**MINUTES**

**October 2, 2012, 10:00 p.m. - 12:00 p.m.**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Present** | Angi Brenton, Marie Huff, Robert Kehrberg, Mimi Fenton, Richard Starnes, Mark Lord, James Zhang, Dale Carpenter, Carol Burton, Dana Sally |
| **Guests** | Debbie Burke for Darrell Parker, Melissa Wargo, Susan Fouts for Regis Gilman |
| **Recorder** | Anne Aldrich |

**ANNOUNCEMENTS/INFORMATION**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Program Prioritization (Angi)** | We held the first meeting of the Program Prioritization Task Force on Monday, October 1st. We are off to a good start and will meet again next Monday, October 8th. |
| **Arts and Sciences Dean Search (Angi)** | We have established the search committee for the Arts and Sciences Dean search. Sean O’Connell will be chairing. |
| **Health and Human Sciences Dean Search (Angi)** | We are in the process of establishing the search committee for the Health and Human Sciences Dean search. |

**DISCUSSION**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Space Utilization (Melissa Wargo)** | This was the hot item at the Board of Governors meeting last week. They have the mistaken notion that if we are doing distance education we don’t need buildings anymore; the other concern is they do not believe we are fully utilizing our current space.  Melissa distributed an additional handout - GA’s report on space utilization for the system – Melissa excerpted what she deemed important. We maintain an inventory of our facilities, coded based on purpose, updated annually. GA matches our space inventory to our space location file and from that they develop this utilization report. They have standards they use to consider “good use of space.” 35 hours of instruction in a classroom is considered good. They also look at lab space, dependent upon type of lab – pegged to disciplines. Some computer labs are included. We also have open computer lab space and those usage times are very flexible.  GA looks at average hours of use and seat utilization. They are using standards defined in the 1970’s which are outdated based on current classroom configurations. On average, WCU has not been very good at utilizing space for many reasons: we have spaces not furnished appropriately; we have not made sure smaller classes are in smaller spaces likes conference rooms, etc.  Angi suggested a couple of ideas – we may want to go back through and reassess if classes are assigned appropriately to make sure our records are accurate – we try to do this but do not always know how a space is being utilized. We have improved a lot by trying to clean up inventory, making sure rooms are coded appropriately, going to an electronic system to assign classrooms.  **Q:** If a faculty member schedules a study session in a space, is that being reported?  **A:** No, but that would not count because it is not direct instruction.  **Q:** What about library space – is the entire library scheduled?  **A:** Melissa will follow up.  **Q:** If we scheduled study sessions as labs, would they count?  **A:** Yes. And you could schedule it that way.  The ideal space factor is .79. Our space factor has been steadily improving, ours is now 1.04. ASU and Wilmington utilize their space better than most. We are doing better at matching our classes to spaces.  **Q:** What happens when a building goes off line?  **A:** It comes off of our space inventory.  We are still having coding issues. This maybe a project to take on building by building as it gains significance with BOG. Another document included in your materials will allow you to drill down and look at departments that may identify areas that could be improved. We will likely come back to this as an action item later.  R25 was good for scheduling centralized courses, the down side is that it has allowed us to concentrate instruction in certain time periods – we may need to look at the up and down sides of R25 – we may need to go back to select situations where departments schedule their own classrooms again. That would provide deans responsibility and accountability. |
| **COACHE Survey Results (Mark)** | We have been participating in the COACHE survey since 2005. The survey is administered by Harvard University and issued to 150 institutions and covers a large cross section. The surveys try to get quality of life/experience for faculty. Attached is the summary sheet for our 2011 data. Mark reviewed the handout.  Traditional strengths from prior surveys is collegiality, faculty rated local level and department high. This was done over multiple weeks last fall. We were in a very transitory phase at this time, so it may be difficult to determine what people were responding to. The point of this survey is to be able to discuss some of the items that emerge so we can attempt to address these concerns. Discussion ensued.  The response rate for WCU is 57%. The full report will be posted online. We will revisit results at COD. For the Department Heads’ workshop we will discuss and shift to think about what we can improve and who will be responsible for driving that. The raw data sent down to college level and some department level data is dependent upon the response rate – IOPE is working on this. The authors of the survey have published a book – it may be worth a look. Discussion ensued. |
