, 2005; Livingston, 2018; Salinitri, 2005). While some research focuses on specific mentoring programs that affect students (Campbell & Campbell, 1997; Hoffman & Wallach, 2005; Livingston, 2018; McArthur, 2005; Salinitri, 2005; Ssemata et al., 2017), other studies seem to give general recommendations for mentoring (Crisp, 2010; DeAngelo et al., 2016; Pope, 2002). Due to the methodology used in previous studies related to mentorship, generalizability to other institutions will be difficult (Crisp & Cruz, 2009); therefore, it will be important to look at the information available, followed by the formulation of a mentoring program that will work at my institution.

There were three questions of importance within this professional literature review. First, what is the definition of mentoring within higher education settings? Second, are there currently programs focused on mentoring undergraduates? Third, what are best practices regarding mentoring undergraduates within community colleges? The first question was answered, although not specifically. A literature review by Crisp and Cruz (2009) showed that there were over 50 definitions of the term mentor. Because this gives a broad starting point when working through a definition of mentor, it is daunting to narrow the definition down to one useable definition. My second question was answered. There have been several studies looking at the effects of mentorship programs on undergraduate students (Campbell & Campbell, 1997; Crisp, 2010; Hoffman & Wallach, 2005; Livingston, 2018; Long et al., 2010; Salinitri, 2005; Santos & Reigadas, 2005). While not all the studies will be useful directly in my study, the information provided is important in developing a mentorship program. I was not able to get a clear and concise answer to my third question. While I did find studies related to mentoring community

college students (Crisp, 2010; Hoffman & Wallach, 2005; Pope, 2002), they did not provide specific information to develop a mentorship program. The information obtained from this literature review will help in developing a mentorship program at a community college. The development of a working definition of mentor and the programs in place at other institutions should provide enough information for the successful implementation of a mentorship program.

Appendix C

Qualitative Data Analysis Project

Wayne Mabe

School of Education, Gardner-Webb University

DEOL 738-CZ: Research, Program Evaluation, Data Analysis, and Qualitative Methods

Dr. Dale Lamb

April 24, 2021

My consultancy project is focused on redesigning the faculty advising model at a community college. To understand faculty's current views on advising, I plan on sending an online interview questionnaire to faculty prior to work on the execution phase of this project.

There are various interview types that can be used in qualitative research (Merriam & Tisdell, 2016). Interviews can be categorized based on the amount of structure they have, by their philosophical viewpoints, and by mode of delivery (Merriam & Tisdell, 2016). Below I will discuss the strengths and weaknesses of the various types of interviews, and I will describe the type of interview that will be used in this study and justifications.

There are a few different types of interviews based on the amount of structure present. There are structured interviews, where the questions are specific and asked in a particular order (Merriam & Tisdell, 2016). There are also semi-structured interviews that allow for a bit more flexibility than the structured interview, but there is still some structure related to the questions (Merriam & Tisdell, 2016). Lastly, there are unstructured interviews, where there might not be a specified list of questions to be asked, there is no order to when questions are asked, and the questions allow for open-ended responses (Merriam & Tisdell, 2016). Each of these interview types has strengths and weaknesses. According to Merriam and Tisdell (2016), structured interviews have the advantage of providing specific information, because questions are developed and ordered ahead of time. This type of interview can prevent the interviewer from gaining some understanding of the problem because the respondents may not provide information not considered by the interviewer (Merriam & Tisdell, 2016). This could lead to the interviewer concluding that their preconceived notions were correct (Merriam &Tisdell, 2016). Semi-structured interviews can help with gaining more useful information (Merriam & Tisdell, 2016). Since semi-structured interviews are more flexible in their approach, researchers can gain

valuable information from the interviewees (Merriam & Tisdell, 2016). Because of the mix of more and less structured questions, the researcher can gain the information they need for the study while allowing for elaboration from the interviewee (Merriam & Tisdell, 2016). Unstructured interviews are useful for gaining a variety of data, but it may not provide enough specificity to be useful to a particular study (Merriam & Tisdell, 2016). So, according to Merriam and Tisdell, these types of interviews tend to be used for exploratory studies, where the researcher does not have much information.

