Members Present: Mr. Bansal, Ms. Dimkova, Mr. Foley, Dr. Gabriel, Mr. Gary, Dr. Hill, Ms. Holt, Dr. Leidig, Dr. Maphumulo, Dr. Sachs, Dr. Saperstone, Dr. Tardd, and Dr. Templin.

Guests
Ms. Donna Carlton, Loudoun Testing Center Supervisor
Dr. Preston Davis, ELI Director of Instructional Services
Ms. Nicole Foreman Tong, English Faculty, Annandale Campus
Dr. Ellen Fancher-Ruiz, Coordinator of Counseling, Annandale Campus
Ms. Shelli Jarvis, Director of Human Resources
Mr. Dana Kauffman, Director of College Government Affairs
Dr. Sheri Robertson, Associate Vice President, Academic Services
Ms. Alison Thimblin, Special Assistant for the QEP

Access
• Spring Enrollment
  o The Daily Enrollment Report for Spring 2012, as of February 7, 2012, shows an increase of 1.7% from the comparable date for Spring 2011.
  o Dr. Gabriel was asked to see when OIR might be able to provide enrollment data for the second 8-week spring session and report back to the Administrative Council.
  o The Administrative Council asked about changes to summer financial aid. Dr. Tardd will invite Ms. Zanders to a future Administrative Council meeting to talk about this.

Student Success
• Student Learning Outcomes
  o Dr. Gabriel distributed a draft memo to the academic deans and provosts regarding SLOs for Council consideration.
  o The Administrative Council agreed that the memo should instead be addressed to administrators (including academic deans) and provosts.
  o By April 17, 2012, NOVA must respond to the recommendations made by the SACS visiting team.
  o All college administrative leaders are responsible for achieving compliance with SACS requirements. This means all programs must assess student learning outcomes each semester, and documentation must be submitted.
  o In preparation for the reports due in September 2012, programs should examine the work they have done so far for the 2011-2012 academic year. If a program has not collected sufficient evidence of student learning (i.e., for at least two to three SLOs) in the Fall 2011 semester, then the program must make up for it in the current spring semester. Programs will need to report at least four SLOs for the year.
  • The Administrative Council noted that there are two elements to address for long-term alignment:
    o Lead faculty, program heads, and provosts must be in alignment.
    o We need to more clearly define the role and expectations of the program heads.
  • The deans will be told to pay special attention to the fourteen programs identified as not having done SLOs and being out of compliance because they will receive special attention in the next review.
  • Dates for deliverables:
o March 1: Provosts submit information which SLOs were assessed in Fall 2011, which are being assessed in Spring 2012, and which sections are being used to collect data in Spring 2012.
o April 1: Updates by the provosts on progress on the SLO documentation.
o May 15: Preliminary drafts of 2011-2012 Annual Planning and Evaluation Reports for respective programs are due from the provosts.
o September 1: Complete drafts of Annual Planning and Evaluation Reports for 2011-2012 due to OIR for feedback.
o September 30: Final Annual Planning and Evaluation Reports for 2011-2012 are due to the provosts.

- The Administrative Council requested that SLOs be addressed as part of Convocation.

Human Resources Campus Consultants

- Ms. Jarvis distributed a summary of the work the pilot HR campus consultants at Alexandria and Loudoun have been doing.
- Activities to date:
  o Coaching new supervisors and facilitating performance improvement discussions between supervisors and new employees.
  o Conducting on-site orientations for new employees.
  o Facilitating discussions between supervisors and employees regarding performance concerns.
  o Tracking HR documentation.
  o Providing managers, supervisors, and employees with policy interpretations, procedural information, and clarification.
  o Conducting workshops on performance evaluations, EWPs, and other related topics.
  o Participating in disciplinary and termination meetings.
  o Assisting campus leadership with reorganization, organizational development, and communication.

- Future activities:
  o Assisting with preparation of job descriptions and Notice of Vacancies.
  o Participating in search committees and related hiring activities.
  o Tracking employees for various actions and transactions.
  o Serving as a campus catalyst for the Service Excellence initiative.