| **Priorities for Tuition Increase Funds (All)** | The Tuition and Fee Committee is co-chaired by Sam and Alecia Page (SGA President). Our priorities are due in December. The committee composition is designated by GA and requires a certain percent of students. This committee is required to present to Faculty Senate this year.  The portion we are offering input on is the local tuition increase rate that comes to Academic Affairs with the exception of student scholarships. We need to set priorities to agree on how we will utilize those funds. The committee is settling on allocating 20% of CITI (Campus Initiated Tuition Increase) to need-based scholarship and 5% to merit-based scholarship. There has been a negative reaction from BOG to the high rate of increases in tuition going to cover need based students. There has been some movement from setting a minimum to setting a maximum.  We used 30 % to cover New Century Scholars which had run out of funds. We still have $1.8 million in instructional deficits – salaries and IT. We have individuals in permanent full time positions being paid out of temporary funds. We are allowed to allocate a portion to salary increases or new positions. This is to define broad categories. Discussion ensued.  Some campuses have revised and added in lab fees, course fees, etc. – we are the highest in E&T in the system but we just have the one fee. We may increase our health fee.  Priorities for consideration put forth are salary increases, library, graduate assistantships, Biltmore Park, new positions, and research support – we may have about 75% to utilize. Discussion ensued. The following was agreed upon: 25% for salary increases, 10% for graduate assistantships, 10% library, whatever is left after IT will go to (20-30%) new faculty positions. |
| **Enrollment Projections (All, Melissa Wargo)** | The handout is the compilation of estimates individuals provided. There are a few questions that we need to have deans provide us some rationale. Discussion ensued. We discussed questions on specific programs to make sure we understood college estimates. |
| **Intent to Plan: Entrepreneurship Certificate**  **(Debbie Burke)** | We would like a four course (12 hours) course that centers on innovation and creativity – geared toward Biltmore Park and Mission Hospital. Mission Hospital has indicated an interest in having higher level administrators go through something like this – continuing education; ultimately this four credit course would exist for a wider audience. To get credit with GA, a certificate must be at least 18 hours – something to consider doing. Eighteen hours is the requirement to be eligible for financial aid. Discussion ensued. COD unanimously voted to approve. |
| **Articulation Agreement between SOCW and SCC Human Services**  **(Marie Huff)** | SOCW wants to create an articulation agreement with SCC duplicating that with SWC. COD voted unanimously to approve. |
| **Grant Proposals and the Office of Research**  **(Lynda Parlett)** | Lynda distributed an information packet and reviewed the materials. The Office of Research added a Research Compliance Office this past year. They are working very diligently with providing personalized support services to faculty and staff for research. The Endowed Professor Committee agreed to mentor faculty as new PI’s. Please be reminded that all research proposals need to run through this office in order. Accountability lies with faculty, departments, deans, the chancellor and the institution due to the increasing complexity of the grant compliance arena. GA is tracking this information very carefully.  The Digital Data and Transparency Act will be going into effect at the federal level and will have a significant impact on us. It is more stringent than what we experience currently. We need your assistance in getting this information out to campus/faculty. The earlier we can get faculty involved with the research office, the better.  We need to be better at funding course release time and building a percentage of faculty salary into grant funding. We also need to consistently write graduate assistantships into our grants. Faculty need to understand they are not authorized to sign off on behalf of the university – it is unsafe for the institution for individuals to not have grants run through this office. |
| **Use of “Lecturer” vs. “Instructor” (Richard Starnes)** | This item is postponed to the next Council of Deans meeting. |
| **Expansion Budgets and Faculty Proposals (Angi)** | We submitted two proposals to GA - one to fund the Endowed Professorship in Entrepreneurship and the other is the sciences – not sure how competitive we will be.  We had the opportunity to submit three proposals for expansion budget requests. We had a number of proposals in total: 1) expand engineering to Biltmore Park; 2) expand online degree completion programs; and 3) for support of IT infrastructure. |

**REPORTS AND UPDATES**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Marie Huff** | Linda Comer received $700,000 in funding via a very competitive HRSA Grant to support students in the Family Nurse Practitioner program over the next two years. Students in the second and third year of the program will each receive around $11,000 to help defray the cost of their education!  The $100,000 equipment grant written by Marie and Linda Stanford and submitted to the Appalachian Regional Commission came through this week. The money will be spent on equipment needed to support the developing Balance and Fall Prevention Clinic. |