Interviews can be conducted both in-person and virtually, and with advances in technology, it is becoming easier and more common for researchers to conduct online interviews (Hawkins, 2018; Merriam & Tisdell, 2016; Opdenakker, 2006). As with any other type of interview, there are advantages and disadvantages to online interviews. According to Royse et al. (2016), the amount of time needed for an online interview is an advantage. Time can be a major roadblock regarding face-to-face interviews but conducting interviews online can save time for both the researcher and the interviewee (Royse et al., 2016). Also, there are advantages regarding geography (Hawkins, 2018; Merriam & Tisdell, 2016). This can save resources because travel expenses can be reduced and the research can potentially interview people from a wider geographic area (Hawkins, 2018; Merriam & Tisdell, 2016). Also, interviewees may be able to express themselves to a greater extent using asynchronous interviews because asynchronous techniques allow individuals time to process information and discuss it in more detail (Schiek & Ullrich, 2017). Unfortunately, there are some disadvantages with asynchronous interviewing techniques. Because questions are being asked and answers given at different times, it impossible to pick up on social cues and nonverbal communication (Hawkins, 2018; Merriam & Tisdell, 2016; Opdenakker, 2006). The researcher could also face issues with maintaining confidentiality,

dealing with technology malfunctions, and providing efficient training so everyone can use the technology (Merriam & Tisdell, 2016).

For my study, I plan to use an online, semi-structured interview to gain insight into faculty's views on advising. Since there are still several faculty members working offsite, and there will be fewer faculty present in the summer, I believe this will be the most efficient way to collect the information I need.

To understand faculty's views on advising, I have constructed five open-ended interview questions. As discussed above, they will be administered online since many faculty are currently working off-site and we are close to the summer semester, when more faculty will be off campus. I worked on developing these questions by using Merriam and Tisdell (2016) and Royse et al. (2016) as guides when writing these questions. Below are the interview questions.

- What are your views regarding the current advising model?
- Is the number of advisees per faculty advisor too high, too low, or about right? Why?
- Would it be possible to mentor the same number of students that you currently advise? Why?
- Should faculty spend more of their time mentoring students, to prepare them for work and university, or should they work more toward course planning and registration?
- In a mentoring role, how should students be assigned to a faculty member? Why?

As mentioned above, I will administer this interview online to capture the responses of as many faculty members as possible. Since the goal of this project is to develop a faculty-student mentorship program, and move away from the traditional idea of advising, I want to understand the faculty's feelings toward the current model so that I can understand their perspectives to better explain the purpose of this transition.

References

Hawkins, J. E. (2018). The practical utility and suitability of email interviews in qualitative research. *The Qualitative Report, 23*(2).

Merriam, S. B., & Tisdell, E. J. (2016). *Qualitative research: A guide to design and implementation*. John Wiley & Sons.

Opdenakker, R. (2006, September). Advantages and disadvantages of four interview techniques in qualitative research. In *Forum qualitative sozialforschung/forum: Qualitative social research, 7*(4).

Royse, D., Thyer, B. A., & Padgett, D. K. (2016). *Program evaluation: An introduction to an evidence-based approach*. Cengage Learning.

Schiek, D., & Ullrich, C. G. (2017). Using asynchronous written online communications for qualitative inquiries: A research note. *Qualitative Research, 17*(5), 589-597.

Appendix D

Quantitative Data Analysis Project

Wayne Mabe

School of Education, Gardner-Webb University

DEOL 738-CZ: Research, Program Evaluation, Data Analysis, and Qualitative Methods

Dr. Dale Lamb

April 24, 2021

I will be working with a community college on redesigning the college's advising model. For the quantitative part of this project, I will send out surveys asking faculty about their views on advising. I will ask questions about their views on the current model of advising and on aspects of the new model. The survey will use a four-point Likert scale for evaluation.

