

CHAIRS COUNCIL MINUTES

Meeting Date: February 11, 2010 at 3:00pm in ITV rooms: SH-204, BA-C121 and SYN141

Members Present:

April Adams	Joseph Faulds	Joyce Van Nostrand
Mark Bighley	Cari Keller	Kathryn Sanders
Renee Cambiano	Deborah Landry	Kathlyn Shahan
Mike Chanslor	Fritz Laux	Michael Turner
Anne Davey	Darrel Linde	Charles Ziehr

Guests: Charlie Babb, Regional University System of Oklahoma General Counsel and Dr. Bahr

Call to Order: Dr. Landry

Handouts: “So Now I’m the Department Chair” by Charlie Babb

Approval of Minutes: Dr. Keller made a motion to accept and Dr. Adams seconded.

Business Items:

- Welcome and Introduction by Dr. Bahr
- Charlie Babb, General Counsel, Regional University System of Oklahoma, Oklahoma City

He is here today to explain some of the current topics and issues that are raised in the prevalent lawsuits of the day and to discuss some concerns that NSU department chairs may have these days.

- 1) What legal pitfalls are involved with faculty promotion, tenure and discipline?(Handout P.1)
In Oklahoma all employees are an at-will employee unless by law or contract they are not. “At will” employees can be terminated for any reason, no reason, good reason, bad reason as long as the reason is not an unlawful reason. An example of lawful reasons includes discrimination and retaliation.

Q: What difference between legal and illegal discrimination? (Dr. Ziehr)

A: Legal discrimination: against a person who is not in the protective classes such as political views, the image of the university or department, first amendment issue, trans-gender, etc.

Illegal discrimination: against a person who is in the protective classes such as race, age, gender, national origin, religion, and disability

Q: Could we evaluate more frequently a second or third-year faculty, who has problems, even though the university instructs us to do so at certain times? (Dr. Sanders)

A: From a legal stand point the use of frequent evaluations is helpful because many employment issues can be avoided.

Q: How could we treat a faculty missing significant amount of work due to spouse being ill? (Dr. Sanders)

A: According to Family Medical Leave Act, every person gets up to 12 weeks of leave if they or a close family member has a serious medical condition

Q: According to our policy first-year faculty are evaluated all of his/her classes and only two of their classes need to be evaluated after that, but could we evaluate all of the classes for who are not performing well in their second and third year? (Dr. Sanders)

A: Absolutely.

Q: I have a member of my department whom we are not going to renew. If I articulate the reasons, it may cause a problem. Should I or should I not give the employee a reason? (Dr. Chanslor)

A: If someone wants a legal battle and especially the person is in the protective class, I am available to help you.

Q: I have a faculty member, who is not tenure track, but has been teaching 11 years. Is there a policy for those kinds of individuals? (Dr. Turner)

A: They can renew the contract each year through the Board of Regents. We must report the faculty in RUSO, who have been here more than 7 years. (Dr. Bahr)

Q: Should we accelerate a review for a tenured faculty member, who has some issues? (Dr. Chanslor)

A: Yes. RUSO Policy 3.3.5 states “When the review results in a finding that a tenured faculty member’s academic and professional performance is unsatisfactory, the faculty member shall be notified of the deficiencies in performance and must be reviewed again within one year.”

2) Q: May I search offices, hard drives, desks, briefcases, file cabinets, and/or emails?(Handout P.2)

A: Generally the courts will focus on whether the person being searched had a reasonable expectation to the privacy of their belongings.

3) Now that I am the Chair, do I need to purchase additional insurance and if so, in what amounts? (Handout P.9)

No discussion under this subject.

4) What records do I have to keep and how long do I have to keep them?(Handout P. 12)

No discussion under this subject.

5) How do I deal with “helicopter” parents or why don’t we have a Dean of Parents?(Handout P.15)

Generally helicopter parents are interested in student’s records, typically involving grades and discipline, and /or disability accommodations for their child.

Q: If a student shows up with a parent, does there have to be a written document? (Dr. Ziehr)

A: Yes.

