**MINUTES**

**February 1, 2011, 9:00a.m. -12:00 p.m.**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Present** | Linda Stanford, James Zhang, Louis Buck, Robert Kehrberg, Carol Burton, Perry Schoon, Wendy Ford, Dana Sally, Beth Lofquist, Marie Huff, Brian Railsback, Scott Higgins, Regis Gilman |
| **Guests** | Bob Beichner (ACE Fellow) |
| **Recorder** | Anne Aldrich |

**ANNOUNCEMENTS/INFORMATION**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Dana Sally** | The library now has a second entrance to the library commons on the ground floor. |
| **Scott Higgins** | The Third Annual Faculty Scholarship celebration and reception is February 22 at 4:30. |
| **Beth Lofquist** | The February 7th Department Head Workshop is cancelled. |
| **Linda Stanford** | Linda reminded COD of Steven Leath’s visit to campus on February 3rd and 4th. Linda will follow up on details regarding legislators coming to campus at end of February. |

**DEAN’S ROUNDTABLE**

There are no items.

**TASK INTRODUCTION AND DISPOSITION**

There are no items.

**DISCUSSION**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Language for Non-Reappointments**  **(Mary Ann Lochner)** | Deans have RIF information that has been provided in previous meetings. If an SPA position is filled and you are utilizing a RIF, you must comply with Policy 23which pertains to SPA. It comports in all respects to state personnel policy and law.  We have to provide 30 days written notice and payouts which involve a severance prescribed by the state. Kathy Wong wants the list of these individuals given to her. She will compile a spreadsheet including payout information and the date notice is due. At the conclusion, we are obligated by law to have Henry Wong take a look to make sure there are not disparate impact issues.  Career status employees (2 years continuous status) get priority if we rehire and they have to request it. Priority consideration lasts 12 months. We have to pay health insurance for one year. This payout comes out of the department. Human Resources generate the notice. Those on disability will require further conversation with Human Resources and Legal Council.  The March 1st date is not so tied to the 30 day notice as much as getting the payouts completed this fiscal year. This also impact EPA non- faculty.  **Q:** If you RIF’d someone, then were able to rescind the RIF, can you rehire that person?  **A:** Circumstances make it difficult to “rescind” the RIF notice. Further, we would have to consider priority consideration requests in filling the position in question. Discussion ensued.  **Q:** If you are terminated for cause, you must have documentation to that point - performance documentation. Can performance be considered in a RIF?  **A:** Termination for cause is a different matter than termination related to a RIF. While “relative efficiency” (performance) may be considered in determining retention of employees, do not confuse termination for cause/performance with RIF processes.  **Q:** What about EPA non-faculty?  **A:** EPA non-faculty are at- will employees unless they have a contract for a stated term. Termination is accomplished with a discontinuation of appointment letter - all terminations go through Human Resources and all letters are developed by Human Resources, even faculty. EPA-non faculty (depending on length of service) get 30, 60, or 90 days of notice or severance. Sick leave is not paid out but can be reinstated at a later date. Payouts are vacation and bonus leave only. Health care is also paid for one year for EPA non-faculty.  **Q:** What about faculty?  **A:** For fixed term faculty on a year to year contract, just don’t renew the contract. There is no letter and no timely notice rights under the Code. Notice is given the moment the contract is signed. It is appropriate to have a face to face with conversation with all. With faculty you should state when their last day is based on the contract.  **Q:** Can we buy out a fixed term contract that has not expired?  **A:** It has not been done. The answer is probably no because there are a number of state fiscal/audit laws and regulations that basically prohibit the state from paying for services or goods it didn’t actually receive, except in cases of settlements of bona fide disputes. While this is a common practice in the private sector, there are a number of issues for public agencies and we would want guidance from GA before moving forward with this practice.  **Q:** Can you buy out a phased retirement?  **A:** No for the same reasons stated above.  **Q:** Are fixed term faculty on multiyear contact the same as tenure track?  **A:** No. The due process/notice provisions in the Faculty Handbook pertaining to the termination of employment prior to the expiration of a multi-year fixed term contract are the same as for termination of tenured faculty. See Section 4.09(D).  **Q:** What about when we close a program?  **A:** Do not confuse program elimination and curtailment with the current program evaluation or prioritization activities. To curtail or eliminate a program, Section 605 of the Code provides that the determination must be made by the Chancellor after consultation with academic administration and the faculty, subject to concurrence by the President and approval by the Board of Governors. Right now you are searching for institutional efficiencies that may or may not lead to the above. You can choose to not reappoint someone for any reason other than impermissible reasons – violation of First Amendment Rights, unlawful discrimination, and personal malice You can say you are looking at reorganizing, etc and decisions are being made based on institutional needs and resources, which is legitimate and permissible  **Q:** Can we put a program on inactive status to get students through?  **A:** You can minimize enrollment and make some RIF decisions, but frame it in terms of economic efficiencies and performance of programs in all ways. You cannot use the words eliminate or curtailment until it has gone through the process at GA.  To make a program inactive is a campus process. |
| **IT Project Rating (Anna McFadden/**  **Craig Fowler)** | Anna distributed two documents for COD review. She asked the deans to look at a large spreadsheet, up to 106 projects and with the understanding that all are not on the list. IT has 44 projects that have been prioritized, including those that come through the governance process and IT infrastructure items that were already being worked on. Those with a zero have been completed. Those in yellow came through the Administrative Technology Advisory Committee – compliance issues. Those in blue came through the Academic Technology Advisory Committee. IT has added 60 to the list that have not been prioritized yet. Ten projects have come fully through the governance process – most from the academic side. IT had two projects that went to Executive Council.  The second handout refers to defining what goes through the governance process – Anna reviewed the document with COD. One handout defined what goes through the project process.  **Q:** (Concerning the $5000 cost to define a project) Is the total cost to IT or total of project to both groups?  **A:** The total implementation cost both.  **Q:** Who initiates an unfunded mandate from GA that is campus related?  **A:** Contact Anna and let her know the situation. She will indicate if it is a compliance problem in which case it will move up the ladder regarding priority.  Even within IT we have been surprised at the number of projects – we are hoping the approach we are taking will help people to feel better. Is there any feedback about meetings and councils?  **Q:** Are these documents on your webpage?  **A:** No, but we will email it out to the deans. IT staff are going through project management training. Discussion ensued.  Craig reviewed the handout with COD regarding IT direction statements. The Student Technology Commons in the library is the place to go for IT services. That is where the Help Desk is now located. Carol gave kudos on the space. The Board of Trustees will tour it on March 11.  We have implemented a pricing initiative on pc’s where those in the UNC system pay the same across the board – it is working well. There have been questions about the exception process put in place – with this process we are having insight into things – in most cases we have been able to come up with some things that lowered the costs.  Craig spoke about the IT budget. The IT budget reduction is about $400,000 – involves a couple of vacant positions, etc. This will be applied to the million dollar short fall.  A few years ago, IT had to borrow $1.7 million to do basic support and is now paying this debt service. We also are going to have to absorb duties that GA is cutting. We have been conducting some analysis on our website; one is to see which sites at WCU are visited most frequently. If you want to look at this data, we will share: within academics the #1 hit is Hunter Library, #2 is College of Education and Allied Professions, and #3 is nursing. We have lots of data about the website, so as you think about how you want academics to look we can work with you on this. Let Craig and Anna know.  We currently have 250 people on campus doing content work on websites – that’s a lot of people, but also a good thing. We are trying to look for an audience from a web services perspective – should we gather these folks, share lessons learned, etc. We have 150 websites.  **Q:** Why do deans have to sign off on devices to have email pushed, since faculty are paying out of their own pocket?  **A:** An audit requirement. |
| **Commencement Re-visioning**  **(Brian Railsback)** | If COD can agree on this document, where do we go with it from here? Brian is going to move it to Erin McNelis; will also meet with Fred (but does not want it to go to the commencement committee) and will get it to SGA. About half the faculty rent their regalia. Deans discussed what their experiences were at other institutions. Beth will put this on her task list. |

