**MINUTES**

**July 16, 2013, 10:00-12:00**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Present** | Beth Lofquist, Susan Fouts, James Zhang, Richard Starnes, Robert Kehrberg, Doug Keskula, Carol Burton, Brian Railsback, Dale Carpenter |
| **Guests** | Mary Ann Lochner, Debbie Burke for Darrell Parker, Mark Stoffan for Dana Sally, Brian Kloeppel for Mimi Fenton |
| **Recorder** | Anne Aldrich |

**ANNOUNCEMENTS**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Dean Evaluations and AFE’s for DH’s (Beth Lofquist)** | In preparation for your next individual meeting with Beth, she will conduct a brief summary as an official evaluation for this past year based on survey results.  Please bring your proposed (2013-2014) job targets to these meetings. On your job target (Beth will send electronically) develop a report of each program in your college based on enrollment, retention rates (4 and 6 year), and the items reviewed for program prioritization asking for strategies in place for the past year. This is based on our performance-based funding model. Also add a paragraph about how your department heads have managed personnel on their AFEs.  If deans have not received their survey results, please contact Kay Turpin. If you have not finalized your department AFEs you will not receive the results of your survey. |
| **PED Report**  **(Beth Lofquist)** | Beth will send this information to you electronically. We need it this week; we received the request last year. Beth distributed a copy with the questions but it does not include Kristen’s answers which Beth will send. Beth will indicate items you need to attend to by placing your name by it. |
| **Articulation Agreement**  **(Richard Starnes)** | The College of Arts and Sciences has developed an articulation agreement with School of Science and Math. |
| **Articulation Agreement**  **(James Zhang)** | The Kimmel School has developed an articulation agreement with multiple local community colleges. |
| **Graduate School enrollment**  **(Brian Kloeppel)** | Enrollment is up 82 students for fall over last year for the graduate school. |
| **Program Prioritization Letters (Beth Lofquist)** | Letters for program prioritization are being developed. We think the letters should come from the Chancellor indicating that departments will follow up with the process for teach out plans. Beth will discuss with the Chancellor. Beth will send the draft letters to the deans so they can see what is being communicated. |