Q: Are faculty members bound to meet the needs of the students with disabilities? (Dr. Turner)

A: Before coming to a reasonable accommodation, the law requires the student and the university to enter into an interactive process which includes discussing various options and alternatives as an accommodation, but do not try to make an accommodation decision on your own. Seek advice and assistance from the student affairs officer, disability compliance officer and/or legal counsel.

- **Dr. David Kern – Strategic Planning Update**

We are in the process of making a major change on web approach at the university. One of the issues we have had in the past is engaging all of colleges and all of administrative units and planning. We have been reevaluating, refocusing, and reframing mission, vision and values on strategic goals. Dr. Betz is really interested in collaboration and communication.

Dr. Shahan commented that perhaps diversity and acquiring international students should be separated. She thinks we ought to have more of a focus on understanding different cultures and different races that are real.

Dr. Kern said diversity was addressed across the three goals. If it is an inclusion issue in collaboration from internal stand point, he needs to hear it, but if it is more of developing cultural awareness and understanding, he strongly recommends addressing the issue within Goal 5 (Global Knowledge and Cultural Awareness). Or if she would like to have an opportunity to address to Dr. Betz and the Cabinet, there is an assembly on March 15, 2010.

New Business

1. Topics for future discussion: Academic Prioritization Process
2. Future meetings: March 25 at 3:00pm in ITV rooms
3. Other new business: Dr. Linde has updated math course information.

Announcement: Dr. Bahr announced Center for Teaching and Learning has two web casts on advising in early March.

Adjourn: Dr. Turner made a motion to adjourn and Dr. Cambiano seconded.

Next Meeting: March 25, 2010 at 3:00pm in ITV rooms: SH204, BA-B225, and NSM209

CHAIRS COUNCIL MINUTES

Meeting Date: March 25, 2010 at 3:00pm in ITV rooms: SH-204, BA-B225 and SYN141

Members Present:

April Adams	Deborah Landry	Michael Turner
Renee Cambiano	Fritz Laux	Joyce Van Nostrand
Mike Chanslor	Darrel Linde	Charles Ziehr
Leslie Hannah	Kathryn Sanders	
Cari Keller	Kathlyn Shahan	

Guests: Martha Albin, Amy Aldridge Sanford, Monica Barnett, Pamela Fly, Jeff Walker, Becky Williams

Call to Order: Dr. Landry

Handouts: NSU Personnel Action Form Training, NSU General Education, NSU Major Declaration Form, Teacher Education & General Education v.2010, Advising Science Courses for Freshmen Students, Math1473 Applied Mathematics Course Objectives

Approval of Minutes: Dr. Ziehr made a motion to accept and Dr. Cambiano seconded.

Business Items:

Welcome and Introductions

Guest Speaker(s)

Becky Williams – Preparing PAF's

- PAF (Personal Action Form) is important to maintain current and correct employee information during the audit that we might have. It is also a legal documentation of the employees that someday could be reviewed in a court.
- Two types of PAF's: New Hire/Termination PAF and Change of Status PAF
- Two forms need to be completed before PAF is processed: Request to fill vacant position and Request for New Position/Change a position

Monica Barnett – Preparing PAF's

- Everything is explained in the handout "NSU Personnel Action Form Training" and PAF must have all the signatures before it becomes official to hire someone.
- Summer PAF's need to be completed regardless of status: full or part-time
- Position and account numbers are listed in the budget notebook located in the dean's office.
- For the termination PAF, it is important to have a resignation letter.

Dr. Martha Albin, Human Resource

- New benefit effective on February 1, 2010
EAP (Employee Assistance Program) provides to all full-time and some part-time employees up to 6-session counseling on one-on-one with a certified counselor at no cost to the employees. It is 6 sessions per matter per year and available as well for the employee's spouse and the dependent children. Research shows 4 or 5 counseling sessions are enough for most life situations so that there is no need for ongoing therapy. There are three ways to access to the services: self-referral, recommended referral, and required referral. It is up to the department

chairs to negotiate time flexibility if the administrative assistance has an appointment with EAP during the work hours.