- The provosts at the two pilot locations noted that the new position has been very successful, and there are many opportunities for process improvement.
- Ms. Jarvis is developing an instrument for anonymous feedback opportunities.
- The Administrative Council was asked to consider the reporting structure for the HR generalists.
- Ms. Jarvis is recommending that these positions report centrally because a lot of their work is in employee relations and policy interpretation. She is concerned with consistency in these areas among the campuses. A central employee relations/policy associate who oversees these positions will help ensure consistency.
- Dr. Templin clarified that there are two issues:
  o Compliance and consistency.
  o Flexibility and responsiveness to the campus.
- Dr. Leidig noted that she believes a part of the success on her campus has been that the employees see this person as a part of their campus.
• The Administrative Council agreed it is essential that:
  o The campus will be involved in interviewing candidates.
  o The campus will be involved in annual reviews.
  o There will be a dotted line relationship with the campus director of operations.
• Ms. Jarvis will incorporate these into the EWP and bring it back for Administrative Council review.
• Dr. Templin asked Ms. Jarvis to provide evidence of results to the Council. A comparison of the results from the surveys conducted ten months ago, to survey results today.
• Dr. Templin will add this issue to our emerging priorities for discussion at the Administrative Council budget discussion meeting late in March or early in April.

Student Activities Program Update
• Mr. Kauffman distributed list of next steps on student activities fees:
  o The state Community College Board and the NOVA Board are very concerned with the costs to students.
  o SCHEV was charged by the Virginia General Assembly to review whether auxiliary buildings fit with the mission of community colleges.
  o We have invited SCHEV Executive Director, Mr. Peter Blake to review our response to the State General Assembly and help us relay that these facilities can be a tool for the college in areas such as retention.
  o Mr. Kauffman recommends we consider designing new buildings to incorporate a mix of facilities.
  o This is a difficult approach and will be complicated; it will require some creativity in the use of common areas, and the use of private vendors.
  o Parking garages pose different challenges. We need to explore the potential benefits and feasibility of instituting an “all students” fee, and other avenues such as investing in public transportation.
• Timetable:
  o Late March/early April – meeting with SCHEV Executive Director regarding how the changing use/demands on our college is driving the need for a different mix of facilities.
  o Spring 2012-July 2012 – provosts and support staff to realistically consider their shared and respective need for auxiliary facilities.
• Dr. Templin asked Mr. Bansal to research when we need to start revision to our capital plan and report back.
• Dr. Templin will be creating a working group to look closely at our needs. Ms. Dimkova and Mr. Bansal will be on this group. He asked the provosts to consider who else should be in the working group.
• Dr. Templin asked the Council to consider if we need a project manager for this.

Campus Food Services RFP
• Mr. Bansal informed the Administrative Council that we are about to issue an RFP for food services at NOVA.
• He distributed an executive summary of information gathered from focus groups and surveys conducted.
• The survey findings are:
  o Poor dining operations are affecting the campus culture.
Focus group metrics provide the foundation for change. Areas identified for improvement include serving healthier food, providing variety, improving service, and ensuring sustainability.

A one size fits all approach will not work for NOVA. A strategic approach is required. Operations must be profitable to be sustainable.

Long term view:
- 10 year contract term.
- 5 one year extension options.
- Exclusive dining.
- Non-exclusive catering.
- Exclusive snack vending.
- Existing beverage vending contract not impacted.
- Requires immediate improvement, as well as continued development of the program over time.

Partnership expectations:
- Looking for potential partners to present a holistic vision for NOVA.
- NOVA commitment to quality dining program.
- Shared risk for shared benefit.

NOVA priority model:
- A quality dining program that includes quality, variety, choice, customer service, and value.
- A plan for existing facility improvements, and for new operations in existing and future space.

Evaluation criteria:
- Vision for campus dining.
- Approach to providing service.
- Financial proposal and capital investment.
- Capability and skill.
- Experience and references.
- Financial capability.
- Completeness of proposal.
- Small business plan.

The Administrative Council noted that we must include clear criteria for what happens if performance is unsatisfactory.

The Administrative Council added that we need to build in the option for outside parties who use our facilities to be able to use other vendors. It needs to be non-exclusive for outside parties. The vendors should have a competitive advantage, but not an exclusive advantage.

Mr. Bansal will email today’s presentation to the Administrative Council.

The Administrative Council approved moving forward, and thanked Mr. Bansal for his work.

Report from the Task Force on Testing
- The Task Force on Testing was given five charges:
- Charge 1: A revised re-testing policy that is appropriate to the new McCann testing instrument and provides accessible opportunities for students, under clearly structured
conditions, to move directly into college-level work or advanced developmental units when they are capable of demonstrating their readiness to be successful.

- **Analysis:** We need to add clarity to an already-crafted VPT retesting policy. The English test is still being developed, so the retesting policy has not yet been articulated. Confusion arises when retesting policies are not uniformly enforced.

- **Recommendations:** Endorse the VPT retesting policy as written. Limit consideration of exceptions to this policy to a division dean or designee. Clarify how long the score from an in-class math module is valid. Articulate parameters for developmental testing and retesting in handouts and online. Explore existing models to bridge non-placing English students to developmental classes and sources of funding for this group of students.

