College Senate
Meeting Minutes
Thursday, October 20, 2011
Large Board Room, Brault Bldg.
Annandale Campus
1:30-3:45pm

Alexandria: Jennie Ward, Jessica Rodgers, Joann Blankmann, Mark Naber, Vaden Fitton (video-conference)
Annandale: Dr. Abe Eftekhari, Barbara Divers, Charlie Dy, Stewart Edwards
Loudoun: Dr. Diane Mucci, Dr. Georgeanna Stratton, Mike Polcen, Joshua Anton (student rep)
Manassas: Alex Longhi, Alicia Tucker, Dr. Dee Martin (alternate for Dr. Mark Kidd), George Flowers
MEC: Adora Alexander (student rep), Andrew Cornell(video-conference), Chris Slevin, Dr. Mary Mosley, Patricia Ottavio
Woodbridge: Alice Reagan, Ann Turpyn, David Dillon
ELI: Jayne Townend
College Staff: Dr. Alison Thimblin, Jamie Ellis
Guests: Dr. Charles Errico, LaToya Gray, Shelli Jarvis

Call to Order
The chair called the College Senate meeting to order at 1:30pm.

Approval of the Agenda
College Senate members unanimously approved the agenda as distributed.

Approval of the Minutes
Several revision and proofreading changes were discussed among committee members. The chair introduced the College Recorder to the Senate and informed members that any corrections and typos in the minutes should be forwarded to LaToya Gray.

The chair motioned to approve the minutes pending corrections. Senate members approved this motion, and the meeting continued.

Agenda Issues

Personnel Service Committee Items
Dr. Charles Errico, Chair of Personnel Services Committee, began a discussion of summer pay for faculty members. He explained that summer pay was urgent because the summer session is approaching. Further, Dr. Errico provided details about three ways of calculating faculty pay rates for summer pay: equivalent pay, overload pay and adjunct pay. Seven teaching contact hours is considered equivalent pay. Eight or more hours are overload pay.

Dr. Errico also explained that most other colleges have their own summer pay formulas. Additionally, the summer pay formula at Northern Virginia Community College was the norm, but the College Senate would need to vote on a new proposal for summer pay in November. The new proposal would also include release time and/or stipends for assistant deans and program heads.

Other committee members broached additional concerns about summer pay such as changing equivalent pay from seven to eight hours. Furthermore, most faculty members have already decided about whether
they are going to teach during the summer months. Therefore, it is more proactive to make changes and recommendations for summer pay as faculty members are determining summer teaching schedules.

Dr. Errico addressed these concerns by rationalizing that 7-8 hours for equivalent pay is sensible. Moreover, NOVA may never get back to 10 hours as equivalent pay until after the recession is over. He also added that summer pay is more expensive than Fall and Spring semesters because enrollment declines. Other factors such as room cost and utilities also increase overhead for the summer months.

Finally, Dr. Errico concluded that everyone will not receive the same rate of pay. However, Personnel Services will return in November with an updated formula for summer pay.

**Human Resources- Applicant Tracking System and Modified Hiring**

Ms. Jarvis from Human Resources and the Personnel Services Committee presented background information and other details about People Admin, an applicant tracking software program. As a result of Human Resources’ participation in a survey initiative, concerns about faculty recruitment occurred. The Process Improvement Team devised the Applicant Tracking System called People Admin.

Using People Admin, applicants can create one account, and they can apply for multiple jobs. People Admin is a similar software applicant tracking system as ones used by George Mason University, Old Dominion University and the University of Virginia. The applicant tracking process includes identifying characteristics such as gender, ethnicity and age. Unfortunately, there will be a three-year implementation period.

According to Ms. Jarvis, People Admin will allow NOVA to be more of a twenty-first century employer. Human Resources will still interface with Careerbuilder. However, People Admin will eliminate the need for public folders. Advantages to People Admin are that cover letters and resumes will remain on the server, and the People Admin program is more uniform.

The chair asked Ms. Jarvis if there was any step in the application process that would screen applicants. In response to this question, Ms. Jarvis explained that there is a set of requirements identified in the beginning of the process. “If applicants do not meet the minimum qualifications, they are not seen in the new system.”

Next, the chair asked about scheduled training for People Admin. Ms. Jarvis informed the College Senate that training will occur after January 1, 2012. Another Senate member inquired whether People Admin was similar or connected to People Soft. Ms. Jarvis clarified that People Admin was not related to People Soft. To explain, People Admin is an applicant tracking system.

**Quality Enhancement Plan and SACs Accreditation- Dr. Alison Thimblin**

Dr. Alison Thimblin was introduced as the SACs Accreditation contact person. She proceeded to explain the background and the QEP process.

1. Where are we in the QEP process? SACs is coming for an on-site visit in November 2011, and the focus is on improving student academics through enhanced academic advising. SACs will also visit Woodbridge and Alexandria campuses.

2. Students from the Alexandria campus explained to College Senate members that they have not been informed about QEP. As a result, Dr. Thimblin discussed the background information about
the Quality Enhancement Plan. Furthermore, Fall 2009 semester began the discussion on how Northern Virginia Community College could improve student learning. Institutional data demonstrated that student learning has been a problem for a while. Some students at NOVA are non-traditional students who have additional needs not covered in the College Catalog.

3. What was discovered? Academic advising at Annandale is different from Manassas and other locations. The majority of students advise themselves poorly. NOVA needs to provide additional training and personnel to help students. As a result, the QEP addresses enhanced academic advising using a best-practices approach. Furthermore, the QEP is focused on academic planning skills.

4. QEP also addresses teaching and learning through academic advising. Here are a few points of interest that must be addressed in the Quality Enhancement Plan.

