

## TCNJ GOVERNANCE MEMORANDUM

To: Committee on Academic Programs  
From: Steering Committee  
Date: November 19, 2025  
Re: Student Advising Policy and Practices

**Background:** In Steering's review of the recent changes to the Student Advising Policy and Practices, several concerns about the existing policy were raised. While CAP & GSC successfully delivered a coherent single policy that aligned undergraduate and graduate advising policy and practices, the policy as a whole needs to be updated.

**Charge:** In keeping with the timeline outlined below, Steering asks CAP & GSC to review the recently accepted new Student Advising Policy and Practices to address the following concerns:

1. CAP should provide an updated definition of academic advising, as the current definition used is from 1987. If they choose to keep the current definition, they should provide a rationale in the final recommendation.
2. The current policy is heavy on procedure, with specific tasks assigned to a precise individual. One example is in III.D.c, where it states that "Within the first week of classes, departmental program assistants will send students a follow-up email indicating the name of their assigned advisor." CAP should update the policy to make those tasks the responsibility of the department more generally or other entities as appropriate so the policy requires less updating if job descriptions change.
3. This language does not align with the faculty contracts: "Departments should not assign new advisees prior to the first day of classes for a particular academic year, which is when the AFT contract commences for TCNJ faculty."
4. The policy should address advising that happens outside of academic departments, for example in EOF and Center for Student Success.
5. CAP should update the policy in any other ways that they deem appropriate.

If testimony is needed, the testimony tier and timeline are outlined below. In particular, at Step 2, CAP should consult with the Council of Deans, Academic Leaders, Center for Student Success, and other relevant stakeholders to approve the proposed changes.

### **Testimony Tier: Tier II**

- The issue requires moderate testimony from the campus community.
- The assigned council or committee should consult with relevant stakeholder individuals and groups in developing a preliminary recommendation.

The completed preliminary recommendation should then be made available to the relevant stakeholder groups, and testimony should be solicited in the form of written feedback (through a survey and or e-mail).

**Timeline:** CAP should make a Final Recommendation to Steering by **May 1, 2026**. If testimony is sought, in the submission of the final recommendation CAP should note the stakeholder groups, number of persons responding, and summary of testimony collected.

---

## **TCNJ Governance Processes**

### *Step 1—Steering issues a charge*

### *Step 2—Governance prepares a Preliminary Recommendation*

Once the appropriate standing committee or council has received the charge, it should start by collecting data needed to make a preliminary recommendation. It should receive input from affected individuals and all relevant stakeholder groups prior to making a preliminary recommendation. For issues that have broad implications or that affect a large number of individuals, initial testimony should be solicited from the campus community at large. For some issues, sufficient initial testimony may come from input through committee membership or solicitation from targeted constituent groups. When, in the best judgment of the committee, adequate clarity of the principles contributing to the problem are known, a preliminary recommendation should be drafted and disseminated to the campus community.

### *Step 3—The Relevant Stakeholders provide Testimony*

Once a preliminary recommendation has been completed, the standing committee or council should seek testimony from the campus community. The testimony should be gathered in accordance with the Testimony Tier (see below) assigned to the issue by Steering.

For issues that require public testimony from the campus community, the chair of the standing committee or council should approach the president of the appropriate representative bodies to schedule the next available time slot at a meeting of that body.

Testimony should be gathered in a way that allows stakeholders to weigh in fully on the issue. Members of the standing committee or council that wrote the preliminary recommendation should be present to hear and record the testimony.

### *Step 4—Governance prepares a Final Recommendation*

Once the standing committee or council has received appropriate testimony, it should revise the preliminary recommendation into a final recommendation. Once the final recommendation is complete, the standing committee or council should use sound judgment to determine whether or not more public testimony is required. If, in its feedback to the original preliminary recommendation, a stakeholder representative body requests to review an issue again, the committee or council is bound to bring it back to that body. If a full calendar year has passed since the formal announcement of the preliminary recommendation, the committee must re-submit a preliminary recommendation to the campus community. When the committee or council has completed the final recommendation, it should forward it to the Steering Committee. The final recommendation should be accompanied by a cover memo that summarizes the initial charge, how testimony was gathered and the nature of that testimony, and how the committee

responded to that testimony, including a description of how the preliminary recommendation evolved as a result of testimony.

*Step 5–Steering considers the Final Recommendation*

*Step 6–The Provost and/or President and Board consider the Final Recommendation*

*Step 7–Steering notifies the Campus Community Testimony* For a complete description of all steps and of the testimony tiers, see [Governance Structures and Processes, 2019 Revision](#), pages 23–27.