Administrative Council  
March 27, 2012

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

Dr. Hill was represented Dean Michael Turner  
Dr. Sachs was represented by Dr. Lerner

Guests
Dr. Elizabeth Harper, Associate Vice President, Student Services and Enrollment Management  
Mr. Dana Kauffman, Director of College Government Affairs  
Mr. Ed Mellon, Director, Materiel Management

Access  
- Spring Enrollment  
  - The Daily Enrollment Report for Spring 2012, as of March 27, 2012, shows an increase of 1.7% from the comparable date for Spring 2011.  
- Dr. Gabriel also provided preliminary enrollment data for Summer 2012. It is too early in the process to ascertain much from the numbers. He anticipates he will have a better handle on it by the next Administrative Council meeting.

Student Success  
- Student success metrics: retention and graduation by campus.  
  - Dr. Gabriel distributed the report: Metrics by Campus. March 27, 2012. This report contains data from 2007 to 2011 regarding:  
    - Enrollment.  
    - Developmental classes and ESL.  
    - First time students.  
    - Graduation.  
    - Graduation rates by race/ethnicity and gender.  
    - Retention.  
    - Retention by race/ethnicity and gender.  
    - Student engagement.  
    - Pathways outcomes.  
    - Faculty diversity.  
    - Financial aid.  
  - The Administrative Council is asked to review the report and send him their feedback by May 15.  
  - Dr. Gabriel will send an email to the provosts with more information to assist them with their staff discussions.  
  - In the coming weeks the Administrative Council will review in more detail different areas of the report.  
- Student success coordinators.  
  - The focus of the student success coordinators will be retention, graduation, transfer, and job placement.  
  - The QEP advisors will report directly to the student success coordinators.
The Administrative Council will be further discussing and defining the roles and reporting structure at a future meeting.

**Classified Staff Competitive Salary Adjustments**

- At the March 20th meeting Mr. Bansal presented two proposals for classified staff salary increases. The two options were:
  - Percentage increases based on market comparison.
  - Flat base salary adjustments based on market comparison.
- Mr. Bansal distributed an executive summary explaining the background and methodology of the research done regarding the classified salary market comparisons.
- After carefully reviewing the options, and considering that the college did not make its enrollment target, and that it has limited the funds available, the Administrative Council decided that a flat 2% increase for classified employees can be approved at this time.
- Dr. Templin recommended the following communication: *The Administrative Council has approved competitive salary adjustments for full time classified staff and part time P-3 staff whose salaries are below 95% of market average. Increases will be flat amounts within four groups ranging from $750 – $1600. This will affect 62% of our classified staff. We are making an effort to do something similar for faculty, but faculty adjustments have to be approved by the Chancellor and State Board. We have not had great success requesting faculty adjustments recently, but we will definitely continue to try.*
- Dr. Templin will work further with Mr. Bansal and Ms. Jarvis on this message.

**2012-2013 Teaching Faculty Positions - Round 2**

- Dr. Gabriel distributed a summary of the model for allocating teaching faculty positions to the campuses.
- The model takes into account growth, proportion of part-time faculty, programmatic mix, and current vacancy ratio.
- Dr. Templin requested that the provosts review the data and carefully consider their campus priorities; just because there is a vacancy does not mean we must fill it.
- The provosts requested a column be added to the model to identify restricted positions.
- Dr. Maphumulo and Dr. Leidig requested a meeting with Dr. Gabriel to review in more detail the formula being used.
- Dr. Templin noted that a periodic review of the formulas being used is a good idea, but that the Administrative Council would need to review and approve any changes.
- Dr. Templin will work with Drs. Gabriel, Leidig, and Maphumulo. If changes to the formula are needed, they will bring the issue back before the Administrative Council.

**Strategy for Community Engagement**

- The NOVA College Board has established a Community Relations Committee chaired by Mr. Mark Savage.
- The Board requested the Mr. Kauffman prepare a strategy for increasing NOVA’s community engagement.
- Mr. Kauffman presented the following plan for developing closer community ties for the college on a campus-by-campus basis:
  - Background: currently our common community outreach across NOVA campuses is focused on our annual budget outreach and annual visits to local General Assembly
members when the Assembly is in session. Each campus has a range of additional community outreach initiatives in place.

