College Senate
Meeting Minutes
Thursday, November 17, 2011
President’s Dining Room, Ernst Center
Annandale Campus
1:00p.m.-3:00p.m.

Alexandria: Ms. Joan Blankmann, Ms. Felicia Blakeney, Ms. Vaden Fitton, Ms. Selam Yilma
Annandale: Ms. Barbara Divers, Dr. Charlie Dy, Dr. Stewart Edwards, Dr. Abe Eftekari, , Ms. Ms. Shelli Jarvis, Ms. Kimberly Wright
Loudoun: Mr. Joshua Anton (student), Dr. Diane Mucci, Dr. Georgeanna Stratton
Manassas: Mr. George Flowers, Mr. Alex Longhi, Ms. Alicia Tucker
MEC: Mr. Andrew Cornell, Ms. Patricia Ottavio, Mr. Chris Slevin
Woodbridge: Mr. David Dillon, Ms. Tanya Ingram, Ms. Alice Reagan, Ms. Ann Turpyn
ELI: Dr. Frances McDonald
College Staff: Mr. Tony Bansal, Ms. Ina Dimkova, Ms. Jamie Ellis, Ms. Kerin Hilker-Balkissoon
College Recorder: Ms. LaToya Gray

Call to Order
The Chair promptly began the meeting at 1:00p.m.

Approval of the Agenda
The College Senate reviewed and followed the agenda as distributed.

Approval of the Minutes
The chair informed Senators that any changes to the minutes are to be directed to the College Recorder.

Agenda Items

Address by Dr. Templin
First, Dr. Mucci introduced Dr. Templin as the keynote presenter on important issues for the day. Dr. Templin addressed the Senate regarding the visit from the Southern Associations of Colleges and Schools Commission on Colleges. He informed the committee that both SACS and the Department of Education visited the college the week of November 14, 2011 – November 17, 2011. The federal government requested that SACS monitor institutions to ensure that they continued to do the kinds of things that the federal government required them to do.

Dr. Templin also informed the committee of the SACS Exit Report. President Templin stated that the SACS committee found Northern Virginia Community College to be an exemplary institution. However, there are 4 areas of improvement that the college must review. Additionally, Dr. Templin added that one critical area of the QEP that the college needs to work
on was evaluation. After Dr. Templin’s address, he congratulated all the people who worked on the SACS accreditation visit. Dr. Mucci also confirmed that SACS had a positive impression of Northern Virginia Community College.

Dr. Templin also addressed the concern that the college needs to update its ability to use technology in the event that the college shuts down for an extended period of time. Last, Dr. Templin also requested feedback from Senators about whether the college should go virtual and create a **Continuity of Instruction Committee**.

One Senate member inquired about what allowances the college was willing to make for teachers, instructors, professors and other professionals to work 100% online. What are NOVA responsibilities in meeting this goal?

Another committee member added that the college should introduce this plan to faculty gradually. Then, another senator encouraged the College Senate to consider a professional development component. Taking an online course is a lot of work, and the process is very different from training.

Dr. Templin explained that a detailed report will circulate by mid-April on this new concept. The Administrative Council will review and debate this new initiative by the end of the academic year.

**Ad Hoc Compensation Committee**-

Second, Dr. Templin stated that bonuses for classified staff have already occurred. However, a 2% increase will take place on December 2, 2011.

Dr. Templin has requested that exceptional actions should take place in favor of Northern Virginia Community College. Also, he discussed the issue of fairness with Senate members. Some people may not receive bonuses and raises because each set of employees followed a different set of policies and rules regarding pay raises.

Dr. Errico added that the focus was to review salaries of people who are paid the least. The Compensation Committee strived to be as fair to as many NOVA employees as possible. The committee consisted of faculty and classified staff.

Committee members expressed concern about rejection from VCCS. Dr. Templin stated that he is trying to get the Board to agree to a seven-year salary schedule. Dr. Templin also addressed the following viewpoints with senators and guests.

