Northern Virginia Community College Senate
Meeting Minutes
1/16/2020

Attending: Teba Aljumali, Kristin Balbuena, Ivy Beringer, Kathy Bohnstedt, Alexander Case, Julie
Combs, Kerry Cotter, Santwana Das, Patrick Dawes, Kathleen Deal, Kelly L. DeSenti, Ellen
Fancher-Ruiz, Julio Mondonedo (proxy for Michelle Gee), Judith Gomez, Pam Hilbert, Katherine
Hitchcock, Robert Johnson, Imran Kukdawala, Elizabeth Lanthier, Jack Lechelt, Beatrice
McKeithen, Mike McMillon, Donna Minnich, Mary Moseley, Diane Mucci, Tykesha Myrick,
Marilyn Odaka, Mike Polcen, Regina Sanders, Stacy Slaten, Maureen Townsend, Ashlie Warnick,
Tamara Warren Chinyani, Christina Wells, Debbie Wyne, Sam Vafaei (proxy for Jack Zegeer), Ed
Zuniga

Absent: Tammy Currie, Stephanie Dupal, Negina Noorzada, Beth Shewmaker, Lisa Stelle

GUESTS: Michael Alston, Sheri Roberston, Cathleen Cogdill

Senate Chair Donna Minnich called the meeting to order at 1:00 PM.

I. Approval of meeting minutes. Minutes from 11/21/19 meeting were approved by unanimous voice vote.

II. OLD BUSINESS

   a. Update on Ad Hoc Faculty Evaluation Review Committee. Final campus slot for ME
   C filled by Elizabeth Kane-Glass. Committee still needs a provost representative. Senate Chair Donna Minnich to send an email asking for volunteers.

   b. Ina Dimkova’s presentation on enrollment trends has been rescheduled for a future Senate meeting.

   c. Letter re: Presidential Selection Process. At the last Senate meeting, Senator Kerry Cotter was charged with drafting a letter to the Board of Trustees and the Chancellor with feedback from the presidential selection process. A previous letter was sent by the Academic Deans Council before the process began. The Senate’s letter serves as post-search feedback. A copy of the letter Senator Cotter presented is attached at the end of these minutes.

      i. Senator Cotter read the letter. There was no discussion about paragraph 1.

         1. Paragraph 2: Some groups got earlier involvement in the process. Senator McKeithen led a group and her group had time for discussion prior to their panel but there were changes in the makeup of the group.

            a. As an institution, we should make recommendations for how we’d like to be engaged. We want to make recommendations rather than giving background.
b. Senator Rob Johnson said that time for panels to prepare and discuss before the panel met with candidates was an issue for other groups.

c. Senator Ed Zuniga suggested changing language to “due to time constraints, some groups were negatively impacted.” Remove the specificity.

d. Senator Elizabeth Fancher-Ruiz said that the language seems harsh. “time constraints led to inconsistencies in various constituencies involved in the presidential search process”

e. Senator Elizabeth Lanthier said the process felt slapdash. Senator Zuniga said there was not enough time to consider questions and that made people feel like their contribution wasn’t valued.

f. Senator Johnson said the concern is more about the timing than the process. He said the last sentence of the paragraph sums it up.

2. Paragraph 3:
   a. Senator Katherine Hitchcock said that this was part of the Academic Deans Council’s letter. Scheduling during religious holidays does not reflect the VCCS’s shared commitment to diversity and inclusion.

3. Paragraph 4:
   a. Senator McKeithen asked about sending the letter to the VCCS; the process was NOVA-based so it should go to Admin Council.
      i. Senator Hitchcock said that there seem to be two issues: Timeline came from the Chancellor but NOVA responded to that timeline.
      ii. Senator Kelly L. DeSenti said that the timeline element should go to the Chancellor.
      iii. Senator Zuniga asked if Dr. Kress will use the same process for hiring the new Chief Academic Officer
iv. Senator Kerry Cotter said he would change the address to Administrative Council. Senator Zuniga suggested reiterating concerns about the timeline.

v. Senator Jack Lechelt said it should go to the Chancellor. Senator McKeithen suggested sending it to the NOVA Board to forward. Senator Lechelt said that the Senate should send it ourselves. Parliamentarian Patrick Dawes said that the Senate could open this for debate. He advised to address the language first and then debate who it should be sent to.

