**MINUTES**

**May 6, 2014, 10:00-12:00**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Present** | Richard Starnes, Dana Sally, Lowell Davis, Robert Kehrberg, Mimi Fenton, Alison Morrison-Shetlar, Brian Railsback, James Zhang, Dale Carpenter, Susan Fouts, Carol Burton, Doug Keskula |
| **Guests** | Greg Hodges, Craig Fowler, Dan Berk, William Frady, Tim Metz, Mark Stoffan, Chip Ferguson |
| **Recorder** | Anne Aldrich |

**ANNOUNCEMENTS**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Update from Executive Council**  **(Alison)** | * **Budget** discussions have been primary. Greg provided brief update on remaining funds and expenditures. We are considering changes in distribution of funds to get those to deans earlier rather than having funds to quickly spend at the end of the academic year. * **Student retention and enrollment numbers** – we currently have 1800 deposits; up 6.1% in applications, completed applications up 9%, up 13% in accepted applications; SAT/ACT about the same. We are significantly down in transfer students. Community colleges are down as well. We are also down in graduate students. * **Scholarships** – Alison has met with Brenda Holcombe who is doing a stellar job finding scholarships and determining those that can be changed to better address institutional needs. * **Faculty workload** is a major conversation at BOG and CAO (chief academic officers) meetings – no change in this with budget cuts at any of our institutions. In some cases, and with appropriate rationales, WCU is still below 3/3. They are asking for an explanation as to why there is no change in faculty workload. The only change is the increase in class size and even that is minimal. We have explained that our budget cuts were not so much on the Academic Affairs side, so that we preserved instructional quality, but in other areas at WCU. The BOG is looking at Delaware data analyzing faculty workload via FTE, not scholarship (endowed professorships; administrators that count as one FTE but do not have teaching responsibilities). Carnegie classification impact is not a consideration as far as BOG is concerned – the belief is all faculty should be teaching 3/3 regardless of other activities. |
| **Information on how grants count in DCRDs**  **(Mimi Fenton)** | Mimi distributed an update on the latest sponsored research activity. This is an opportunity to begin conversations with departments. GRS is happy to assist in those conversations and can also conduct a study of what comparable sister institutions are doing and how sponsored research can be included in the TPR process.  Alison wants to increase the amount of grant writing that we have, regardless of award amount - $2,000 is as impactful as $500,000. All are welcome. Alison would like for the deans to help get that message out. |

**DISCUSSION**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Thin Client Computer Technology Implementation (Craig Fowler, Dan Burke, William Frady)** | Craig, Dan and William provided a PowerPoint presentation for the COD on the implementation of Thin Client Technology.  A next step for COD is to develop an exploratory work group to work with IT. Another crucial step is a feasibility study regarding costs, etc. Greg will take the lead on working with the deans regarding a feasibility study for Academic Affairs to determine and prioritize needs, costs, and to put a plan in place to implement in collaboration with IT. |
| **Data (Tim Metz)** | We have developed a workgroup including Richard (chair), Doug, Dale and Darrell working with Tim and Larry to create the dashboard we have been discussing that will allow us to be more efficient and make data driven decisions. We also sent Tim a list of data sets we are interested in, a very fruitful process. We have much of this data, just need to determine how to access it.  Tim has met with his staff regarding the requests that came to him and distributed a summary of these academic data needs. Tim reviewed the summary with COD. The turn-around on ad hoc reports CAN be very brief, depending on the type of request, or may take quite long, if the request is complex (data not readily available), or other critical UNC-GA or Chancellor-level work is priority. OIPE plays a primary role in system reporting. Things can be raised at BOG thus a report is generated to OIPE and a response is needed to address these outside concerns – this happens regularly which interrupts internal duties to address the pressing concerns of BOG.  The focus on data for strategic decision making is priority. OIPE is able to assist individuals with report writing skills to further those skills in order to develop some self-service. Tim provided a list of who to go to for data requests:   * personnel/HR * finance/Jolene Elkins and Kristen Crosson * Advancement and Development/Jim Miller * Alumni/Marty Ramsey * Certain types of student data will come from the Registrar’s Office. You can go to the registrar’s office and pull data that you need and those reports can be created – training is needed on how to do this. It might be good to have a refresher.   Official reports vs. internal report defined - official is data that is going to be uploaded to UNC system site or other public face type of data – data is vetted and takes longer to obtain. Internal data might be something you need for a meeting at the end of the week. This is where some discrepancies can be found – official report vs. internal report.  Allocated FTE data is not in the database. It is not being maintained but would be easy to pull. It is maintained but aspects are not, such as adjunct pools. HR has a position budget that can be pulled – but HR has some concerns regarding accuracy of data. This might require a conversation between HR, OIPE and AA.  Next steps – we are very eager to work with group to focus on common elements among the deans to create a common dashboard. The office recognizes these are important and needed data elements. It is a matter of time regarding a project list as to when we can get to these items. Certain individuals in our office will be reaching out to individuals with specific data requests as soon as they are able.  It is important for us to understand what goes into the performance data so that we can influence those numbers. We are uncertain how to do that without data backup. Alison’s charge to the workgroup is by end of summer to come back with an interim report based on the information gathered as to where they are with the start of a dashboard and again in late fall as to the status. Meantime we would like recommendations regarding training. We will have some deadlines to move this forward. |
| **Strategic Planning for Biltmore Park (Doug Keskula/**  **Carol Burton)** | Doug distributed a handout regarding the plan for Biltmore Park.  The handout is summary data that has been gathered via meetings with groups of constituencies, survey results, etc.  Doug reviewed the data with the deans. The BP Strategic Planning Committee is beginning to analyze some of the data, which in some cases is requiring further exploration, and which in turn can raise more questions.  We are trying to compile as much data as possible.    Doug reviewed key points found in some of the different groups:   * We are seeing a much larger influx of empty nesters vs. young families with children but at the same time hearing that elementary school enrollments are up – as an example of an area in which we are trying to get further information. * Advanced manufacturing requires a broad range of skills/technical talent * Health care related to change in opportunities and increase in technical skills * IT skills required across all sectors * Creative arts need help, specifically business applications * WCU’s uniqueness in areas where we could provide leadership in specific areas. * WCU’s visibility has not been that great in the area - a visibility crisis that needs to be addressed in terms of utilizing space as well as academic programs offered * Ability for faculty to work together – logistics, etc.-heard this from both campuses * Having the ability to have a voice was important to both groups and very valuable on an ongoing basis as well as student feedback.     The Biltmore Park site is acutely aware of a number of competitive institutions in the area.  This is not as great a concern on the main campus.  It impacts resources, clinical sites, and internship and clinical opportunities.  Space (for faculty offices, classroom, general student use and for student support) is a concern as programs grow.    We should not pull students away from Cullowhee to grow Biltmore Park.  We need to clarify the role of the Biltmore Park site – some are still referring to it as a campus which it is not; it is an instructional site.  This also points out issues about marketing and increasing awareness.  The work group is continuing to compile this information and come up with some specific recommendations.    Main themes:   * Visibility and Marketing of WCU in region * Educational paradigms may need to change to include educational offerings in the personal growth market * Industry compliance and continuing education issues * What is the site?  What does it mean now and what will it mean in the future?   How do we Facilitate faculty connections and experiences/build community between campuses? It will be important to maintain a voice, structure to support coordination between campuses/build community   * Space (faculty, meeting, parking, academic support, etc.) is a concern across all WCU stakeholders   We hope the end result will be a strategic plan and a mission for this instructional site. |