**MINUTES**

**November 9, 2010, 8:00a.m. -12:00 p.m.**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Present** | Robert Kehrberg, Scott Higgins, Brian Railsback, Perry Schoon, Louis Buck, Marie Huff, Wendy Ford, Dana Sally, Regis Gilman, Linda Stanford |
| **Guests** | Larry Hammer, Melissa Wargo |
| **Recorder** | Anne Aldrich |

**ANNOUNCEMENTS/INFORMATION**

There are no items.

**DEAN’S ROUNDTABLE**

There are no items.

**TASK INTRODUCTION AND DISPOSITION**

There are no items.

**DISCUSSION**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Multi-Campus Scheduling**  **(Larry Hammer/**  **Melissa Wargo)** | We are beginning discussions related to the opening of the new health building. Larry has some good ideas for tackling scheduling issues. Larry reviewed a power point with COD. Linda has requested Melissa and Larry meet with various stakeholders and bring her a proposal by March.  The primary issue is the 15 minute break between classes which is problematic for students and faculty to move between two campuses. They are going to start building the schedule of classes on the millennial campus next spring – registration will begin sooner. The intention is to hold the schedule for only HHS for three years, then will open it up to others. Discussion ensued. |
| **Space Management Policy**  **(Melissa Wargo)** | Melissa reviewed the revised policy with COD. She incorporated all the suggested changes.  **Q:** How do we initiate the process to renovate a space?  **A:** We are not sure, but will follow up with Facilities Management and add that in if there is a policy.  **Q:** Will there be a timeline.  **A:** It is as needed. COD unanimously approved.  The policy will be submitted to Executive Council next. |
| **Summer Session**  **(Linda)** | Reconsideration of Summer SCH Focus:  Online residential will be re-coded as online distance. We are going back to the 2009 summer model. Is there any discussion? We have to grow residential summer and this will make money. Be thinking about your summer offerings.  APR Summer Session Guidelines:  #2 – Course Classifications and Instructor Compensation - Regis questioned the pay rate for retired faculty – difficult to come up with the funds. We are not sure where this rate of pay came from – Linda will talk with Beth and we will bring it back with more information. Discussion ensued.  #8 –Faculty Summer Course Load - There has been a request to increase the course load for summer - to make it unlimited. COD reviewed the handout indicating what Faculty Senate has passed. Discussion ensued. Linda strongly urged the deans to attend Faculty Senate meetings so they are aware of the issues being raised. Linda will request the word “ultimately” be changed on this document.  Summer session revenues are final, the money is posted. The provost office has $40,000 – there is a number of things we have to pay out of that – Ann Green’s salary, marketing materials for next year, etc. We will have about $68,000 to work with. How should we spend that money? These funds have to be spent this year by July 1. The provost could pick up the asset fee cost for all the colleges, use these funds for fixed term full time faculty to travel to conferences or put into scholarly development fund (sabbatical)-we have four. Senate denied a motion to include these individuals in the chancellors travel fund. Discussion ensued.  Linda asked for a small group of deans to join her in a discussion with Craig regarding the asset fee, specifically regarding computer labs – Wendy, Louis volunteered. Anne will set up a meeting. If others have questions please send to Anne.  Linda, Wendy and Louis will meet with Craig to determine the asset cost. The Provost will cover those fees and leave the deans the resources they need to do other things. Robert is opposed to this decision – would prefer to give travel funds to fixed term faculty. |
| **Prioritizing Academic Programs (Linda Stanford)** | We are looking at a 4 billion dollar deficit rather than a 3 billion dollar deficit for the state which will mean more cuts. Erskine Bowles has talked about combining campuses. Bardo thinks workload may be legally mandated in this climate. The new regime would rather not have government pay, so likely will support an increase in fees. Program prioritization must be done.  Linda distributed handouts for COD review. One handout is Perry’s program prioritization process. Perry looked at the desired outcomes of a program prioritization process. We need to look at a 20% scenario and be prepared to make our own decisions. We need faculty input. Discussion ensued.  This will be an institutional perspective – not necessarily taking 20% from each college. Facilities for certain programs are critical and this creates a sustainability issue. This process should also be applied to the support units. Anything that takes a resource is a program.  Discussion ensued regarding the advisory committee that will be formed to look at program prioritization. We are going to have a process in the colleges. Each college does not have to use the same process. Once the colleges conclude their process, an Academic Affairs process will commence with a committee of 9 -11 people made up of faculty, deans, administrators and other important people. We cannot cut more operations, it must be programs. Tuition increases are not going to solve the problem. The process needs to be completed by the colleges by February 15.  Sixty-seven percent of Arts and Sciences dollars are spent on service to other colleges programs, thus Wendy is asking for some flexibility in how programs are defined. The committee will have a process. Linda will make an announcement to faculty – that program prioritization is coming. Linda will run the email by the deans before she sends it out. |
| **Tenure and Promotion Charge (Linda Stanford)** | Linda met with the committee and they redid the charge which is attached. The changes are what the committee was already doing, it just weren’t reflected in the document. The most important part is the procedures regarding what the deans have to do to present.  Linda reviewed this with the deans. You will be called ten minutes before you are to present. The presentations given should be short, demonstrate the dean’s thorough knowledge of the candidate, and summarize their most important attributes. If a committee member does not review the files, they cannot vote; if they are not present, they cannot vote; if they are not there for discussions, they cannot vote. Deans must stay within timeline and answer questions. The first bullet is the most important – the committee reads these documents very well and will expect the deans to be able to speak to the candidate. Discussion ensued.  Linda will sit down with the committee one more time to be sure they understand the Boyer model. Linda will look at the word “advocate” and just say the dean will summarize….as they relate to the CRD. |
| **Boyer Language for Ads**  **(Linda Stanford)** | Is everybody comfortable creating their own statement regarding Boyer? COD agreed this should be at the college level. We need to be consistent – Linda asked each college to have ONE statement rather than specific to programs. |
| **Post Tenure Review Process**  **(Linda Stanford)** | Linda asked for a comment section for deans for department head post tenure review. If a dean disagrees, they will write a letter that will be attached to the AA12. This comes forth to the dean. This would probably require some new goals be attached for this person and it would be reviewed the next go round. Faculty Senate went back to the Code and it said review has to be one level above the faculty. Deans have comment and signature review on department heads only. |
| **Liberal Studies**  **(Regis Gilman)** | Regis gave handout regarding spring 2011 liberal studies, Cullowhee, distance and GAE campuses. She reviewed with COD. |