I chose to use surveys in this study because I want to gauge what faculty's views on advising are currently. I will also be gauging what Faculty's views on mentoring are and how they feel about moving to a mentoring role with students.

To develop a survey for this study, I will use Royse et al. (2016) to develop good questions. As mentioned earlier I plan to use a four-point Likert scale to avoid ambiguity in analyzing the data. I will use chi-square (goodness of fit test) analyze results from the survey because the data obtained from this survey is categorical and nonparametric (Davenport & Kim, 2013; Salkind, 2017). Chi-square analysis is well understood in analyzing nonparametric data because it is one of the most commonly used statistical tools when analyzing categorical data (Salkind, 2017). Chi-square tests were developed by Karl Pearson in 1900 (Franke et al., 2011). Pearson developed different chi-square analyses that use the same formula but differ in their assumptions regarding the data (Franke et al., 2011).

A survey will be used for the quantitative part of data collection because I want to determine faculty at the community college feel about the current advising model. Surveys have the benefit of being easy to implement but developing survey questions needs to be done with care (Davenport & Kim, 2013). Surveys are commonly used in action research to compliment interviews (Merriam & Tisdell, 2016). In mixed methods research, we are trying to utilize both qualitative and quantitative data. By doing this we not only get data related to how strongly individuals feel about a topic (quantitative), but we also get why people feel the way they do

(qualitative; Merriam & Tisdell, 2016). Disadvantages of doing surveys (collecting quantitative data) are that we do not collect data on why individuals view things the way they do (Royse et al., 2016). However, quantitative data does a good job of telling us if a program has been successful, but it does not tell us why the program was successful (Royse et al., 2016).

To analyze statistically faculty's views on advising, I will administer a survey. The survey will be multiple-choice on a four-point Likert scale. The results will be analyzed using chi-square goodness of fit. I am not comparing two different variables with chi-square so I will not be using chi-square test for independence (Franke et al., 2011). Below are the survey questions.

- The current advising model is good as is and does not need to be changed.
- Faculty advising should focus primarily on course planning and registration.
- Faculty advising should focus primarily on mentoring students and planning for careers and transfer to a university.
- Students should be assigned to faculty by faculty's area of expertise and cognate areas.
- Course planning and registration should be primarily the responsibility of advisors.
- Overall, the current advising model has worked well and does not need revising.
- I would like to see more emphasis placed on developing students for life beyond the college.
- I can effectively advise 30-60 students.
- I can effectively advise 60-110 students.
- As a faculty advisor I make meaningful connections with advisees.
- I advise most advisees virtually (phone call, email, online, etc.).

This data followed by the interview questions should give me insight into the current views of advising by faculty. I hope to use this data to supplement my literature review to ensure that the development of the new model is done using best practices.

References

Davenport, T. H., & Kim, J. (2013). *Keeping up with the quants: Your guide to understanding and using analytics*. Harvard Business Review Press.

Franke, T. M., Ho, T., & Christie, C. A. (2011). The chi-square test: Often used and more often misinterpreted. *American Journal of Evaluation, 33*(3), 448-458.

Merriam, S. B., & Tisdell, E. J. (2016). *Qualitative research: A guide to design and implementation*. John Wiley & Sons.

Royse, D., Thyer, B. A., & Padgett, D. K. (2016). *Program evaluation: An introduction to an evidence-based approach*. Cengage Learning.

Salkind, N. J. (2017). *Statistics people who think they hate statistics using Microsoft Excel 2016.* Sage Publications.