**PROVOST UPDATES**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Budget** | Linda clarified the budget cut scenario with the deans.  SPA cuts need to be notified by March 1. Human Resources need at least two weeks for paperwork, payout, etc. Linda will meet with each dean individually to execute a plan – beginning next week. Faculty schedules are due February 14th. The first 5% is pretty fixed, but can be tweaked. Joe will attend these meetings with Linda and each dean and he will immediately make any changes necessary at that time. We need to be in position to give dollars to Linda on February10th. We will follow by looking at the next 5% - we will bring low enrolled programs bring back to COD. For those whose contracts will not be renewed because of performance, deans follow the usual procedures. For those not renewed because of resources, there is particular language to use. |
| **Workload Model** | We never made any decisions as to how we are going to look at work load - a SCH/FTE model or course model. Should it be variable by college? We are not consistent across departments or colleges. Robert said this is a challenge in CFPA. All deans appear to have a workload methodology they are using. Robert suggested each dean put together a statement as to how they operate regarding workload in their college, and then compare them. The last study asked each college to monitor this by looking at work load. There was no master plan or consistent form. Discussion ensued.  Brian described a time when English faculty could volunteer to do a 4/5 load – it had a major negative impact on the quality of the courses, which ultimately impacts retention. A motion was made to have fixed term faculty teach a 4/5 load (excludes lecturers unless otherwise designated by the dean) and there will a decreased service expectation. The motion did not carry. Deans will set the standard for workload based on faculty active scholarship on institutional needs and essential services. Linda will communicate this because of the concern about workload. |
| **Classrooms** | Is there any information the Provost Office can provide regarding classroom? We need rooms for over 40 students, or other spaces that can be converted to classroom use. The registrar is looking at ways to increase class size spaces. Dr. Bob Beichner (ACE Fellow) offered his assistance in this area. Discussion ensued regarding what deans are doing in this regard. |
| **TPR Process** | Linda has revised the guidelines and asked the deans to be sure to bring the charge to the committee. Natalie will resend the charge to the deans. We want candidates to present their own portfolio to the college committee rather than have the department head do it. We’ll have a post mortem on TPR. Discussion ensued. |
| **Changes to Mini-mester** | It has been decided there will be no residential availability during mini-mester. If deans have concerns about that decision, we need to know. Currently there are only 30 students living on campus and we have only one restaurant open. Beth will let Sam know from COD there is a request to have some eating place available for students, faculty and staff. |
| **Summer Session – 4 day work week** | We are receiving feedback on making summer a 4 day week – Beth is waiting to hear from the calendar committee and associate deans. Larry has already worked out a class schedule that may work for summer. Robert mentioned camp and summer workshops he runs that will need access to certain buildings – to change for summer 2011 would be next to impossible. Discussion ensued. Beth is putting together a document with feedback and what it would take to do this. |
| **Night Lighting on Campus** | Concern was voiced over lighting at night on campus – like having the jumbo-tron lit up at night on the football field. There is lots of night time waste of energy – we might want to revisit this discussion. Dana will follow up with Lauren Bishop as to how we can give input into energy reduction. Discussion ensued. |