4. Motion from the Chair: After redraft and sent out for electronic vote, Senate will distribute to Admin Council for then to forward to who they want to. Motion was seconded and open for debate.
   a. Senator Kelly L. DeSenti made a motion to amend to add the Chancellor and the College Board of Trustees to addressees. Seconded.
      i. Senator Tykesha Myrick asked what we want from the conversation. We could send it to Admin Council for them to act.
      ii. Senator Kelly L. DeSenti said that we want the Chancellor to recognize there were problems with the accelerated timeline and the Chancellor made those decisions. Senator Lechelt said that we might as well send it to the people who make the decisions. Senator Tykesha Myrick said that we should follow the chain of command; otherwise we may be suggesting that we don’t trust Administrative Council. Senator Elizabeth Lanthier said that it wasn’t mistrust but its an added layer to ensure it gets seen by those who make decisions. Senator Mike Polcen asked if the Senate was under the Admin Council. No, the Senate reports directly to the College President.
      iii. Senator Katherine Hitchcock said that we could tweak the letter if the audience is the Chancellor. Right now, the letter is geared toward NOVA’s decisions and that should go to Admin Council. Senate Chair Donna Minnich said that the Senate should follow the chain of command. Senator Kelly L. DeSenti said that the college population was
asked for feedback and we are giving it. The chain of command is about asking permission; we aren’t asking permission to do anything. We are just giving feedback.

iv. No additional debate. Hand vote on motion to amend who the letter gets sent to. Amendment would also send it to the Board of Trustees and the Chancellor. Ayes = 17; Nays = 14; 1 Abstention. Motion passes. Motion to take vote by paper ballot. Seconded. Discussion tabled while votes counted.

d. Advocacy Day. Senate Chair Donna Minnich, Senator Maureen Townsend, and Dr. Cathy Cogdill participated in Advocacy Day on 1/9/2020 in Richmond. The schedule was not released by VA Senate until the day before and that made it hard for people to participate. Senate Chair Donna Minnich is working on ideas to improve that for the future. Only 30 people (3 from NOVA) went from all higher education institutions in Virginia. There are 15 4-years and 23 community colleges. If we want a voice, we must go to Richmond. We need to use our voice; write delegates and senators. Dr. Cogdill is asking the Chancellor for a Community College Day. Senator Maureen Townsend said that this should include students, staff, faculty. Reporters were there. Senate Chair Donna Minnich said that VA Senate gave them position papers and those can change for the future. Senate Chair Donna Minnich attends the state meetings. Senator Tykesha Myrick said that we can also use our voice through our government liaison. Senator Elizabeth Lanthier asked if communications with representatives should come through our college or personal accounts. Senate Chair Donna Minnich said that it depends on the topic. Senator Jack Lechelt recommended asking Dana Kauffman. Anyone can use vpap.org to find their representatives and their contact info. Senator Kathy Bohnstedt said that the budget position paper talks about faculty salaries but the last line includes staff salaries. Senate Chair Donna Minnich said that the position papers were written the Virginia State Faculty Senate. Anyone should send questions and comments to Senate Chair Donna Minnich so she can convey them to the VA Senate. Senator Tykesha Myrick said that another group was going to Richmond next week with Dr. Kress.

e. Returned to discussion of the letter. Motion to amend passed by a paper ballot vote of 18-12 with 3 abstentions.

