Members Present: Executive Vice President Dever, Dr. Gabriel, Vice President Gary, Dr. Hinton, Dr. Maphumulo, Dr. Sachs, and Dr. Saperstone.

Brian Foley was represented by Ruth Stanton
Dr. Hill was represented by Mike Turner
Dr. Leidig was represented by Joyce Samuels

Dr. Dever convened the meeting in the absence of Dr. Templin.

**Student Access**
- **Spring Enrollment**
  - The Daily Enrollment Report for Spring 2011, as of December 14, shows an increase in FTES of 5% above the comparable date for Spring 2010.
  - The enrollment target for the Annandale Campus factored in a new building being ready for use in the spring semester. The building is not ready for occupancy. Dr. Gabriel cautioned this will probably result in the Annandale Campus not reaching its enrollment target for the spring.

**Unit Planning Survey Results**
- The Office of Institutional Research (OIR) conducted a survey of the Administrative Council members asking a series of questions about their unit’s planning activities.
- The survey was conducted as a follow up to the Institutional Effectiveness audit conducted in preparation for SACS reaccreditation.
- The survey findings are as follows:
  - There is no consistent process across planning units.
  - Some units have a group focused on unit planning, while others do not.
  - In some units an individual other than the VP or the provost is responsible for the planning process.
  - Some units have a formal planning meeting (i.e., planning retreat) two or three times per year, while others do not.
  - In some units the communication about unit planning is not widely shared within the unit.
  - In many units the head of the unit appears to be the sole planner, compiling documents from subunits into an annual planning and evaluation report.
  - During certain years some units did not submit any planning and evaluation documents for the final report.
- Based on the findings of the Institutional Effectiveness audit and the survey of Administrative Council members, the following recommendations are proposed to improve the planning process at the unit level:
  - Having a unit member other than the vice president or the provost coordinate the unit planning process will help create a higher quality report.
  - The units should consider using a planning committee to provide leadership in the unit planning process.
  - Heads of subunits (e.g., deans, directors, etc.) should meet at least twice a semester with planning as a formal agenda item to coordinate the documentation.
o One staff member from the unit should have responsibility for collecting and compiling the final document. This person will be responsible for quality control of the annual planning evaluation report for the unit.

o Having a planning retreat for the heads of subunits during summer seems to elevate the importance of unit planning in the college.

o SACS reviewers have advised that format consistency is important.

o Professional development opportunities on the college planning process for members of the Annual Planning and Evaluation Working Group will be provided.

o Members of the Annual Planning and Evaluation Working Group will participate in training on the basics of college planning.

• Dr. Dever asked Dr. Gabriel to provide follow up to the individual provosts and vice presidents. He requested that Gr. Gabriel counsel them individually regarding specific years of non-reporting and any other issues identified.

• Dr. Dever noted the importance of thinking in terms of outcomes, not just going through an activity, but envisioning a result at the end of the year. We must work toward an outcome that can be assessed through measurement or demonstration, and then follow through in using the results for ongoing improvement.

• Dr. Gabriel distributed to Council members an Annual Planning, Allocation, and Evaluation Table for completion. Council members are to submit the completed table for 2-3 initiatives for FY 2008, FY 2009, and FY 2010 to Dr. Gabriel by December 21.

• Dr. Gabriel will send a sample completed table for reference.

• The purpose is to demonstrate how we allocate budgetary resources to special initiatives, and how we are tracking them.

### Summer Stipends

• Dr. Saperstone distributed a draft revised policy for summer stipends for structured academic advising, and for summer stipends for assistant deans and program heads.

• The draft was compiled in consultation with the other provosts.

• The policy needs to be finalized by the end of January 2011 so that it can be in place for Summer 2011.

