**MINUTES**

**September 25, 2013, 2:00-5:00**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Present** | Darrell Parker, Lowell Davis, Dana Sally, Susan Fouts, Kim Ruebel, Mimi Fenton, Dale Carpenter, Doug Keskula, Richard Starnes, James Zhang, Brian Railsback |
| **Guests** | Emily Sharpe for Brian Railsback, Brian Gastle, John West for Robert Kehrberg, Andrea Moshier |
| **Recorder** | Anne Aldrich |

**ANNOUNCEMENTS**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Educational Advisory Board (Beth)** | Would anyone be interested in attending the Educational Advisory Board Conference in Washington D.C.? Lowell and Carol will attend. |

**DISCUSSION**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Degree Requirements vs. Program Requirements**  **(Kim Ruebel)** | Kim distributed a handout for COD review. There have been conversations regarding what is required for a degree versus what is required for a program. This information is not always included in the catalog. We have begun to look at the catalog – the handout is from Larry based on what he has found thus far. We would like the catalog to clearly state these requirements which may require adding language rather than just editing what is currently there.  Do you support making this change (not changing the requirement, but making it the same as the degree audit) or do you think it should go through curriculum committee? The issue with graduate students is the requirement of a minimum of 1 hour course credit during the semester in which the student’s degree will be conferred. This is an unenforceable policy – so the graduate school is struggling with this (also a GA policy). Discussion ensued.  It was proposed to require a 0-1 hour comprehensive continuance course if needed to resolve this issue, cover university resources being used and thus satisfy the policy. COD agreed with this proposal.  If comprehensives are not included in the degree requirement it needs to be added to the catalog as an editorial change. If there is no documentation that it ever went through the process, it needs to go through the process. |
| **Department Head Workshops / Use of Indirects**  **(Brian Gastle)** | Department Head Workshops - In preparation for the Department Head workshop (including feedback from last year) we wanted time set aside at the end of the workshop with just department heads without staff or others present. Is that okay with the deans? It was asked why the deans need to go to these workshops in the first place? Discussion ensued.  Some deans wish to go just for information, but offered to make this optional and have Natalie send minutes to the deans for their information. We will have the deans continue to come for a portion then dismisses them.  Use of Indirects - Mimi distributed handouts for COD review. Indirects can be for institutional overhead. Mimi introduced Andrea Moshier, compliance officer. What we hear most often is a misconception about what indirects can and cannot be used for. Indirects are low hanging fruit in federal discussions, like a tax to support institutions to do research so we have to justify these expenditures – more like a reimbursement to do the research we do.  An innovative uses of indirects could be agency visits. This may be discussed at the department head workshop. Previously, we requested information from all deans as to how they have used their indirects this past year – we will follow up with Greg regarding this data. Some deans may not have submitted this information. We should be able to pull this information from Banner and see if we need to adjust anything.  James has used it to support research related activities – graduate student fellowships and to hire student workers during the summer to work on faculty led research projects. For advice on this, go to Andrea. Once we have the report we will know more. This report will go to BOG and this is considered very low hanging fruit at the state level. Andrea will send the indirect report to Anne who will distribute to the deans. |
| **Lapsed Salaries (Beth)** | We had requested proposals for lapsed salaries. We received one from Doug yesterday (will be put on a spreadsheet) and one from Dana (automatic). Doug has had two people move from leadership positions to faculty positions thus need to pay out about $35,000. We are looking for a way to fund this by the end of the year. We will discuss these as they come forward. Do we want to automatically use position line to cover pay outs? Or do we want to utilize lapsed salary for this? In some cases it could require the position to be vacant too long to cover this, however under normal circumstances this should not be a problem. This would be a good automatic proposal if the position is needed and will create undue hardship. We will look at lapsed recurring dollars once a month to capture these. |
| **Staffing Plans for 2014-15 and recruiting funds**  **(Beth Lofquist)** | We need to reduce this fund by $65,000. Deans reviewed the list and discussion ensued. It was suggested computers for new faculty/staff come from lapsed salaries. We could set aside $25,000 for computers for these positions. We can reclassify funds for computers tied to these positions. |