- Suggested additional outreach:
  - With existing programs as a starting point, it is recommended that twice a year each campus reach out to key state and local leaders. The primary purpose would be to establish or further develop ongoing working relationships and work toward a common understanding of the challenges facing the college, the locality, and state issues/concerns.
  - Given the importance of enhancing the image of the college within the communities surrounding each campus, it is also suggested that our campuses develop and host two “marquee” community events each calendar year. It is suggested that each provost take the lead in developing and implementing these events with support from College Government Affairs and their own community outreach staff.

- The Community Engagement Committee will be reviewing this further at their May meeting.
- Mr. Kauffman asked the Administrative Council review the proposal, and send him their feedback.
- Mr. Kauffman next distributed a list of key areas and ideas for possible outreach in the community.
- The following are of the greatest importance:
  - Connect with and regularly update you most critical elected official, i.e., County Board member or City council.
  - Periodic meetings with local Chief Administrative Officer (County Executive or City Manager).
  - Work with are K-12 superintendents, and feeder high schools principles.
  - Have cooperative ties to major local employers.
  - Participate in local Chambers.
- Recognizing that each campus is unique in terms of necessary and appropriate community engagement, it is probable that the College Board will be developing some common expectations and goals.
- Dr. Templin asked the Administrative Council give this some thought and be prepared for discussion at the next College Board meeting.
- Mr. Kauffman encouraged that he is available as a resource. He requested that the provosts create a list of what they are already doing in terms of community outreach and send him this information.

Summer Stipends
- Dr. Leidig distributed the report of the Ad Hoc Committee on Structured Summer Advising Services.
- The committee was given the following five charges:
  - Charge 1 - Review the descriptive statement on Summer Structured Advising Services and make recommendations, specifying the maximum hours that a faculty member can be compensated for during the summer.
    - Committee Recommendation: The committee rewrote the descriptive statement and rewrote it to reflect how the GPS for Success implementation will affect the Summer Structured Advising Services. A maximum of 120 hours recommended
(average of 10 hours per week) per faculty member. The provost has the authority to override this limit when they believe appropriate.

- Charge 2 - Define the distinctive roles of GPS for Success advising specialists and those of faculty advisors.
  - Committee Recommendation:
    - Advising Specialists: During the summer, the advising specialist will work with high school outreach efforts, SOAR, and NSO. In addition, the advising specialist will be proactive about contacting potential NOVA students that are part of the GPS for Success population. Advising specialists will work with students to form an academic goal, verify their chosen program of study, and start to develop a semester-by-semester academic plan. The advising specialist provides the faculty advisor’s contact information to the student and follows up with the student in the fall to ensure contact has been made.
    - Faculty Advisors: During the summer faculty (full-time and adjunct) who opt to participate in the summer structured advising act as advising generalists, providing advising to all students. The population of students that faculty advise includes, but is not limited to, transfer, transient, and continuing students. Faculty advisors should provide program-specific advising to program-placed NOVA students, especially in the event that the student’s “regular” (fall-spring) faculty advisor is not available during the summer. Faculty advisors may assist Student Services personnel in the facilitation of SOAR and NSO, according to the needs of the campus. In addition, select faculty advisors may participate as virtual advisors.