• Summer stipend for academic advising:
  
  o The stipends for summer academic advising will be for structured advising. Provosts will determine the hours that faculty advising is needed on their campus.
  
  o Faculty who are receiving pro rata compensation for summer teaching are already expected to do a certain amount of normal advising. These advising responsibilities are part of their summer work and not the type of structured activity for which this stipend is intended.

  o Dr. Gabriel noted that in the draft policy, the allocation of funds between campuses is based on fall enrollment. This may be a misleading number to use because most of the students seeking counseling are new students. He suggested that it might be better to use the number of new students by campus, and then break that number down by participation in SOAR and NSO. Results may be similar, but it might be a better measure. On the other hand, it was noted that much of faculty advising is directed towards the needs of continuing students.
Dr. Dever asked Dr. Saperstone and the provosts go back and consider this suggestion and decide whether or not to change the calculation.

Dr. Gabriel will send Dr. Saperstone the number of first-time fall semester students by campus.

Dr. Sachs noted that a statement addressing virtual advising would be a good idea.

Dr. Dever will provide the Council information regarding what is currently occurring with virtual advising and what opportunities there are for increased faculty involvement.

- Stipends for assistant deans and program heads for summer work.
  - Currently there is no consistency across campuses.
  - The draft policy establishes commonly held (baseline) expectations of the assistant deans and program heads, along with other responsibilities that may be included.
  - Based on the extent of duties, the stipend can vary. Provosts and academic deans will have discretion.
  - The draft policy stipulates that stipends are based on the number of FTEs. The Council agreed to change this so that provosts can determine the stipend amount in consultation with the academic deans.
  - The Council recognizes that in the long-term we will have to address the larger issue of reassigned time, but at this time we are focusing on the summer. This is an opportunity to better support our assistant deans and programs heads, and recognize the additional work they are doing.

Dr. Dever thanked Dr. Saperstone and the provosts for their work in developing the draft policy.

Dr. Dever asked the provosts to share the draft policy with their staffs to get further feedback.

The provosts were asked to send feedback to Dr. Saperstone, who will prepare a revised version for the Administrative Council to consider in January.

Dr. Saperstone will also share the draft policy with College Senate Chair Al Ross and with Shelli Jarvis in Human Resources for their input.

Dr. Saperstone will present a draft to the Academic Deans Council at the end of January and report back to the Administrative Council in early February.

**Review of Dual Enrollment & Career Coaches**

- As part of the FY 2011 budget approval process, the Administrative Council requested a review of Dual Enrollment, Career Coaches, and Tech Prep.
- Dr. Dever has prepared a draft charge for a work group to conduct this review, and he solicited recommended appointments from the provosts to the work group.
- The Administrative Council requested that the charge include more about how these efforts connect with others in which the college has relations with schools and community partners.
- The Council was requested to provide any further feedback regarding the charge and membership by the end of the week.
- On behalf of the Council, Dr. Dever will convene the group and ask for a report by April 1.
SACS Compliance Certification - Distance Education

- Dr. Sachs distributed a summary of the number of campus-based distance learning classes as of December 13, 2010. He is still receiving updates from the campuses.

