**MINUTES**

**May 21, 2013, 10:00-12:00**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Present** | Mark Lord, Brian Railsback, Marie Huff, Robert Kehrberg, Richard Starnes, Dale Carpenter, Mimi Fenton, Regis Gilman, Carol Burton, Darrell Parker |
| **Guests** | Chip Ferguson for James Zhang, Greg Hodges, Mark Stoffan for Dana Sally |
| **Recorder** | Anne Aldrich |

**DISCUSSION**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Budget (Mark Lord)** | The budget was released last night. There has been considerable discussion as to what this means. The specific cut is on the higher end – it will still be tough to assess where we are. We are still hoping for enrollment growth and tuition increase funds. Enrollment projections are all strong. Retention is looking good. Once the state settles on a budget we still have to wait for BOG regarding what it means for us. No budget decisions will be made before the Chancellor returns to campus on May 31st.  There have been funds set aside at Biltmore Park (Kimmel School) to re-establish funding offering graduate and undergraduate classes and working with high schools and community colleges focusing on STEM programs. These will be primarily night classes. This could be the push to help us get more space at Biltmore Park.  There is still lack of clarity regarding the future of NCCAT. It will be challenging for WCU to assume NCCAT in the unfortunate case that it is not funded. There are no operational resources allocated to support it.  Mark distributed several handouts for COD review. Each dean highlighted important aspects of their submission. We will follow up this meeting with a 3 tier ranking. If there is something ranked low and it is an action we should take regardless of the budget cut mandate, please provide that feedback. Mark reviewed the handout with COD.  We will try to send the summary information out by the end of the day. We will abide by the same rules as before. If there are items we can move forward with because they are good strategic decisions, let’s move on those items. |
| **Program Prioritization**  **(Mark Lord)** | Mark distributed the final report to the deans. This should be posted by tomorrow morning for the campus community and the general public. This will provide information regarding committee processes, how they accomplished their work and the rationale behind these processes. Mark reviewed the layout of the report with COD. It is important to know the committee did not come to these decisions easily. It was very difficult. The comments included were edited to reflect consensus, not outlier opinions. Letters were sent out to students on category 3 programs last week. The Chancellor sent letters to these programs outlining his process and the scheduling of appeal meetings around mid-June. The Chancellor has committed to making his decisions by the end of July.  The coordination committee (basically logistics) has been meeting on myriad issues. We will need to discuss teach out plans, frequently asked question, and timelines. We are trying to schedule another forum once the Chancellor is back on campus, probably the 2nd week in June. Once the Chancellor has made his decisions we will move forward with the processes through GA and SACS. One major item is how we communicate with students. Deans’ positive constructive leadership will be critical during this time working with faculty, staff and students. Discussion ensued.  It was suggested the same letter go to all students (current and potential) in the targeted programs. We are still determining who the letters should come from – program director, department head, dean, and/or the graduate school. All programs recommended for discontinuation should begin to look at what teach out plans might look like – we will begin to develop models along with internal models that have been used before. Minors must also be taught out.  Carol Burton and Sam Miller have been discussing with their staffs the communication strategy with undergraduates. It will be important ultimately to be able to share with the campus and greater community how the program prioritization process reflects institutional mission and outcomes as well as how it provides savings to the university. We also need to think about communication with alumni from your colleges – this is not as immediate. Deans need to review if you have scholarships in any of these program areas—work with development. |