Appendix E

Outline of the Slides Shared with Leadership

- Mentoring Literature
    - Students are assigned to mentor based on department
    - Mentors recorded meetings by writing logs
    - Mentors served students by:
        - Providing academic and career support
        - Providing college-related support
        - Acting as a role-model
- Definition of Mentoring
    - Mentoring is the support and care of the entire student by a faculty member. The faculty member should support the student by **discussing academic progress,** possible **career/transfer opportunities**, and **holistic support needed** by the student to successfully navigate the college setting.
- Faculty Role
    - Faculty should focus on student's goals, and the best way to achieve them.
    - First Meeting – This should focus on getting to know the student.
    - Second Meeting – This will vary depending on the student's needs. Could include support on coursework, career/transfer, non-academic college-related issues.
    - Third and subsequent meetings – The topics of those meetings will relate to student needs.
- Timeline Draft
    - First Meeting – End of Sep/first of Oct
    - Second Meeting – First to mid-Nov
    - Third Meeting – First to mid-Mar
    - Additional meetings can be requested.
- What Faculty Need
    - An understanding of what is required of them. How will meetings be recorded, if at all?
    - List of students the faculty will be mentoring.
    - List of support programs and contacts on campus.

Appendix F

Communications Plan

Stakeholder	Information Needed	Why Needed	When will they get it	How will they get it
College Administration	*An understanding of the general project progression.*	*So they will know when full implementation of the model will occur.*	*Three times this academic year. Once in the fall and twice in the spring.*	*Emailed report and/or meetings.*
Divisional Leadership (Deans)	*Progression of the project. Are milestones being met?*	*To understand if the project is going well. They need to understand how this new advising model is affecting faculty.*	*Monthly (three times per semester)*	*Emailed summaries. Meetings if needed.*
Arts and Sciences Faculty	*How the project will change their role in advising. Timeline of when the project will be implemented.*	*So they are aware of the changes to their advising role and can be prepared. To avoid miscommunication and worry.*	*Monthly (three times per semester)*	*Emails or meetings.*
Student Success Staff	*How the new faculty advising role will affect Student Success.*	*The Student Success Staff will be communicating with faculty, so there needs to be an understanding of what is expected of faculty and where the staff fit into the redesign.*	*Once per semester.*	*Emails and meetings if necessary.*
Students	*A list of their advising team.*	*Students need to know who to contact for advising and mentoring to be successful.*	*When they are admitted to the college or if their advising team is changed.*	*Official communication from Student Success.*

Appendix G

Stakeholder Engagement Plan

Stakeholder engagement plan – Restructuring the Role of Faculty in the Advising Process at a Community College

Project	**Restructuring the Role of Faculty in the Advising Process at a Community College**
Project Manager	**Wayne Mabe**
Organization	**Forsyth Technical Community College**
Date	**July 23, 2021**

1 – Introduction

Project overview

Background

There is a need to restructure the advising process at Forsyth Technical Community College. This project will focus specifically on the role academic division faculty (Math, Science, and Technology; Humanities and Social Sciences) in the new advising model. The goal is for faculty to act more as mentors than a traditional academic advisor. Developing what will be needed from faculty to achieve this is the goal of this project.

Goals

- Online faculty survey gauging views on mentoring students. Percent of returned surveys will be tracked.
- Define the new role of faculty as mentors by providing a detailed document explaining the expectations of faculty.
- Define the process for assigning students to faculty. An outline discussing the items to consider when assigning students will be generated.
- Training faculty in new role. A training document and live training sessions will be implemented.

Milestones

- Mentor definition
- Faculty role document
- Student assignment document
- Updated FT Advise document
- Faculty training document

Risks

- Faculty support of program
- Occurance of student-faculty meetings
- Communicaton between faculty and staff
- Administration support of program

2 – Requirements

Summarize any organization-specific requirements relevant to stakeholder engagement.