1) Many people are paid higher salaries, and the salaries still are not enough.

2) If there is a state appropriation, everyone should get it.
3) The state average for college peer groups was 60%, but Northern Virginia Community College was in the 11 percentile.

4) If state appropriations go beyond the cost of living adjustment, then the college should get that too.

5) The college should use a portion of differential tuition to fund salaries.

In sum, it is unfair for Northern Virginia Community College to be permanently at the bottom of the pay scale.

Summer Salaries/Pay

Third, Dr. Templin asked the committee whether the college should use money to increase base salaries or put the money into summer pay. He added that the faculty salary average drives this issue. Additionally, Dr. Templin advocated that money into base salaries was a better alternative because resources and supplies increased and money went into retirement as a result. In sum, the College would not benefit from increasing equivalent summer pay to 8 hours.

In response, Dr. Errico also addressed the issue of the summer pay formula. First, he updated the College Senate on stipends that are available to faculty during the summer for advising and assistant dean and program head duties. Additionally, Dr. Errico encouraged the Senate to reconsider the issue of increasing equivalent pay for summer. Then, Dr. Errico urged the College Senate to review and decide on this issue soon. Finally, Dr. Errico added that most teaching faculty support the summer pay formula from last year.

President Templin proposed that faculty should continue to receive the stipend for advising despite the fact that the process of advising needed improvement.

Personnel Services Committee Items

Furthermore, concerns about the Medical Education Campus were addressed. Another committee member also added that science faculty members were different because they taught laboratory courses which made it difficult to receive equivalent pay. Dr. Errico stated that the college does not want staff and faculty to equate a salary increase as special treatment for some faculty and staff and not others. One of the significant factors in determining summer pay for faculty was that more faculty members taught full-time.

Although Dr. Errico urged the Senate to make recommendations as soon as possible, committee members asked if a determination made now would impact future years. In response, Dr. Errico explained that because of the nation’s recession and budgeting concerns, an increase to 9 or 10 as equivalent hours probably will not occur any time soon. As a result, committee members stressed that future dialogue and decisions regarding equivalent pay should transpire earlier in the year. However, decisions made now are not permanent.
College Senators expressed the following questions regarding Dr. Templin’s address:

1) How and where does the college get the money to fund summer pay?
2) Should the money be allocated for labor or supplies?
3) If there is extra money available, why has it not been applied before now?

Note: These propositions would not alter faculty positions right now.

To these concerns, Dr. Errico discussed the Ad Hoc Compensation Committee policy. In short, seven equivalent hours of summer pay produced a lump sum surplus for the college. Also, Shelli Jarvis expressed support for Dr. Templin and reiterated his commitment to faculty salary increases.

Additionally, faculty members will receive a survey concerning the following proposed ideas:

1) Many nine-month faculty members should get a ten or eleven-month contract.
2) When future positions open, a full-time person is not needed for locations with low-enrollment. Classified staff (P3) will be hired at 50% contract.
3) Increase lecturer positions/ non-tenure track positions. Lecturers would earn 80% of salary of a full-time professor. Also, the teaching load is equivalent to 39 in-class hours for the academic year. Lecturers must have extra office hours, and they receive full benefits.

More committee members addressed the impact on restrictive faculty. Restrictive faculty members did not receive 80% salary of a full-time professor, but they taught 50% of the teaching hours.

The discussion of extended faculty contracts and lecturer positions prompted senators and the chair to ask the following questions:

1) Would the hiring process be the same in terms of hiring for these new positions?
2) How will lecturers manage to teach 39 hours of courses per year, as well as plan and prepare for classes, and have extended office hours?
3) How will extended faculty contracts and lecturer positions affect laboratory courses?
4) Are lecturer positions going to be used to continue the ratio of full-time and part-time faculty members?
5) Will more adjuncts teach during the summer?
In short, Deans and Department Chairs can choose to incorporate lecturers into their respective departments.

