**MINUTES**

**March 2, 2010, 10:00-12:00**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Present** | Perry Schoon, Dana Sally, Robert Kehrberg, Scott Higgins, Shelly Hargis, Wendy Ford, Bob McMahan, Pat Brown, Linda Stanford, Brian Railsback, Ron Johnson |
| **Recorder** | Anne Aldrich |

**ANNOUNCEMENTS**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Minutes** | The minutes of February 16, 2010 stand approved as written. |

**DEANS’ ROUNDTABLE**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Linda** | Linda has been approached by faculty from another college to see if WCU would support a check out system for equipment. Currently there is no good way to keep track of materials and equipment that is checked out. Dana has been approached to use the library system – not necessarly a practical solution, but we do have inventory that needs to be controlled. Linda, Perry and Dana will form a sub-committee and bring this topic back to COD. |

**TASK INTRODUCTION AND DISPOSITION**

No items.

**DISCUSSION**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Sponsored Programs**  **(Scott Higgins/**  **Shelly Hargis)** | Scott and Kyle have been investigating how effective the Office of Research Administration (sponsored programs) services have been working across campus. Extensive review by faculty focus groups, conducted by outside consultants, has been conducted and the data used to implement a goals and outcomes. The Chancellor has been concerned about the level of sponsored research. Campus and college sponsored research activity (including data points) have been provided to him.  Shelly thanked Bob McMahan for hiring and establishing a grant manager (Alison Krauss) and Linda Stanford for providing space in her college in order to provide responsive service to her faculty.  Shelly distributed information for COD specific to RAMSeS.  WCU received a mandate from GA to purchase RAMSeS in order to track all grant activity. Faculty can enter proposals, send it to the person next in the chain of command where it can be approved and then can track it throughout the whole process.  The handout provided details about the service that RAMSeS can provide to faculty and deans.  The software can track all proposals, indirect costs, student employment, etc.  This is *real time* reporting and provides an accurate record of activity at the desktop in the college. Deans and department heads can view all proposals submitted by their unit. The information on the screen will tell you where a proposal is in the approval process; if it is awaiting signature, and how long it has been waiting.  The Office of Research Administration (ORA) will start the implementation of RAMSeS in the Kimmel School. Training of the use of the software will then move to the other colleges. Staff and faculty trainings will be provided in groups as well as one-on-one training. If you are interested in being the next college after Kimmel for the roll-out of RAMSeS, contact Shelly.  Each proposal has a dashboard with a number of options.  All faculty and staff have *view only* access.  RAMSES is *live*  today and loaded with your grant information up to the last four years.  If there are any errors (information came from HR), please let Shelly know so corrections can be made.  Included in the handout is a sample report for individual colleges showing what you will see when you press “college”.  In addition there is an Excel spreadsheet option available for further college data analysis (known as the Ford Feature).  How do we go to the next level to stimulate grant activity on our campus?  The Kimmel School and College of Health and Human Sciences have been doing this with great success.  The deans need to be more aggressive in working with faculty to generate successful grant proposals. The cost of graduate assistants, travel and related expenses need to be itemized in the grant proposals.  Dana stated the Hunter Library has paid in the past to send a faculty member to Washington D.C. as this activity is very effective and provides important support.  Kyle said it would be helpful to inform Shelly when faculty are going to D.C.  Q:  Faculty have no support in the summer.  They need student support to assist them.  There is no seed money for projects for faculty to begin research.  Is this likely to change?  A:  Bardo has indicated he will look at increasing the indirect costs. In part, your discretionary funds come from the indirects.  Scott stated they have three search engines for those who need assistance on some very specialized areas.  Shelly would like to have a specific research focus for each college. Accomplished faculty should be identified by the deans and shared with ORA for the purpose of working with these faculty.  ORA is in the process of developing a share drive folder with the Development Office so both offices can share information and work more closely together in identifying funding opportunities.  Q:  Are there data bases that faculty can search independently?  A:  Yes.  Emails have been sent out 4-5 times to faculty.  We have received only a handful of replies to sign up for the data base. There just is not a lot of activity by many faculty in searching for funding opportunities for their research and creative activity.  The Provost stated it would be helpful for deans to encourage faculty to attend to schedule a meeting with Shelly to understand the funding opportunities that might be available to them.  “Eighty percent of your grant funding will come from 20% of your faculty”.  Bob stated there is a much higher likelihood of success if there is *collaboration with two or more institutions* --to know not just what agencies provide funding, but what other institutions are pursing in the same areas.  Additionally, he has found most faculty have no idea how to submit a competitive research proposal.  They simply do not know how to initiate a proposal.  It would be good to identify seasoned grant writers to become mentors for faculty.  