| **Endowed Professors (Beth Lofquist)** | The Kimmel 2 Endowed Professorship is currently held by Patrick Gardner. Kimmel 1 will be searched this year and Cass Ballenger for the fall of 2014 – we have funding for both. The Ballenger professorship will be the department head for engineering. These are the only professorships we are going to hire this year. Professorships that are Spangler funded are term limited but others are not and can be tenured. |
| **Tuition and Fees (Beth Lofquist)** | Greg distributed handouts for COD review, guidelines were distributed earlier. There are two packets – one for special fee requests and the second for differentiated tuition with three criteria: 1) program has higher costs; 2) demand for graduates is high; and 3) graduates have high starting salaries. We would have a good chance of getting one if we can meet these three criteria.  Engineering has a $75 fee per semester to support general student instruction related activities – it cannot be used to send faculty to conferences. It has to be student related. We are not sure if we can use it for student travel, and have not thus far. Engineering would meet these criteria - if granted where does the actual money go? The program gets the money. Students have to be declared majors to pay the differential tuition. Beth asked deans to look across the state and see where they are instituting differential tuition. To our knowledge most are graduate programs; however some institutions are instituting an undergraduate nursing differential tuition.  Beth reviewed the timeline provided. Student forums are mandated for proposed differential tuition – we have merged these forums into faculty, staff and student forums. The timeline is very tight. We must have proposals to Greg by Monday at noon so we can finalize in COD on Tuesday. Greg will put it together and we will discuss at the October 1st COD in our extended meeting.  Discussion ensued regarding doing this for a relatively small number of students in some cases. James raised question on page 8 of report re School of Engineering – Beth will have Greg follow up. Discussion ensued. |
| **CAO Updates**  **(Beth Lofquist)** | We are getting many, many requests from GA. Fortunately we have been paying close attention so we are staying very much on top of it. There is a lot going on at GA.  After Beth’s attendance at the CAO meeting, her notes and packets of information were provided for your information – the major agenda items. Note initials by specific items that are being taken care of by specific individuals.  Beth referenced the articulation agreement item – some of you have reviewed the proposal and given feedback. It indicates there would be 30 common hours across all institutions that will be automatically transferred into each institutions general education liberal studies program and 5-6 hours that would automatically transfer for pre-majors no matter what community college they go to. The rule would still be AA and AAS degrees will automatically transfer thus a student’s liberal studies would be taken care of. Discussion ensued – this will be a nightmare to implement and monitor. Pre-majors are not just professional but all pre-majors. Some might have accreditation issues as well as SACS issues. Discussion ensued.  E-learning data findings – we looked at Ds, Ws, and Fs across sections that were online versus face to face, with everything else the same and looked at grade distribution. Susan is pulling raw data to review. Our charge is to ensure quality of online instruction. One of the issues that came up is why are we treating online differently than face to face? There will be much more to come about this topic with more emphasis on how we ensure quality in our online courses.  We have created a separate evaluation for online instruction. Is there any other assessment being done, like peer observation? CEAP does peer observation and peer mentors; COB move to pay attention to synchronous time. Are you using Skype or Go-To-Meeting so students feel they have met the instructor? Entrepreneurship is doing this as well as having serious discussions if an instructor is just posting materials online and not really engaging with students. Faculty need to know these are being examined, the methodology may need tweaking, but still it is being looked at.  Post Tenure review – needs to be rigorous. We have tried to help GA understand we do not need to fire people in order to improve, action plans work.  New program proposals – in our curriculum proposal there is a process for us to consider what programs we wish to move forward. The APR for curriculum development is there – we can have three in the queue at one time. This will be on a future COD agenda. Other than MS in Engineering, Anne will look to see what might have been on deck previously. If you want to propose something new, bring to that meeting.  GA is now requesting a vote count from each campus for approval of these programs when they are brought forth for their consideration. Beth reviewed the notes and pertinent information. |
| **Master Planning (Melissa Wargo/**  **Sam Miller)** | Melissa and Sam met with COD to receive further feedback on the Master Planning options. |