Dr. Errico also responded that fewer adjuncts teach during the summer because full-time faculty members teach the majority of the courses during the summer months. Again, Dr. Errico urged the College Senate to make a decision as soon as possible.

As a result, several College Senators recommended that the senate support Dr. Templin’s recommendation for a review of the feasibility of a Continuity of Instruction Committee. With this recommendation, the Senate also added that the new committee concerning instruction should also include faculty and student participation.

The College Senate voted and approved the above recommendations unanimously.

Another committee member suggested the idea of an external standard and component for adjuncts to record their progress in courses and professional development. Josh Anton, student at Loudoun campus, also recommended a hybrid system for students as well.

**Human Resources/Professional Development Committee- Shelli Jarvis**

Then, a reconfiguration of the Professional Development Committee was circulated, and the committee was considered a work in progress. Ms. Jarvis stated that the committee needed people to organize in the interest of clarity to establish the purpose and function of this committee. The former committee focused mostly on cross-campus day.

According to Shelli Jarvis and the distributed reconfiguration, this new committee demonstrated a paradigm shift. During the reengineering of Human Resources in Spring 201 McGaldrey, the consulting firm hired by the College proposed, and the Administrative Council approved, that the scope of the Professional Development committee should be changed. Consequently, the following charges were presented to the PD committee at the May 15, 2011 Professional Development Committee meeting.

1) The committee will be limited.

2) The committee will meet quarterly beginning Fall 2011.

3) The focus will be to support training in the content areas defined by the committee in the fall of 2010, and to assist with Cross Campus Days as appropriate.

After considering the best ways to accomplish the new charge, the Professional Development Committee issued the following recommendations concerning the PD committee configuration and role:

1) The role of the committee will be advisory not operational;
The committee will meet four times per year to report on progress made towards goals; the status of the PD budget; and to prioritize resources;

3) Operational work related to Cross Campus Days will be reassigned; and

4) The PD Committee will be reconfigured to include senior level stakeholders representing operational units and college committees.

The impetuses for the Professional Development Committee were questions and concerns about emergency management; concerns about what is best for the college; OSHA standards; disaster preparedness; and new ways to develop a career path at Northern Virginia Community College.

The chair added that the College Senate should make a recommendation on the Professional Development committee and its changes today. The new configuration is effective for one transitional year. Dr. Mucci announced the motion to accept the proposal. The motion was approved and seconded.

Next, dialogue and debate resumed regarding summer pay. Many committee members stressed that an $1100 increase in pay today was their preference. Dr. Mucci repeated some of the positive aspects of faculty members on 10 or 11 month contracts. Then, questions about the criterion for determining NVCC employees who get a raise loomed. One college Senator inquired about how the pay raise will impact developmental faculty who teach 5 credit hour courses.

Other important comments that members made were that students did not always choose to take classes taught by full-time faculty members, and full-time faculty members also provided excellent resources and information to students.

The College Senate recommended 8 (pro-rated) hours for equivalent pay, continuing structured advising, and stipends to teaching faculty, assistant deans and programs heads. This motion was approved and passed unanimously.

Approval of October 2011 Minutes

The motion to approve the minutes from October 20, 2011 was approved at 2:49p.m.

Announcements

Finally, Dr. Mucci met with representatives from Parking Services about parking concerns. It was estimated that 25,000 tickets for parking violations were distributed.

Parking Services can be monitored if representatives from each campus get involved.
Reengineering the traffic committee would provide more administrative oversight and involvement. Other concerns were that problems with Parking Services were agitated and often escalated at the Alexandria campus.

Parking Services has been audited, so the office was trying to discover equitable solutions for transparency.

Other recommendations were to permit Campus Councils to review appeals. Since the Annandale campus generally received 2000 appeals in any given month, it was unlikely that Campus Councils could handle the sheer volume of appeals at each campus.

The next meeting is scheduled for January 19, 2012 in the Large Boardroom, Brault Building.

Adjournment

The motion to adjourn the November meeting was approved at 3:00p.m.