Wendy would like for faculty to be able to go out (travel support) to investigate and work with successful grant writers. |
| **Roll Up for Fiscal Year 2010 (Kyle)** | Administration and Finance have not mentioned this to date so this is a Provost roll up. Last year around April, we were about to make a large computer purchase when everything was frozen. We are concerned this will happen again, so we want to get major purchases taken care of. For our area, the deadline is March 15. This means you need to forecast expenses for the rest of the year. If there is money left over it will be put into a pool for big ticket items. In the next week identify these items - some equipment needs have already been identified. These should be priority items deans truly need to get the job done. You will get more information from Joe or AJ within the week. This is just operational money.  Q: How does Pay for Print come into this?  A: I wouldn’t worry about it.  Everyone is having money deducted from accounts. Some deans don’t receive bills, just have money disappear from their accounts which makes it impossible to validate, verify and plan. Dr. Carter, who sits on the Paw Print Steering Committee said that right now Accounting does not have the ability to send out a bill.  Bob is now requesting quotes from Facilities Management for all things – on the last quote he received a 100% variance. Clearly, there are problems that need to be resolved. |
| **Budget Process for Fiscal Year 2011 (Kyle)** | There will be a process. More information will be coming forth. This is in reference to operational dollars, all things other than staffing plan. There will be a format to complete. Bardo is talking about having budget hearings sometime in late June. Kyle will check with AJ on information to send out regarding coverage of distance learning courses. This next year will be a stretch but you will have lapsed salaries which can be applied towards this and make up any gaps. Also there is some possibility of enrollment growth funds. |
| **Providing Graduate Assistantships within Academic Support Areas (Scott)** | Carol Burton asked Scott to bring the issue of providing GA’s to academic support units on campus. The concern is that the academic departments are not willing to give up their assistantship positions, allocated to the college, to these units.  Scott distributed a handout listing college and out-of program GA allocations for 2010-2011. The document provided evidence of the difficult balance in providing competitive stipends to grow programs and meet the specific needs of each department and college (graduate teaching assistants, research assistants, and incentives for recruiting top graduate students.) There is only a finite amount of money obligated for awarding assistantships. The amount has decreased over the past 2 years.  Wendy proposed three different possible solutions for increasing the monies for assistantships. Discussion enured about the limitation of these proposed solutions. There is strong competition at the university level for funds and graduate assistantships are not a priority right now for the funds. No further discussion or agreement by the deans regarding the issue was forthcoming. No action was taken on this matter. |
| **Hunter Scholar Award (Dana/Scott)** | Issues with release time. Historically, release time has been provided by the college and this can be problematic for several reasons: Ron pointed out that such support coming from the colleges is a type of “tax” on college faculty resources; even with funding of some type, the faculty member may not be able to be spared; or finding an adequate replacement may be difficult to impossible. We need to look at some of these programs to see if money can be made available during summer or mini-mester.  This particular award has associated with it things like graduate assistantship – a nice package – but maybe we should think about some options. What if part of the proposal specified something like a stipend during the summer? Should this be funded centrally – come out of the instructional pool – be budgeted within Scott or Dana’s area, and then they are the ones that have the funds there. It would be their funds to support the activity. The provost asked Scott and Dana to investigate and report back on a possible central funding model. |
| **Program Directors Guidelines (Linda)** | Wendy, Ron, Scott and Linda have been reviewing the guidelines. There is just one area they want to discuss with COD – page 3, relationship to Department Head. Discussion ensued and language changes were suggested.  The only other piece questioned was under Term – the last sentence. Discussion ensued and language was suggested. |
| ***Action Item*** | Linda will pass this to Anne to correct. |
| **Undergraduate TA Questions (Brian)** | These questions have been sent out to the deans. We are requesting input from deans, asking that you meet with your college leadership group around these discussions. We can pull feedback from your minutes. We need to draft a policy as quickly as possible. |
| **Summer Session Distance/Resident Cross-listed Courses (Beth)** | This item is postponed to the next COD agenda. |
| **Residential Courses Being Taught Online (Linda)** | This item is postponed to the next COD agenda. |

**REPORTS AND UPDATES**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Department Head and Dean Evaluations (Kyle)** | We are in the final editing process. We will not bring it back to COD for a line by line review. Beth has sent it to you – if you have any input, provide it by 5:00 today. We will begin mid-March. |
| **Policy #6 (Bob/Scott)** | This item is postponed to the next COD agenda. |
| **Faculty Workload (Beth/Linda)** | This item is postponed to the next COD agenda. |

**PROVOST UPDATES**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Report on CAO Meeting** | This item is postponed to the next COD agenda. |

c: Terry Welch