i. Active motion on the floor: once final letter approved, it would be sent to the Board of Trustees, the Chancellor and Administrative Council. Letter will be edited and distributed electronically by Senator Kerry Cotter. Senators would vote electronically on the substance of the letter.
ii. Senator Beatrice McKeithen clarified that it should go to the College Board. Senator Kathy Bohnstedt suggested that it should go to the Chancellor with CC's to Administrative Council and the Board of Trustees. Senate Parliamentarian said that if it goes to all, it doesn’t matter if some are “To” and others are “CC.” Senator Kelly L. DeSenti said that we want others to act if the process is repeated. Senate Parliamentarian Patrick Dawes said that, based on Robert’s Rules of Order, formal letters do not have CCs.

iii. Senate Chair Donna Minnich made a motion to send a copy of the letter to Dr. Kress. Seconded. Senator Kathy Bohnstedt said that this shows courtesy and respect for our President. Voice vote. No opposition; one abstention. Motion passes.

iv. Active motion: letter to be sent to College President, College Board, Administrative Council, and the Chancellor. Voice vote: no opposition; 3 abstentions. Motion passes.

f. Constitution Committee

i. Today’s vote needs a majority. This vote will send information to the forum councils to start a 30-day clock. Constitutional amendment proposals will be distributed to forum councils to see if they approve the constitutional amendments or want to amend them. At the next meeting, the Senate will vote and need a 2/3 vote to pass.

ii. Committee looked at representation on the forums and in the Senate. Proposal would change numbers and separate teaching faculty and professional faculty. For campus-based forums, amendment would have Senate representation of 3 teaching faculty, 1 professional faculty, 1 administrative faculty, 2 classified staff, and 2 students. Campus based forums would have the same ratios with a minimum of 6 TF, 2 PF, 2 AF, 4 CS, and 4 students. Senator Kelly L. DeSenti said that this was to reflect the college’s makeup. The College Staff Council would stay the same with 5 representatives to Senate.

iii. Senator Ellen Francher-Ruiz asked if this change will affect the size of the Senate. Yes.

iv. Senator Kristin Balbuena asked why college staff forum wouldn’t change. Senate Parliamentarian Patrick Dawes said that there will be an increase in classified staff through the campus forum number changes. The proportion in the amendment reflects where the population is.

v. Senate Secretary Ashlie Warnick made a motion to amend the amendments to clarify committee’s intent. Seconded.

vi. Senator Katherine Hitchcock asked about the number of people on campuses who can fill the roles. Senate Parliamentarian Patrick Dawes said that we only have big categories.
vii. Senate Chair Donna Minnic made a motion to table to motion to amend. Amendment was tabled and Committee will review the amendment suggestions and forward their position.

viii. Senator Kelly L. DeSenti said that the point of the Committee’s amendment is to reflect the college’s makeup. Discussion of amendment procedure.

ix. Senator Julie Combs asked if the Committee could speed up the time window.

x. Vote on sending the Constitution Committee’s proposal to the forum councils. Hand vote taken. One opposed; one abstention. Motion passes. Proposal will be sent to campus forum chairs.

xi. Dr. Sheri Robertson presented information about Dual Enrollment

i. Why doesn’t NOVA charge for dual enrollment? According to VP of Finance and Administration, the costs of administering the program for payment would exceed the benefits. If we charge, the public school get mad because of the money and man hours are high. Who would collect the money? The code of Virginia requires that we charge, and we do but we give a 100% reimbursement to the schools. NOVA used to charge 15% but the schools got irritated, and NOVA got payment from some parents but not from others. If NOVA makes it difficult, both fiscally and logistically, the schools will do less dual enrollment.

ii. NOVA serves 11,000 contract dual enrollment students and 70,734 credits awarded. Dual enrollment students are NOVA students.

iii. Senator Ellen Fancher-Ruiz asked if we can continue not charging going forward. Dr. Robertson said that other systems do charge but we are trying not to.