- Charge 3 - Recommend how structured advising services should be integrated with SOAR and/or NSO activities on the campuses.
  - Committee Recommendation:
    - Advising specialists will work with first-time-to-college students, particularly those who are recent high school graduates. Careful planning is necessary to adjust current SOAR, NSO, and walk-in advising practices to ensure a smooth transition for the incorporation of this new position.
    - Campuses should develop and communicate a well thought out intake procedure to determine who should advise the incoming student. First-time-to-college students, particularly those who are recent high school graduates, should be assigned to an Advising Specialist. Students not in this population should also receive advising, and there should be a plan in place to determine who advises whom.
    - The coordinators of student success should meet periodically with the director of academic planning and advising to ensure consistency in implementation of the GPS for Success with regard to orientation and other summer advising activities; to discuss issues and potential problems; and to provide data necessary for the assessment of the GPS for Success.
    - The GPS for Success campus implementation task forces, coordinators of student success, and the director of academic planning and advising should evaluate the position of the faculty advising manager to recommend whether there is a need for such a role during the summer.
    - The director of academic planning and advising should assume oversight of the Summer Structured Advising Services program.
o Charge 4 – Recommend how structured advising service should be integrated with SOAR and/or NSO activities on campuses.
  ▪ Committee Recommendation: See recommendations for charges 1 and 2.

o Charge 5 - Assess whether or not training provided and accountability expected are sufficient and if not, recommend what additional training/accountability should be required.
  ▪ Committee Recommendations:
    • The committee provided a list of recommended training topics for first time summer advisors, and a separate list to update and refresh returning summer advisors.
    • Faculty who did not participate in the Summer 2011 Structured Advising Services initiative will complete a 4-hour workshop similar to that offered last year. Based on feedback from last year’s training and the expectation that we will have to train a smaller number of faculty for Summer 2012, we propose that the training be offered in a single-day, face-to-face format on each of the five comprehensive campuses.
    • Faculty who participated last year will complete a 90-minute update in order to continue in Summer 2012; the update will be offered on each of the five comprehensive campuses. Faculty who are unable to attend the training on their own campus and any MEC faculty who wish to participate may attend on any of the other campuses.

o General recommendations of the Ad Hoc Committee on Summer Structured Advising Services:
  ▪ To ensure consistency across the college, the provost of each campus should designate a coordinator for the Summer Structured Advising Services program. The coordinator may be a counselor or another employee who is close to the advising process.
  ▪ The scheduling of time slots for participating faculty should be based on student need and student traffic. Collaboration between campus student and academic services should take place when developing a schedule for participating faculty.
  ▪ Time slots should be created according to the assignment of the faculty, i.e. participation in SOAR or NSO, general walk-in advising, virtual advising.
  ▪ A web-based scheduling and time tracking system is recommended to enable participating faculty to log and keep track of their hours.
  ▪ Adjunct faculty should be employed as advisors during the weeks immediately before the beginning of the fall semester (and, as needed, through the first few weeks of the fall semester), when the structured advising program has ended and full-time faculty are back on contract.
  ▪ Faculty who plan to participate in structured advising services must attend training and receive certification. Faculty who completed initial training last summer must attend a shorter update on advising.
  ▪ The Ad Hoc Committee on Summer Structured Advising Services should reconvene in early Fall to review the outcomes from Summer 2012 and begin developing a plan for Summer 2013. Prior to the meeting, each campus coordinator would submit a summary report for Summer 2012.
  • Dr. Templin asked Drs. Gabriel and Sachs to meet and discuss the recommendation regarding a web-based scheduling and time tracking system.
The Administrative Council agreed that further discussion needs to occur about the director of academic planning and advising having oversight of the Summer Structured Advising Services program.

OIR is tracking data from the summer advising program. They will continue this summer so that there is a summer-to-summer comparison.

Drs. Templin and Tardd will draft a faculty communication about the program.

The Administrative Council thanked Dr. Leidig for her leadership in this effort.

Testing Task Force

On August 30, 2011 NOVA’s Administrative Council authorized a short-term Task Force on Testing to examine multiple challenges that will have an impact on support units that are involved in testing. The charge to the task force identified the following factors that have triggered important changes to the assessment environment:

- The Redesign of Developmental Math and English is resulting in the system-wide development of new McCann placement instruments now known as the Virginia Placement Test (VPT), to include both placement and diagnostic components, to replace COMPASS.
- Intensive work with school systems in serving students likely bound for NOVA (e.g., Pathway, Dual Enrollment, College Readiness initiative) means increasing demand for testing in the schools.
- Likewise, co-enrollment arrangements with community-based organizations (CBOs) result in the need for placement testing at off-campus sites.
- The college’s Student Success agenda calls for universal early testing in basic skills and mandatory placement.
- The significant growth of ELI is creating a greater demand for course-base testing.
- Financial Aid requirements for Ability to Benefit testing using COMPASS or another approved instrument are ongoing.
- Assessment requirements in core competencies, as required by SCHEV, VCCS, and SACS, are increasing.

