**PROVOST COUNCIL**

**WORKDAY MINUTES**

**July 24, 2014, 8:00-1:00**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Present** | Brian Railsback, Susan Fouts, Lowell Davis, Richard Starnes, Doug Keskula, Mimi Fenton, Darrell Parker, Jeffrey Ray, Dale Carpenter, Brandon Schwab, Carol Burton, Dana Sally, Alison Morrison-Shetlar |
| **Guests** | David Onder, Jennifer McDonough, Jim Miller |
| **Recorder** | Anne Aldrich |

**DISCUSSION**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Update from Executive Council**  **(Alison)** | Executive Council has not met for the last three weeks, meeting instead to conduct mini retreats about major initiatives:  1) how to move forward with the **Master Plan**; 2) focus on renovation of Brown Cafeteria for which we have received funds to add another dining facility; 3) BASE Camp Cullowhee move to the University Center where the current Catamount Gifts and Clothing store is located; 4) Catamounts Gifts and Clothing store move to join with the Book Store; 5) moving IT from Graham  (leaving it vacated); 6) building a micro steam plant next to Brown that will feed several buildings in proximity reducing pressure from the steam plant; 7) and consideration of opportunity to repurpose Graham. Alison and Robert Edwards have been asked by the chancellor to lead the next steps of the Master Plan.  The Mountain Heritage Center will move from H.F. Robinson (HFR) temporarily to the library to allow Campus Police and Admissions to move into HFR. Much of this impacts Academic Affairs. The multi-use facility to be constructed in the former location of Mad Batter, Subway and Rolling Stone Burrito has moved up on the priority list. Belk now has working air conditioning and those temporarily displaced during this work have moved back in to that facility.  **Enrollment management** – we are up considerably in first year students. Carol and the deans are adding courses (600 seats added); now the challenge is assigning faculty to teach those courses.  The **performance funding model** has been a significant source of discussion. There has been discussion regarding starting the **budget process** much earlier, as soon as faculty return in the fall. The goal is to have budget discussions in November rather than waiting until February and moving university budget hearings earlier. The result would be the allocation of funds to colleges earlier. Equipment needs are always the issue because of the time is takes to receive quotes, deliveries, etc.  **Scholarships** – the chancellor is gearing up to conduct considerably more community work (raising funds for scholarships), and has shifted more duties to the Provost Office and then out to the deans as we redistribute that load.  There is another Executive Council retreat scheduled on Monday morning with topics of discussion to be R25 and space utilization.  **The Kimmel School hosted “Instant Decision Day” at Biltmore Park earlier in July**. Students could apply, be accepted, be advised and register for classes in one sitting as well as have transcripts articulated. By 2:30 they had a line to the door (event began at 3:00). The event ended at 8:30. It was a very successful activity and we are now brainstorming how to do similar activities. Renovations are almost complete. We received a great deal of feedback regarding the need for this program and the support of companies supporting employees. Our appreciation is expressed to Robin Oliver who did a phenomenal job of marketing this program and event. |
| **Deans’ Evaluations (Alison)** | The provost requested deans submit a two page report connecting their goals to the strategic vision. The provost will review materials beforehand then discuss at next scheduled individual meeting. The outcome is to determine how we can support deans in the colleges and schools and how we can move forward. Please send these materials at least two days in advance of scheduled meeting. |
| **Update on Program Review Process (Carol Burton/**  **David Onder)** | There are three major processes for assessing the quality of academic programs. The academic program review process occurs every 5-7 years; the annual assessment plans and reports, and there is also the program prioritization process. Our goal is to align these processes so they are working more efficiently together. David Onder is here as the individual that manages the program review and assessment processes.  Carol displayed the redesigned website, reviewed with the council and provided a handout regarding the programs that will be undergoing program review in the coming year (11 academic and administrative). We are trying to shift the culture to one in which departments have ownership of the process and truly improve what they are doing. We are still working through the results of the program prioritization process and we delayed several program reviews scheduled last year because of the program prioritization process.  A dean or the provost can request at any time for a program to go through a formal review process. None of the programs in the College of Business go through program review because they are accredited through AACSB. The same is true of the College of Education and Allied Professions, which is accredited through NCATE. Is this agreeable to this council? This will be a topic of discussion as we get a better handle on these processes. Programs going through the process overwhelmingly feel more supported after the process concludes. It is not a punitive process, but a process to have external reviewers help us work on continuous improvement. We need to change the culture in how this process is viewed as one that results in a very positive impact for a program.  One item we struggled with last year was upcoming accreditation visits so we want to get a handle on this with a list of accreditations. We will be putting out a call to each of the colleges to let us know if you have professional accreditation reviews coming up this year so our office can review these documents and assist with these visits. Carol distributed and briefly discussed a handout regarding the guidelines and procedures for academic program review. We have successfully argued for the need to have two internal reviewers (one from within the college but from a different department and one external to the college) and two reviewers external to the university.  For the Office of Sponsored Research it was a very positive experience especially since the unit has undergone so much transition. Choice of external reviewers is important – to have a national reputation but still understand the mission of the university.  Anthropology was up for review last year. We highlighted issues we had in terms of roles and duties of individual faculty members and support as the program has grown. The incoming department head participated in the review process, which helped to determine the coming agenda and really assisted with leadership transition.  Carol distributed Annual Assessment reports/program portfolios. All programs are involved in this initiative. These can be found on the share drive.  Outdated cross walks/articulation agreements on the website presented a problem recently. Do these in some way need to be updated routinely possibly as part of the program review process? We need to look at MOUs every year. |
| **Capital Campaign**  **(Jennifer McDonough/**  **Jim Miller)** | Discussion took place regarding the upcoming capital campaign. |