iv. Senate Chair Donna Minnich asked how do we get more dual enrollment students to come to NOVA after high school. Dr. Robertson said that many who take the courses in high school are motivated and are going straight to the 4-year schools and we are trying to show them the benefits of NOVA courses and to tell them about ADVANCE. We can show them our pathways in applied and transfer programs and how what they’ve taken already can be used. NOVA is working with Honors. We want highly motivated high school students to know that there are kindred spirits at NOVA.

v. Senator Katherine Hitchcock said that, at Loudoun, 25% of FTEs come from dual enrollment. There is a concern that the high schools are not encouraging students to come to NOVA. How many convert from DE to NOVA. Dr. Robertson said 10%.

vi. Senator Santwana Das said that marketing to students should also include NOVA’s class size information. Dr. Robertson said that NOVA is
using student ambassadors. Senator Elizabeth Lanthier said there must be a way to send information directly to parents about the benefits of NOVA.

vii. Senator Tykesha Myrick asked what is the VCCS’s foundation for dual enrollment. It seems to cut community college out. Conversion is low and models that promote direct transfer will make it lower. Dr. Robertson said that NOVA, with Passport, is targeting students who are unsure where they are going or what they will study. Most students don’t finish their AA degree in high school.

viii. Senator Mike Polcen asked if the county pays people to teach these courses. Yes, it is part of their teaching loads.

1. How much does NOVA spend? There are 7-8 people, secondary faculty role to oversee. Senator Mike Polcen asked if, overall, dual enrollment is a cost or a benefit. Dr. Robertson said that, overall, it is a benefit but we need to get conversion up and to get 1st time to college to see NOVA as an option.

ix. Senator Julie Combs said that NOVA librarians go to the pubic school libraries for library instruction. How can we help encourage those students to come to NOVA? Are there promotional materials? Dr. Robertson said that it is a good idea to expand outreach beyond teaching faculty and NOVA is working on promotional materials.

x. Senator Jack Lechelt said that there was concern that dual enrollment wants to credential teachers more easily. Dr. Robertson said that when there is a credentialing concern, we can look at it. Our problems are finding new dual enrollment lead faculty and dual enrollment moving from one campus to another. Senator Lechelt said that that isn’t the problem in Political Science. Senator Santwana Das said that Pathway Deans can help.

h. Copyright policy has been forwarded to all forums for feedback. Feedback is due on January 30.

i. Discussions by Senators Pam Hilbert and Katherine Hitchcock tabled.

j. Questions from Campus Forums tabled. Question listed as coming from Annandale is actually from College Staff.

k. Reward and Recognition committees.

i. Campus forums should work with their provosts to fill the Teaching Faculty Reward and Recognition Committees. Each forum’s committee should have 4 teaching faculty (2 MSTB; 2 LASS), 1 classified staff, 1 Student Services (any classification), and 1 Dean or Associate Dean. These committees should be formed as soon as possible.

ii. Discussion about staffing Classified Staff and Administrative/Professional Faculty committees.
III. Motion to adjourn passes by voice vote.
In advance of their meeting with presidential candidates, the deans of Student Services and deans of Learning and Technology Resources were provided with a list of prearranged questions, however, due to time limitations those questions were not communicated until immediately before the meeting to those who were to serve as substitutes for deans unable to attend. This resulted in opportunity cost for those who took time to carefully draft thoughtful questions in advance of the meeting. Before the meeting, it was communicated to the deans and their designees that time was short and focus was on conveying the prearranged questions. Combined, this experience resulted in the perception that the participant’s role in the search was insignificant and individual concerns were of marginal consequence to the process.

As already addressed by the Academic Deans Council, presidential and other search processes which require the input of the college community, where possible, should not conflict with religious holidays. Such conflicts have the potential to marginalize entire denominations and unintentionally communicates that the College does not value input from those unable to participate in the process. This effectively eliminates the unique insights and perspectives these colleagues bring to what should otherwise be an inclusive selection process.