A. The process of implementation assumes involvement of a college committee.

B. Institutional capability implies that NOVA must have the resources, budget and personnel to implement enhanced academic advising.

C. The Goals and Assessment Plan measures where we are now (goals) and where we want to be (outcomes). SACs will return in five years, and the committee will want to determine if goals were met. If goals weren’t reached, what factors negated success?

Dr. Thimblin expounded further that students who have the most difficulty with academic advising are first-time to college, curricular students. These students typically have 0 transfer credits. The Quality Enhancement Plan mandates that these students must also meet with advising specialists and set academic goals. This process will be a standardized procedure at all NVCC campus sites. This requirement will go into effect Fall 2013.

Dr. Thimblin also advocated that we will train faculty advisors. Every teaching faculty member will serve as an advisor. To explain, there are no non-advising faculty positions. Therefore, the question is not whether faculty will advise. Rather, whom should faculty members advise? How many advisees should faculty members have? The goal is to have 25 advisees per faculty member as a manageable load.

Additionally, Advising Specialists will be part of Student Services area. They are not counselors. Rather, they focus on (1) goal setting and (2) program of study verification. The best scenario was one advising specialist per 250 students. Advising Specialists encourage an environment of teaching and learning.

Academic planning software will allow faculty advisors to manage academic planning effectively. Thimblin suggested web sites and other methods of managing academic advising. The basic idea is to improve communication between students and faculty.
The QEP creates additional positions and responsibilities at NVCC. For example, The Director of Academic Planning and Advising supervises advising at each campus. Also, one Faculty Advising Manager would serve faculty members. Then, the requirement for advising training must be more than one (1) three-hour training session. Last, faculty advisors are also program specific and should be aware of other subject areas besides their own.

Northern Virginia Community College also integrated CCSSE and SENSE, surveys of student engagement and academic excellence as additional methods for acquiring student feedback on advising and student engagement on campus. While the Community College Student Survey of Excellence assesses the quality of education students receive, the Survey of Entering Student Engagement details students’ perceptions about the college and focuses on early engagement and continued engagement of students.

Student participants attending the College Senate meeting made several suggestions about what might make academic advising easier. First, Facebook can be used more effectively in the First Year Experience of students. Also, links between NOVA and other universities would also be helpful so that students can see what courses transfer to universities like the University of Virginia and George Mason University.

One Senate member asked if new faculty would be excluded from advising in the first year of teaching. Dr. Thimblin responded in the affirmative, explaining that new faculty would have to wait until the completion of training before beginning to advise students.

As a reminder, Dr. Thimblin stated that SACs will meet with faculty who were not involved with the Quality Enhancement Plan on Wednesday, November 16, 2011. More importantly, the SACs committee will talk with students about QEP to get a sense of how much they know about the QEP. Later, debriefing with Dr. Templin is scheduled for Thursday, November 17, 2011.

Dr. Thimblin added that it might be helpful for faculty to read and review the chapter entitled “Actions to be Implemented.”

Finally, Dr. Thimblin informed College Senate members that during the week of November 7th each Provost will host a Town Hall meeting to address SACs questions and concerns. Faculty and staff should forward any additional questions and comments regarding the SACs on-site visit to Dr. Diane Mucci.

Parking Services and Policies Update
In the absence of Norrie Flowers, the College Senate continued with the agenda as planned. A memorandum from Norrie Flowers addressed contentious issues regarding parking citation appeals. Much discussion from the College Senate focused on the following statements:

1. There is a difference in the process for students, faculty and staff.

2. The business manager possesses unilateral authority.

3. The business manager should not handle citation appeals.
Much dialogue and debate centered around issues concerning the development of additional committees which handle parking citations, the conflicting roles of the business manager, concerns about tracking appeals, the responsibilities of the Tracking Committee, and the obscurity of and flaws in the appeals’ process.

Questions regarding parking citations and policies are listed, but not limited to the questions below:

A. Can appeals be rejected?
B. When someone receives a ticket, will that person be allowed to refute the ticket immediately?

Many College Senate members and student participants argued that the Business Manager makes decisions on issues that are not controversial. Additionally, changes in policy regarding parking citations would mandate the revision of the Faculty Handbook. Furthermore, revisions and additions to the handbook and the parking citation appeals’ process would need to be addressed and approved.

Another College Senate member added that students must be a part of the appeals’ process, and Academic Deans should replace the Business Managers. The process of appeal should recognize due process and eliminate conflicts of interest. College Senate faculty members and student participants proposed that rules be centralized and uniform. Finally, personnel who create policies and make judgments on appeals matters should not be college-wide, but campus-wide personnel would be more effective in ruling on such matters.

New Business

The issue of College Committee appointments was broached and discussed in brief. After the College Senate approves College Committee appointments, Dr. Templin will receive a list of College Committee members. As an added note, Northern Virginia Community College at Annandale needs to approve many committee positions.

A motion to approve the list of 2011-2012 College Committee Appointments was properly seconded at 2:12p.m.

The chair also discussed the challenge of reserving rooms on the Annandale campus. Making requests electronically would be more efficient. Nevertheless, completing the Facility Use form is counter-productive because of the numerous signatures required.

Ms. Ellis from Human Resources made a motion to centralize software systems for reserving rooms. The College Senate approved this motion.

Other concerns about why there are expiration dates on identification badges surfaced. Some College Senate members addressed problems with access to parking garages and other locations because their badges were deactivated at the beginning of the Fall 2011 semester. The chair replied that more information would be provided at a later date.

Announcements

The College Senate is requesting more volunteers for the Committee on Committees Review.
Adjournment
The chair motioned to adjourn the meeting. The College Senate adjourned at 3:44pm.

LaToya Gray, College Recorder, respectively submitted the minutes.