Charge 1: A revised re-testing policy that is appropriate to the new McCann testing instrument and that 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.

Task force recommendations:

- Endorse the VPT retesting policy for math as written: “Once a student takes the Virginia Placement Test (VPT), one retest can be taken within the next 12 months from the initial test date, but only if the student has not yet registered for and started taking a non-credit or credit math course. If the 12-month retest period expires and the student still has not registered for a math course, the student may test again and retest one more time within the next 12 months. This cycle may continue until the student begins a math course.”
- Limit consideration of exceptions to a division dean or designee, whether the course is offered on a campus, through ELI, or as part of a special program (e.g. Pathway, Dual Enrollment, and CBOs).
o Clarify how long the score from an in-class completion of a math module is valid and whether the system will differentiate between test score completion of a module and in-class completion.

o Articulate parameters for developmental testing and retesting on handouts and online. As is done for COMPASS, provide links to sample tests.

o Look to the ACLI/ Credit ESL connection as one potential model for a way NOVA can serve students who are not yet ready for credit Developmental English.

o Explore existing models of bridge programs between community colleges and other agencies that offer adult basic skills training. For example, Virginia Highlands Community College has the Mod Zero program, and Thomas Nelson Community College offers on-campus basic skills programming. An on-campus solution is ideal. Because of the way Adult Basic Education (ABE) programs are funded (by county), a college-wide solution is necessary.

o Investigate parameters for those eligible for ABE courses (including modified diploma contingencies) and add this information to the Testing Procedures Manual once it represents the new VPT instruments.

o English faculty in consultation with Testing Center coordinators craft a message students receive upon completing the VPT instrument for English placement.

• Charge 2: An organizational and governance model for testing that results 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.

• Task force recommendations:
  o Develop and implement a mission statement consistent with the policies and standards set forth in this charge.
    ▪ Proposed Mission: The purpose of testing services at NOVA shall be to:
      • Support curricular goals by accurately assessing prerequisites for entrance into courses and programs through appropriate assessment instruments as identified by the college, VCCS and national testing agencies
      • Support preparation and/or achievement of certification or licensure in programs for which these are requirements for entry into the field.
      • Deliver assessment services to meet college learning outcomes for specific courses and programs, including ELI specific requirements, using appropriate instruments in a variety of formats.
      • Participate in the development and implementation of system wide testing instruments in the VCCS and in coordination of testing activities.
      • Provide proctoring services as resources allow for students from institutions outside of the college.
      • Coordinate with other college units (i.e.: Student Services, Academic Services, Financial Aid, Counseling, Disability Services, ELI) to provide comprehensive testing services supporting the college’s customer service initiatives.

  o The Organizational Structure of the college-wide testing program should be as follows:
    ▪ The President and Administrative Council are ultimately responsible for college-wide testing policy and fiscal support for testing and assessment services.
    ▪ The Learning and Technology Resources Leadership Council (LTRLC) provides oversight and coordination of testing services across the college. The LTRLC will
make policy recommendations with regard to logistical matters to the Administrative Council and implement those testing policies set forth by the Administrative Council.

- As recommended by the LTRLC, a college-wide testing advisory committee should be appointed to assist the LTRLC in identifying key areas of instructional support and customer service needs.