The College Senate wishes to recommend a potential solution which may help mitigate some of these challenges. Live streaming of the smaller group Q&A events combined with a mechanism for active participation from members of those groups is recommended to allow those unable to physically attend an opportunity to participate in a meaningful way. Additionally, allowing the proceedings to be viewed by the community will have the added benefit of increasing the transparency of the process.

Thank you for your consideration.

Respectfully,
Your Name
Northern Virginia Community College
Proposed Constitutional Amendments:

Change 1:

Representation and Position Clarification

The college Senate resolves to amend the constitution to the following:

MEMBERSHIPS Article III

1) Definitions

a) Administrative faculty shall be defined as Executive Vice President, Vice Presidents, Associate Vice Presidents, Provosts, Deans, Directors, Associate Directors, and Coordinators[DK1].

b) Teaching and Professional faculty shall be defined as all 9-month and 12-month College personnel who hold both P-3 status and faculty rank, with the exception of administrative faculty as defined herein[DK2]. (Associate Deans will fall into this category)

c) Classified staff shall be defined as all P3 College personnel not holding faculty rank.

d) Students shall be defined as all persons registered for a course or courses of instruction leading to academic credit at the College.

e) Adjunct faculty shall be defined as temporary (P-14) part-time teaching faculty who are appointed on a semester basis to teach in the day, evening, or weekend.

f) Ex officio shall be defined as "by virtue of office and without vote."

2) Composition

a) Forum Councils are defined as one council per campus and one council representing College Staff. Voting membership of each Campus Forum Council shall be based upon a ratio of two students to two classified staff to one administrative faculty to one professional faculty to three teaching faculty. By March 15th of each year, each campus provost, in consultation with the incumbent Forum Council, will determine and announce the number of members required for each Forum Council the following organizational year. Such number must include no less than four students, four classified staff, two administrative faculty, two professional faculty and six teaching faculty, [DK3]

Voting membership of the Forum Council representing College Staff shall be based upon a ratio of two students [DK4] to one administrative faculty to one professional faculty, to four classified staff, to three teaching faculty. By March 15th of each year, the Executive Vice
President will, in consultation with the incumbent College Staff Forum Council, determine and announce the number of memberships of which that Forum Council will consist for the following organizational year. Such number must include no less than four students, eight classified staff, two administrative faculty, and two professional faculty. Forum Councils may include one or two adjunct faculty representatives, who shall not be eligible for Senate membership.

b) College Senate

i) Voting membership of the College Senate shall consist of two students (as available), two classified staff, one administrative faculty, one professional faculty and three teaching faculty, elected from each Forum Council plus presidential appointees from among all those eligible at large, in number equal to one third the total number of elected teaching or professional faculty members.

ii) Alternate membership of the College Senate shall consist of one alternate member for each student, classified staff, teaching and professional faculty, and administrative faculty voting member from each Forum Council.

Reason: These changes are meant to equalize representation based on current staffing numbers and to update position titles based on current job classifications.

Change 2:

Page H-8

Currently Reads:

v) Senate members absent from regular meeting three times without a designated alternate forfeit membership and will be replaced by their respective Forum Council.

Change to:

v) Senate members absent from regular meeting three times without a designated and appropriate alternate forfeit membership and will be replaced by their respective Forum Council or in the case of a presidential appointee presidential appointment.

Reason: this change provides parody between appointed and elected Senate members

Change 3:
1) Separating the chair from forum councils as I currently see it as a conflict of interest that the chair also seats on a forum council as they are meant to represent the entire college not just one campus.

Page H-9 section e) i)

Add Section e) i) a) upon election The Chair of the College Senate will become a representative of the entire college community and as such will be removed as a campus forum council member and will be an ex-officio member of all campus forum councils and the College staff forum council. The chair’s former campus council shall replace them in the manner of a resigned campus council member.

Reason: This change makes the Senate Chair a true college-wide representative

Notes:

Additionally the committee would ask that the constitution be further reviewed next year after consultation with the President’s office and upper administrative positions as to how to replace references in the document to the Executive Vice President if that position will not be filled.