N/A

3 – Summary of previous stakeholder engagement activities relevant to this project

Date	Attendees	Attendees' Role	Location	Topic/Discussion
1/9/2020	Masonne Sawyer	Project Host	RLS 2414	Introductions, brainstorming, general project topics.
6/26/2020	Kesa Jessup	Stakeholder	Online	Discussed online advisee management system
7/10/2020	Kesa Jessup	Stakeholder	Online	Discussed online advisee management system
7/17/2020	Kesa Jessup	Stakeholder	Online	Discussed online advisee management system
9/17/2020	Kesa Jessup	Stakeholder	Online	Discussed online advisee management system
10/2/2020	Kesa Jessup	Stakeholder	Online	Discussed online advisee management system
2/23/2021	Kesa Jessup	Stakeholder	Online	Discussion about what advising redesign will look like.
3/9/2021	Kesa Jessup	Stakeholder	Online	Updated stakeholders on project progression.
3/23/2021	Kesa Jessup	Stakeholder	Online	Updated stakeholders on project progression.
3/30/2021	Kesa Jessup	Stakeholder	Online	Workshop on the use of the advisee management system.
4/20/2021	Kesa Jessup	Stakeholder	Online	Updated stakeholders on project progression.
6/4/2021	Masonne Sawyer	Project Host	Online	GWU check-in.
6/29/2021	Kesa Jessup	Stakeholder	Online	Updated stakeholders on project progression.
7/9/2021	Kesa Jessup	Stakeholder	Online	Updated stakeholders on project progression.
7/15/2021	Deans	Stakeholder	RLS Conference Room	Presented current plan for shifting faculty from advising to mentoring.

	4 – **Project stakeholders** *continued*

Stakeholder	Stakeholder key contact/s	Level of interest (low>medium> high)	Ability to impact (low>medium> high)	What we want from stakeholder	What stakeholder wants from us	Conflicts of interest	Relationship owner(s)	Organisational cross-over with stakeholder
College Administration	Dr. Jacob Surratt	High	High	Feedback, Communication between project team and executive leadership.	Details of project execution. How will this be implemented?	N/A	Dr. Jacob Surratt	Stakeholder is internal.
Divisional Leadership (Deans)	Dr. Torry Reynolds	High	Medium	Feedback on if the plan will work in their division.	Transparency and details regarding requirements.	N/A	Dr. Torry Reynolds	Stakeholder is internal.
Arts and Sciences Faculty	Dr. Torry Reynolds	High	Low	We want to hear about questions and concerns to address.	An understanding of how this new process will affect their work.	N/A	Dr. Torry Reynolds	Stakeholder is internal.
Student Success Staff	Kesa Jessup	High	Low	We need to know what systems they have in place for communicating with faculty.	An understanding of the division of labor between faculty and staff.	N/A	Kesa Jessup	Stakeholder is internal.
Students	Kesa Jessup	Low	Low	Feedback after the first meeting to see how the new model is working.	Easy to find who their mentor is. Information about who they should contact for various questions.	N/A	Student Success Center	Students will interact directly with the college.

5 – Stakeholder engagement activity timetable

Stakeholder	Engagement purpose	Engagement technique	Engagement frequency	Date(s) and location	Activity owner	Activity progress
College Administration	Updates and feedback	Group meetings	Once per semester	December 2021; TBD May 2022; TBD	Masonne Sawyer	N/A
Divisional Leadership (Deans)	Updates and feedback	Group meetings	Once per semester	December 2021; TBD May 2022; TBD	Torry Reynolds	N/A
Arts and Sciences Faculty	Check-in on progress	Group meetings, emails, or surveys	Two to three times per semester	September, October, and November 2021; TBD January and April 2022; TBD	TBD	N/A
Student Success Staff	Check-in on progress	Group meetings, emails, or surveys	twice per semester	September and November 2021; TBD January and April 2022; TBD	Kesa Jessup	N/A
Students	Feedback	Surveys	Once per semester	December 2021; TBD May 2022; TBD	Kesa Jessup	N/A