- The recommended membership structure of the proposed College Testing Advisory Committee is as follows:
  - Chair, dean of LTR (Testing Liaison)
  - Associate vice president, academic services
  - Coordinator of academic assessment
  - 5 faculty members representative of the following areas: MTH, ENG, ESL, ELI, Developmental Studies, Workforce Development
  - 2 student services representatives
  - 1 Testing Center Supervisor
  - 1 disability services counselor
  - 1 ELI instructional designer

- The Testing Center Working Group (TCWG) consists of the testing center supervisor at each campus and the testing specialist at ELI. The TCWG ensures collegial communication among the campuses and ELI, and shares crucial operational information with the LTRLC.

- The testing center supervisors are responsible for the day-to-day operations of their campus testing center and for the appropriate administration of the college testing programs. Supervisors coordinate with various departments at the college that use testing services and supervise the testing center staff. The testing center supervisor reports to the campus dean of learning and technology resources.

- IT support staff should be designated at each campus to be responsible for providing prompt attention to and resolution of technical problems in order to facilitate successful test administration.

- The Testing Center services should be coordinated with the availability of pre and post testing services (such as advising, counseling or business office functions), as required to meet the customer service goals of the college. To this end, the college-wide testing program will:
  - Work with stakeholders to ensure testing best-practices are adopted, such as time limited tests for college courses, and will take advantage of testing technology where practicable and appropriate.
  - Use technology to expand and enhance customer service by notifying students of wait times at Testing Centers and allowing for testing at additional locations where appropriate.
  - Determine Testing Center operational hours by reviewing usage data and collecting student needs assessment data. Testing Centers will be adequately staffed at all times with a minimum of two staff members, including extended evening and weekend hours as required to meet the testing needs of all NOVA students.
  - Administer commercial tests as prescribed by the vendor.
• **Charge 3:** The development of standards and best practices (e.g., clear mission and expectations for service) that are aligned with those for professional organizations, such as the National College Testing Association.

  • Task force recommendations:
    o NOVA should pursue certification by NCTA beginning with the March 2012 approval cycle.
    o As part of the certification process, a site-by-site evaluation should include an analysis of the adequacy of each facility in terms of available seats and equipment based on traffic and the campus population.
    o The college should place priority on correcting deficiencies identified in the site-by-site analysis with the goal of bringing all facilities up to a minimum standard.

• **Charge 4:** A plan for coordination between Testing and Counseling/Advising so that 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.

  • Task force recommendations:
    o The VPT result printout should contain a list of courses for which the student is eligible to register, including diagnostic information for developmental mathematics modules.
    o The VPT result that is printed out should also be included in the Student Information System, so that it is accessible to the student, to counselors, and to advisors.
    o Each testing center should send each student to an appropriate advisor to select appropriate courses.
    o The Honors Committee should collaborate with math and English faculty to determine eligibility for English and math honors courses and how to include an eligibility statement on the VPT results.
    o To facilitate consistency in advising, guidance on math placement and course selection should be made available on a college-wide website to advisors and counselors.
    o Representatives from Student Services, Testing Centers, and Academic Units should meet regularly to discuss coordination of testing and advising.

• **Charge 5:** An assessment of the adequacy of resources (space, locations, equipment, staffing, supplies, hours) for Testing to carry out its mission. As needed, a proposal for additional or reallocated resources.

  • Task force recommendations:
    o As facilities are renovated and redesigned, priority should be given to locating Testing Centers in close proximity to other related units (e.g., student counseling, tutoring) to better integrate student support functions and reduce student “bounce.”
    o Testing Center operational hours should be determined by collecting student usage and needs assessment data. This data should be used to establish base hours of operation consistent across all campuses. Testing Centers should be adequately staffed at all times, including extended evening and weekend hours as required to meet student testing needs.
    o With the increase in ELI’s multiple 8-week course sessions, course testing statistics should be tracked by each Testing Center to determine peak usage patterns during the semester. This information 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 the Testing Center’s computer/network needs.

A review of the testing stations should be compiled. The number of testing stations at each Testing Center combined with the total number of hours each Testing Center is open will determine accessibility and should be based on a review of usage data from each campus including the number of exams given annually and projected growth trends.