**DISCUSSION**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **TPR and BOG**  **(Mary Ann Lochner)** | You are all aware of the challenges we have had over the past many years regarding faculty and staff evaluations. Mary Ann is working with all unit managers on fundamental systemic issues that have come to the Legal Counsel Office. Mary Ann needs your help in educating your faculty, department heads, subordinate managers and collegial review committees in demystifying certain processes and to bolster our managerial capacity to deal with issues. Mary Ann has found in defending 60 legal proceedings over the past three years (state and federal levels and BOG appeals) certain themes have emerged as to faculty evaluations and management of faculty finding tremendous confusion regarding the UNC Code and Faculty Handbook.  First and foremost faculty are employees. Because they are employees there are fundamental basics that apply to *all* employees. The deans and department heads have to think about evaluating faculty in two ways: 1) professional performance based on the three legged stool of teaching, scholarship and service and 2) expectations for all faculty.  Please read the attachment and use it as a resource going forward. Items that came up most often in litigation are highlighted in the handout. Mary Ann reviewed specific items of importance:   * Page 4 – On or off campus conduct that renders faculty members unfit for their position or makes them unfit on campus and renders them subject to discipline and possible dismissal. We get to consider things that happen off campus as we consider employment at WCU. Faculty must be evaluated in the same way as every other employee. Disciplinary actions must be ongoing not waiting until the AFE. Most disturbing is that often once a faculty member gets to the point of separation after several years of employment, there has not been a single conversation or documentation trail regarding poor performance. It is best to separate employees early in the probationary period if there is a problem. * Please be specific regarding actions plans, identifying the area at a minimum where there is need for improvement. The action plan follows that area. Discussion ensued regarding how to capture this additional area in the AFE and the CRD. * Page 6, point 5, Confidentiality – When sitting on peer review committees information is confidential and state law requires that of us. When people feel they can speak honestly and that it will not get back to the faculty member being discussed, they can be frank and honest. What an individual says needs to be real and appropriate. In the reappointment process there is the thought that the people sitting on that committee may only consider and talk about what is in the dossier – this is wrong! Faculty are employees and conduct must be discussed. These discussions need to happen at the college committee level as well as the university committee level.   If you have questions, please do not hesitate to contact Mary Ann.  Discussion ensued as to the deans’ reactions to the conversation regarding conduct. |
| **Space Issues with Disability Services (Larry Hammer)** | Lance Alexis has presented an issue to Larry and asked him to share with the deans to get their thoughts. There is an ongoing issue with testing space in Killian Annex. The request for accommodations has continued to grow beyond Killian Annex’s space. These requests most commonly occur during mid-terms and finals. About 85% of accommodations are for a quiet environment or extra time. Larry distributed copies of the space as they are currently laid out in Killian Annex. Discussion ensued.  **Q:** Do these testing situations need to be monitored?  **A:** We have cameras that we can set up.  It would be helpful if we can identify spaces in the library or colleges that could be utilized during mid-terms and finals. Mark will check to see how the library can help. CEAP will try to handle most of their own requests going forward; there may be some space in CEAP but due to roof replacement that space may not be as usable for the fall semester. Robert Kehrberg has a student project space that is a quiet space. Susan has one office space in EO but is uncertain if it meets the criteria. Discussion ensued.  Please discuss with your departments. One outcome is just the identification of spaces – anything you can provide Lance with would be great. |
| **Transcripts and AA-21 Process**  **(Beth Lofquist)** | The AA 21 is a required document to invite someone to campus for an interview with an unofficial transcript attached. However, within 30 days of hire we must have the official transcript and we are having difficulty in meeting this requirement. This is a major SACS violation. Do you have suggestions? Should we request an official transcript from the onset? Discussion ensued.  It was agreed to hold the contract until we receive the official transcript. We will work with HR to accomplish that and Anne will work with the deans’ assistants on this process. Sometimes there will be special circumstances. |
| **COD Meeting Materials Moving to SharePoint**  **(Beth Lofquist)** | Beginning in the fall (August) we will access materials through SharePoint. Anne will work with the deans’ assistants on this new process. |
| **Research and Sponsored Program Report**  **(Mimi Fenton)** | Postponed to a future COD meeting. |
| **Student Learning Outcomes**  **(Beth Lofquist)** | Student Learning Outcomes for each program are to be published and easily accessed by students. Where are these? Do we have a consistent way to communicate these to students?  Beth suggested in the online catalog under each program to include a list of learning outcomes. They can be updated annually through the catalog. Do we want to add that to the curricular process? Discussion ensued.  Beth asked the deans to give this more thought and we will come back to it. This could be really helpful for recruitment. |
| **MOOCs**  **(Beth Lofquist)** | MOOCs are Massive Open Online Courses that are free for the user. In April Regis told Richard the Emergency and Disaster Management program had received a grant to try to find a way to use MOOCs to extend college accessibility, moving it from pure education to transitioning those to credit granting programs in some way. They will grant academic credit. The proposal involved the entry level EDM program that is a fully online degree completion program. They have a certain way they want to do it. Neither Marie, Richard nor the department head signed off on the grant as it did not go through the RAMSEs process. The faculty who owned the curriculum had not discussed whether WCU should be utilizing MOOCs.  We need to be clear how we move forward on a policy decision regarding MOOCs. Do we even have the ability to offer MOOCs from an economic perspective? We have not committed at this point. Discussion ensued.  It was suggested Faculty Senate take this up as a discussion item. We need to do more investigation as to what we want to do with MOOCs. |
| **Articulation Agreement with Isothermal Community College**  **(Beth Lofquist)** | Beth and the Chancellor met with representatives from Isothermal Community College. They are interested in the RIBN program in the School of Nursing – would they be interested in doing an articulation agreement with Isothermal?  If you have any other programs, please let Beth know. James asked that they add Kimmel School who has maintained a close relationship with Isothermal (CM, ET, and ECT articulations agreements in process). |
| **Grants**  **(Beth Lofquist)** | Deans need to be aware of all grant activity. Any grant that your department or college is proposing or working on needs to come to COD as an information item with a brief two sentence description (not for approval). We would prefer this be an FYI at the discussion phase or even include this in the announcement submissions. This could provide collaboration between programs. Additionally, faculty and department heads need to be educated on the RAMSES process and the requirement to use this process.  It was also suggested that GA hold to this same policy. Beth will address this at the next CAO meeting. |