6 – Monitoring and reporting

Date	Staff member	Stakeholder name	Organisation	Engagement activity summary and issues raised	Follow-up actions	Action status
February and May 2022	Masonne Sawyer	College Administration	Forsyth Technical Community College	Will review previous discussions and describe how feedback was	N/A	N/A

				implemented into the project.		
February and May 2022	Torry Reynolds	Divisional Leadership (Deans)	Forsyth Technical Community College	Meetings to determine if the group has been kept up to date regarding the project.	N/A	N/A
May 2022	TBD	Arts and Sciences Faculty	Forsyth Technical Community College	Survey to gauge the faculty's perspective on level of engagement.	N/A	N/A
May 2022	Kesa Jessup	Student Success Staff	Forsyth Technical Community College	Survey to gauge the staff's views on engagement during the project.	N/A	N/A

7 – Evaluation
In the fall semester of 2021, we will run a pilot of the proposed advising redesign. At the end of the fall semester (December 2021) I plan to send a survey to those involved in the pilot to understand what worked well and what could be improved. Also in the survey, I will be asking about the level of engagement the project team had with faculty and staff and if the level of engagement was sufficient. The data will be used to modify any procedures to have a more successful spring 2022 semester.

Appendix H

Survey Questions and Results

Four-Point Likert Scale Questions and Results

#	Field	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std Deviation	Variance	Count
1	Faculty advising should focus primarily on course planning and registration.	1.00	4.00	2.67	0.86	0.74	27
2	Faculty advising should focus primarily on mentoring students and planning for careers and transfer to a university.	1.00	4.00	3.04	0.88	0.78	27
3	Students should be assigned to faculty by faculty's area of expertise and cognate areas.	1.00	4.00	3.63	0.82	0.68	27
4	Course planning and registration should be primarily the responsibility of advisors (not faculty advisors).	1.00	4.00	3.15	1.01	1.02	27
5	I would like to see more emphasis placed on developing students for life beyond the college.	1.00	4.00	3.30	0.76	0.58	27
6	I can effectively advise 30-60 students.	1.00	4.00	1.70	0.81	0.65	27
7	I can effectively advise 60-110 students.	1.00	4.00	1.35	0.78	0.61	26
8	As a faculty advisor I make meaningful connections with advisees.	1.00	4.00	2.93	0.86	0.74	27
9	I advise most advisees virtually (phone call, email, online, etc.).	1.00	4.00	2.85	0.70	0.50	27
10	The current advising model is good as is and does not need to be changed.	1.00	4.00	2.22	0.83	0.69	27

Chi-Square Analysis – p=0.05

Question	**Strongly Disagree**	**Somewhat Disagree**	**Somewhat Agree**	**Strongly Agree**	**Total**	**Chi Square**	**Critical Value**	**p-value**	**Accept/Reject H_0**
Faculty advising should focus primarily on course planning and registration.	2	10	10	5	27	6.926	7.82	0.0743	Accept
Faculty advising should focus primarily on mentoring students and planning for careers and transfer to a university.	2	4	12	9	27	9.296	7.82	0.0256	Reject
Students should be assigned to faculty by faculty's area of expertise and cognate areas.	2	0	4	21	27	41.296	7.82	<0.00001	Reject
Course planning and registration should be primarily the responsibility of advisors (not faculty advisors).	3	3	8	13	27	10.185	7.82	0.01706	Reject
I would like to see more emphasis placed on developing	1	2	12	12	27	16.407	7.82	0.00094	Reject

students for life beyond the college.									
I can effectively advise 30-60 students.	13	10	3	1	27	14.333	7.82	0.00248	Reject
I can effectively advise 60-110 students.	21	2	2	1	26	43.231	7.82	<0.00001	Reject
As a faculty advisor I make meaningful connections with advisees.	2	5	13	7	27	9.593	7.82	0.02237	Reject
I advise most advisees virtually (phone call, email, online, etc.).	1	6	16	4	27	18.778	7.82	0.0003	Reject
The current advising model is good as is and does not need to be changed.	5	13	7	2	27	9.593	7.82	0.2237	Reject

Open-Ended Survey Questions

- In your opinion, what is mentorship?
- What are your views regarding the current advising model?
- Would it be possible to mentor the same number of students that you currently advise? Why?
- Should faculty spend more of their time mentoring students, to prepare them for work and university, or should they work more toward course planning and registration?
- In a mentoring role, how should students be assigned to a faculty member? Why?
- How do you engage advisees? Virtually, in-person? Explain.