The Testing Centers at each campus need to incorporate the use of an electronic line management system to allow for accurate tracking and real-time reporting of wait times. The line management system may require specialized equipment and IT support to optimize effectiveness.

A Testing Center dashboard should be added to the web-based testing portal to provide students with access to the real-time information on the wait times for testing sites at all campuses. This promotes more efficient use of testing resources across the college.

The exploding need for testing services at additional sites may require centralized funding for testing services to ensure that Testing Centers maintain a minimum level of quality.

Course exams administered in a Testing Center should be consistent with those administered in a college classroom. Online and/or paper exams taken in a Testing Center should be time limited in a manner consistent with exams administered in a campus classroom. Examinations should be designed to assess learning outcomes and to be completed within the time limit prescribed by NOVA and VCCS policy.

Recognizing that “one size does not fit all” and recognizing the complexities of each campus, it is proposed that the college support consistency in baseline testing services.

Baseline hours of operation should be maintained across the campuses to ensure consistent college-wide access to testing services, just as the college provides baseline hours for other services (M-F 8:30-5).

- A minimum of 60 hours of operation is proposed for baseline testing services.
  - LTR Deans would consider longer hours based on historical data, trends, projections, campus, and other college input.
- A minimum of two staff members must be on duty at all times to ensure test integrity, safety and security of staff. To meet the baseline hours of operation (noted above) a minimum of 3.5 staffing is needed (e.g., 3 FT and 1 PT… or …2 FT and 3 PT, etc. with status to be determined by the campus).

- Dr. Leidig noted that one of the most important recommendations is the establishment of a College Testing Advisory Committee. Because the charge to the task force was so extensive, the Advisory Committee may need to process the recommendations a few at a time and bring them back to the Administrative Council for approval.
- The Administrative Council noted that all campuses should be represented on the advisory committee, and the task force should consider representation on the advisory committee by campus being proportionate to the size of the campus.
- The Administrative Council asked that the Learning & Technology Resources Leadership Council, working the College Testing Advisory Committee, look at the recommendations in detail to identify the ones that could and should be implemented immediately.
- The Administrative Council expressed some concerns regarding NCAT membership.
• The Administrative Council requested that the Leadership Council look at benchmarking best practices against our peers. OIR can help start this process.
• Dr. Templin will work with Dr. Leidig on an official response to the task force and Dr. Templin will share the draft with the Council before sending it out.
• Dr. Templin added further discussion needs to occur regarding the connections between college wide councils and their link to the existing governance structure.
• The Administrative Council thanked Dr. Leidig and the task force for their thorough report. Their hard work and thoughtful recommendations are appreciated.

Update on CLARUS Corporation for Campus Planning
• Ms. Cathy Swanson of CLARUS Corporation will be visiting each campus and working with them to help maximize current space usage.
• She will look at what is in demand, when it is in demand, class schedule rollover, space assigned to a division, etc.
• The provosts are asked to submit their space requests to Mr. Bansal. He will review the requests and determine the most immediate need for CLARUS services.
• The Medical Education Campus will be one of the two campuses CLARUS works with first.
• Dr. Gabriel and Ms. Dimkova will work on the contract and payment terms with CLARUS.

Travel Agency and Travel Procedures
• Mr. Bansal has been working to identify and rectify problems with our current travel procedures.
• Booking hotels cannot be done on p-cards, so employees have to pay first and then get reimbursed.
• When booking flights and reserving rental cars, we often have to have p-card single transaction limits lifted.
• A travel agent can make this process much simpler. Mr. Bansal has been working with Uniglobe Ulti Max Travel Services.
• Uniglobe Ulti Max Travel Services are available to the college to assist in alleviating some of these problems. We are not required to use the agency, except for international travel.

Tracking
• New Faculty Roles – April 3
• Financial Aid Assessment Report - April 10
• English Redesign Status Report – May 1
• Proposal on Space Planning
• Workplace Violence Prevention & Threat Assessment Policy Guidelines
• AD/PH Release Time Work Group
• Continuity of Operations in Instruction Task Force