**MINUTES**

**April 6, 2010, 9:30a.m. -12:00 p.m.**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Present** | Shelly Hargis, Elisabeth Leonard, Wendy Ford, Pat Brown, Linda Stanford, Perry Schoon, Robert Kehrberg, Beth Lofquist, Ron Johnson, Brian Railsback, Bob McMahan |
| **Guests** | Sam Miller, Carol Burton |
| **Recorder** | Anne Aldrich |

**ANNOUNCEMENTS/INFORMATION**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Kyle** | A week ago Kyle met with the John Marshall of Rabun Gap School who is interested in trying to develop relationships in a variety of areas. They are a boarding high school with focus in fine and performing arts and the sciences. They want to be involved in engagement projects, internships, etc. Dr. Marshall will generate a list and come back to the Office of the Provost Office. Ron sits on their board. |
| **Beth** | Surveys for winter mini-mester will be coming out to faculty and students in the next week or so. It is very short and won’t take long. Please complete and spread the word to your colleges. |
| **Minutes** | The minutes of March 2, 2010 and March 16, 2010 stand approved as written. |

**DEAN’S ROUNDTABLE**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Ron** | There has been confusion and a lack of communication regarding the computers that were purchased as “refresh.” IT wished to follow the refresh policy regarding the computers that were purchased by the Provost Office share of summer revenue. There needs to be better communication between IT and COD regarding these sorts of purchases. Kyle will follow up with Craig Fowler. |
| **Perry** | Perry has heard rumors regarding deans seeing AFE’s before the faculty member see them. We have discussed problems with AFE’s that do not address areas as completely as dean may require. Kyle stated deans can hold sessions a head of time and this ought to be part of the Department Head evaluation. Deans have every right to see an AFE, review and require certain information to be there. Discussion ensued. |
| **Wendy** | Wendy brought up concerns about a resolution that is coming forth in Faculty Senate. Kyle will go back and look at this and won’t hesitate to provide clarification if needed. |

**DISCUSSION**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **University Process for Program Specific Admissions Criteria (Sam, Carol)** | A couple of programs have come to our attention over the last month that have established departmental criteria for admissions that did not go through a process – one in the College of Fine and Performing Arts and one in the College of Health and Human Sciences. There are certain issues associated with this (recruitment, truth in advertising, following correct procedures).  You have a copy of a memo from Belle Wheelan that addresses specific issues in terms of what is required for SACS. There is a need to have a process in place where all programs have to go through the curriculum process. The Retention Steering Committee made a conscious decision to work with colleges but not hold up the process, but there is a process in part. We have stumbled upon programs that have chosen to go around this process. The Wheelan email refers to just one program.  This is to discuss the process – with a timeline to make sure items are put in place in a timely manner, but follow specific standards and processes. Programs are putting this information in handbooks, on line and in handouts which indicates it has been approved when it has not. Phil Cauley is receiving calls and being asked to change and update guidelines in admissions information and he has no idea if it has been approved.  Sam asked if there is a way we can create a business practice to create an appropriate timeline to approve these sort of changes and a trigger to admissions to make these changes. Admissions upgrades materials in April and May and then have June end of year money to publish materials for end of summer delivery to start the new cycle. Once we are committed our admissions standards require that we have to give students due notice of any changes before they are admitted. There needs to be a lag for a change approved in April for another year, because you have been selling to the fall class based on old guidelines. Or do we start earlier in the year – approvals by end of fall semester for the following fall class? Another issue is the transferability of college credits and sometimes 300 level courses are being created to instill greater rigor in programs but creates problems for transfer students.  We are forming a task force (TAG) that will deal with these issues. If you think Sam’s comments make sense we can turn that task over to the associate deans group and bring it back here. Robert indicated that admissions materials need to be proofed by departments and suggested taking an inventory of departments that have an admissions requirement that is different than the standards of the university. This also needs to accurately reflect the limited number of students to be enrolled in certain programs. |
| ***Action Item*** | This task will go to associate deans to create a business practice to resolve the issue. |
| **Role of Department Head/Evaluation (Beth/Linda)** | We were waiting on the role of department head to be finalized and then merge the two documents. This year deans will have to do their own evaluation and then make changes for next year. It would be nice for department heads to review the instrument and give their feedback. Melissa will go ahead and administer the other instrument. This item will go on the department head workshop agenda for summer. |
| ***Action Item*** | Beth and Linda will meet and merge those two documents. Anne will meet with Linda to do a one final review. |
| **Intent to Plan (Nursing ) Linda** | This was dealt with in a previous COD meeting. |
| **Summer Session Distance Faculty Compensation (Beth)** | Beth explained the rules governing the spreadsheet handout. It is broken down according to college. Based on faculty salary, we pretended like they reached their target enrollment, the pay received plus benefits is in the column, based on this year’s activity. The new rules stipulate salaries are to be prorated, so if a course is cross listed with two other resident courses, 1/3 will come out of distance and 2/3 out of residence. XL means cross listed. This is not actual because we don’t know what the enrollment will be. This is an example. This is a padded estimate, because likely we won’t reach these enrollment targets.  Keep in mind the benefits formula is .815%. We would like to stay with the model we have created and as a contingency, the Provost share of the revenue could assist deans if they spend more than they earn. Also, by that time we may also have a new budget. |
| ***Action Item*** | Deans please review the numbers for your college realistically and get back with Beth and Ann as soon as possible. |

**REPORTS AND UPDATES**

There are no items.

c: Terry Welch