Appendix I

CITI Completion Certificate

CITI PROGRAM

Completion Date 31-Dec-2020
Expiration Date 31-Dec-2023
Record ID 39513438

This is to certify that:

Michael Mabe

Has completed the following CITI Program course:

Not valid for renewal of certification through CME.

Graduate School of Education Research Investigators
(Curriculum Group)
Graduate School of Education Research Investigators
(Course Learner Group)
1 - Basic Course
(Stage)

Under requirements set by:

Gardner-Webb University

CITI
Collaborative Institutional Training Initiative

Verify at www.citiprogram.org/verify/?we6724cdf-f82d-4bb6-bbfc-f77c62e8ce0e-39513438

References

Bradberry, T., & Greaves, J. (2009). *Emotional intelligence 2.0*. TalentSmart.

Campbell, T. A., & Campbell, D. E. (1997). Faculty/student mentor program: Effects on academic performance and retention. *Research in Higher Education, 38*(6), 727-742.

Crisp, G. (2010). The impact of mentoring on the success of community college students. *Review of Higher Education, 34*(1), 39-60.

Crisp, G., & Cruz, I. (2009). Mentoring college students: Acritical review of the literature between 1990 and 2007. *Research in Higher Education, 50*(6), 525-545.

DeAngelo, L., Mason, J., & Winters, D. (2016). Faculty engagement in mentoring undergraduate students: How institutional environments regulate and promote extra-role behavior. *Innovative Higher Education, 41*(4), 317-332.

DuBrin, A. J. (2016). *Leadership: Research findings, practice, and skills*. Cengage Learning.

Hoffman, A. J., & Wallach, J. (2005). Effects of mentoring on community college students in transition to university. *The Community College Enterprise, 11*(1), 67-78.

Holba, A. M. (2012). From advising to mentoring: Shifting the metaphor. *The Mentor, 14*. https://doi.org/10.26209/mj1461318

Kloppenborg, T. J., Anantatmula, V., & Wells, K. N. (2019). *Contemporary project management.* Cengage.

Livingston, J. (2018). Faculty-student mentoring program in the Digital Media Department at East Tennessee State University. *International Journal of Arts & Sciences, 11*(1), 233-236.

Long, E. C. J., Fish, J., Kuhn, L., & Sowders, J. (2010). Mentoring undergraduates: Professors strategically guiding the next generation of professionals. *Michigan Family Review, 14*(1).

McArthur, R. C. (2005). Faculty-based advising: an important factor in community college retention. *Community College Review, 32*(4), 1-I.

Pope, M. L. (2002). Community college mentoring: Minority student perception. *Community College Review, 30*(3), 31-45.

Salinitri, G. (2005). The effects of formal mentoring on the retention rates for first-year, low achieving students. *Canadian Journal of Education, 28*(4), 853-873,924.

Santos, S. J., & Reigadas, E. T. (2005). Understanding the student-faculty mentoring process: Its effects on at-risk university students. *Journal of College Student Retention, 6*(3), 337-357.

Senge, P. M. (2006). *The fifth discipline the art and practice of the learning organization*. Random House.

Ssemata, A. S., Gladding, S., John, C. C., & Kiguli, S. (2017). Developing mentorship in a resource-limited context: A qualitative research study of the experiences and perceptions of the Makerere university student and faculty mentorship programme. *BMC Medical Education, 17*(1), 123.