- Dr. Sachs distributed a draft policy for distance education and hybrid classes. The policy is based on previous discussions in Administrative Council about distance education. It also reflects the thinking of the Hybrid Policy Advisory Group.
  - Expectations:
    - NOVA will demonstrate through regular and systemic documentation that all classes considered distance education meet all provisions of SACSCOC policy.
    - NOVA will ensure that its non-distance education hybrid classes meet the institutional standards of quality expected for all instruction at the college.
  - Responsibility for administering distance education and hybrid classes:
    - Classes that meet 100% online must be offered through ELI.
    - Classes where face-to-face instruction is less than 50%, but are not 100% online, are considered distance education hybrid classes.
      - Hybrid classes that meet face-to-face less than 30% are administered the same as online courses, and must be offered through ELI.
      - Hybrid classes that meet between 30% and 49% face-to-face are jointly administered by the campus and ELI.
    - Classes where the instructor and the students are in different locations at the same time through the use of technology (synchronous distance education classes) will be jointly administered by the sponsoring campus and ELI.
    - Classes that meet face-to-face 50% or more, but less than 100% of the normal meeting pattern, are considered non-distance education hybrid classes and are administered by the campus.
  - Special requirements for all hybrid classes:
    - Class notes in the Schedule of Classes for all hybrid courses must:
      - Use the hybrid icon
      - Include the following hybrid course statement: “Hybrid class. Includes both classroom meetings and significant additional online work which replaces some classroom meetings. Class meets face-to-face (insert schedule). Computer with internet access required.”
      - Include the required note as the first note in PeopleSoft, because only the first note shows in the online schedule available on the NOVA web site.
    - All faculty who teach a hybrid course must complete training prior to offering their first hybrid class.
    - Faculty may not offer hybrid classes, or any other class that meets less than 100% face-to-face, without the specific approval of their division dean.
    - Division deans, in coordination with their provosts, will review all hybrid class schedules and coordinate their scheduled meeting times and locations as necessary to fully utilize classrooms throughout the term before finalizing the class schedule.
  - Course coding and hybrid classes:
    - Hybrid courses that meet face-to-face less than 50% of the time must be coded as a hybrid to meet SCHEV and VCCS requirements.
Courses that meet face-to-face 50% of the time or more are not coded as hybrids, but should be identified as hybrids in the Schedule of Classes and include the standard hybrid class note.

Classes where the instructor and students are in different locations through the use of technology (synchronous distance education classes) require special coding to show whether distance education is being delivered or received by that particular section.

- By Fall 2011 we will have no campus-based distance learning. All of these classes must be moved to ELI, changed to meet 50% or more face-to-face, or be eliminated.
- Dr. Sachs noted that for courses that meet less than 50% face-to-face, ELI must be involved from the beginning in scheduling the classes. Most hybrids are 50% or more face-to-face, so they can remain campus based.
- Unless a class meets face-to-face 100% of the normal meeting time, it is a hybrid.
- Campus-based hybrids are overseen by deans.
- The schedule entry staff must be clear on what to do, and why we are doing it.
- The Administrative Council requested that Dr. Sachs add a statement that questions concerning policies and procedures affecting hybrid classes and distance learning should be directed to the associate vice president for e-learning, Dr. Jennifer Lerner.
- The Administrative Council approved the policy.
- The policy, and its implementation, will be discussed at upcoming meetings with the division deans.

Meeting AKT submission deadline
- Dr. Gabriel stated that at end of each semester we submit data to VCCS. In the past NOVA had been late submitting the data. We are a large part of the system, so without our data the VCCS cannot even estimate results.
- Dr. Gabriel asked for Council assistance with ensuring we have responded to identified data errors and issues by the date requested.
- Dr. Gabriel will develop a list of dates for next year, and give this to the provosts.
- The provosts requested that when the data is due to Dr. Gabriel’s office, the deans should be informed first. The matter should then be escalated to the provost’s office if necessary.
- The Council agreed that this topic should be addressed at a meeting of the registrars, so that they better understand the importance of this report and our timely response.
- The Council also agreed that the issue should be brought before the Deans Working Group.

Allocation of Non-Teaching Positions - Round 3
- Dr. Dever distributed the allocation of non-teaching positions from Dr. Templin.

Other Issues
- The Council agreed to request a meeting with Dr. Templin to discuss the impact of growth on the campuses and the college.
- Dr. Dever agreed to relay this discussion request to Dr. Templin.
Tracking

- Analysis of Potential Students Who Did Not Complete
- Registration – Jan 11
- Customer Service Definition – January 11
- Honoring NOVA police – January 11
- High School Recruiting – January 18
- McGladrey briefing on Internal Controls & ARMICS – January 18
- Update on Keys and Card Swipes
- Ad Hoc Budget Crisis Committee Release Time Report
- Ad Hoc Budget Crisis Committee Recommendations Follow Up
- Budget Review, Reallocations, & Year-End Strategy