- **Charge 2:** An organizational and governance model for testing that result in clear accountability for performance and well-informed decisions being made at both the procedural and policy levels, with rapid and consistent implementation at all campuses.

  - **Analysis:** Need clearly defined roles and responsibilities and effective channels of communication. Policies must promote high quality operations, reflect a customer service approach, and remain consistent with the standards set by the college.

  - **Recommendation:** Develop and implement a mission statement governing a college-wide testing program at NOVA. Establish a standing committee to be called the College Testing Advisory Committee, chaired by a Dean of LTR; members should include the AVP for Academic Services, the Coordinator of Academic Assessment, 5 faculty members representative of MTH, ENG, ESL, ELI, Developmental Studies, and Workforce Development, 2 Student Services representatives, 1 Testing Center supervisor, 1 Disability Services Counselor, and 1 ELI Instructional Designer. Organizational structure of the college-wide testing program showing the governance model at both the campus and college level with the committee reporting back to the Learning and Technology Resources Leadership Council. Testing Center services coordinated with other departments to meet the customer service goals of the college.

- **Charge 3:** The development of standards and best practices that are aligned with those for professional organizations, such as the National College Testing Association.

  - **Analysis:** To provide consistent testing services across campuses and testing sites, it would be helpful to follow established standards and best practices. The National College Testing Association (NCTA) has developed standards and best practices.

  - **Recommendations:** NOVA should pursue NCTA certification with the March 2012 approval cycle. A site-by-site evaluation should include a facility adequacy analysis based on traffic and campus population. The college should prioritize the correction of deficiencies with the goal of bringing all facilities up to a minimum standard.

- **Charge 4:** A plan for coordination between testing and counseling/advising so students are well served in having their testing results interpreted and then used for guidance, placement, and scheduling in accord with the college’s Student Success agenda.

  - **Analysis:** Test scores for both the COMPASS and the VPT are not easy to interpret. Students need a clear indication of which courses their scores allow them to take according to their program of study. PeopleSoft is inconsistent blocking registration when a student lacks a prerequisite. Currently COMPASS reports indicate placement in honors; this is not the case with the VPT.
o Recommendations: VPT results printout should include courses the student is eligible to take. VPT results should be stored in SIS. Testing center should recommend students to see an advisor. Creation of honors eligibility and statement. Consistency in advising through website presence. Collaboration between Testing Centers, Student Services, and Academic Services.

• Charge 5: An assessment of the adequacy of resources for testing to carry out its mission. As needed, a proposal for additional or reallocated resources.

  o Analysis: The location, space, and layout of the testing centers are vital to accomplish the mission of the college-wide testing program. Standardizing the conditions under which tests are administered across the college is essential to ensure the integrity of test administration. A sufficient number of staff members must remain on duty all hours of operation in order to maintain test integrity and ensure safety and security.

  o Recommendations: As facilities are renovated and redesigned, priority should be given to locating testing centers in close proximity to other related units. Student usage and needs assessment data should be used to establish base hours of operation consistent across all campuses. Course testing statistics will be used to prepare and implement a plan for serving student needs during any surge in demand for testing services. The IT unit at each campus will assign priority status to the testing center in order to ensure timely response to computer/network needs. A review of the testing stations available, testing hours, usage data and projected growth trends will determine accessibility needs. An electronic line management system to allow for accurate tracking and real-time reporting of wait times. A testing center dashboard added to the web-based testing portal to provide students with access to real-time information on the wait times for all testing sites. Centralized funding for testing services may be required to maintain a minimum level of quality testing service. All course exams should be time-limited in a manner consistent with NOVA and VCCS policy. Baseline hours of operation should be maintained across all campuses. Testing centers should be staffed with 2 or more employees at all times, including extended evening and weekend hours.

• The Administrative Council is asked to study the report from the task force. The Council will review the report again as an action item at a future meeting.

• Dr. Templin and the Administrative Council thanked the task force for their thorough review and analysis.

Tracking

• Briefing on Internal Controls – February 14
• Budget Review, Reallocations, & Year-End Strategy – February 14
• Student Success Metrics By Campus – Unit – February 14
• Enrollment Process Improvement Team Report – February 21
• Payment Redesign Process Report – February 21
• 2012-2013 Enrollment Target Budget Implications – February 21
• 2012-2015 Enrollment Targets – February 21
• Institutional Memberships – March 6
• Financial Aid Assessment Report - April 2
• Workplace Violence Prevention and Threat Assessment Policy Guidelines
• AD/PH Release Time Work Group
• Continuity of Operations in Instruction Task Force