The website also provides helpful tips, articles, etc. and you could also send confidential questions and they answer you confidentially as well: www.ndbh.com , pass word: nsuok

- VSP is another great vision benefit that is available to all employees. There is not a membership card, but VSP has a network. Please call or visit their website to find an optometrist near you.

Dr. Amy Aldridge Sanford – Changes to General Education

- Gen Ed Task Force has become a standing committee that meets regularly for improvement.
- Regents approved NSU's new general education curriculum effective in the fall of 2010.
- Current students have an option to switch to a degree plan with the new general education.
- Capstone is going to be added as a one-hour online course.

Jeff Walker – Changes to General Education

- All the changes are listed on the General Education Comparison chart at the FYE (First-Year Experience) website.
- Dec Sheet (Declaration Sheet) will be changed into a new format called “NSU Major Declaration Form, which is going to be digitalized.
- Articulation agreements with other institutions stay the same.

Dr. Pamela Fly – Teacher Education & General Education v.2010

- Teacher education programs are limited to 124 hours by state law. (SS 70.6.185)
- All Teacher Education Programs: EDUC4823 Technology in Education will double count as a GE life skill and in the Professional Sequence. The course is still restricted by admission to teacher education status.
- Most teacher education programs will have NO free electives or very limited few, even with the double counting. Candidates need to be aware that they advise themselves at their own risk.
- Early Childhood, Elementary, and Special Education program must include the 12 hours in each of these areas: English, mathematics, sciences and social sciences. Commonly known as the 4x12, these courses include those in the general education sequence as well as other content support courses.

Dr. April Adams – Advising Science Courses for Freshmen Students

- Science requirements vary for different majors.
- SCI 1114 and BIOL1114 will no longer be offered without a lab effective in the fall of 2010.
- The lab must be taken either concurrently or after the 3-hour lecture course, not prior to the lecture.

Dr. Darrel Linde – Computer and Math course changes

- Computer course has been required at NSU in order for students to meet the computer proficiency, but the change is effective in the fall 2010 due to the Regents guideline.
 - 1) NSU will accept the Regents compliant high school course
 - 2) Testing out – the committee is in the process of revising the test
 - 3) Taking a computer course either CS1003 or IS1003
- Math 1473 Applied Mathematics Course
Math 1473 (currently known as “Math Structures”) has a new course title “Applied Mathematics” that will become more relevant for chemistry and more suitable prerequisite for statistics. This course is emphasizing exponential functions, solving formulas for different

variables, using properties of logarithms and exponents to investigate topics of personal finance. Applied Mathematics should meet all the needs for the students in all different majors: business, chemistry, biology, education, psychology, etc. Math 1513 is designed to be a pre-calculus course.

New Business-Letterhead Changes

- Dr. Van Nostrand made a motion that Dr. Landry would visit with Mark Kinders about our concerns regarding letterhead changes. Dr. Cambiano seconded and the motion was approved.
1. Topics for future discussion
 - Dr. Cambiano would like to know more about campus wide post-tenure review process.
 - Dr. Adams wishes more information on new release time by the new assessment committee.
 2. Future meetings: April 22, 2010
 3. Other new business: Welcome a new chair, Dr. Leslie Hannah, department of Language and Literature

Announcements

Adjourn

Next Meeting: April 22, 2010 at 3:00pm in ITV rooms: SH204, BA-C121, and SYN141

CHAIRS COUNCIL MINUTES

Meeting Date: April 22, 2010 at 3:00pm in ITV rooms: SH-204, BA-C121 and SYN141

Members Present:

Amy Aldridge Sanford
April Adams
Mark Bighley
Renee Cambiano

Anne Davey
Cari Keller
Deborah Landry
Fritz Laux

Darryl Linde
Kathlyn Shahan
Joyce Van Nostrand
Charles Ziehr

Guests: Dr. Tadlock and Dr. Carey

Call to Order: Dr. Landry

Handouts:

Approval of Minutes: Dr. Van Nostrand made a motion to accept with an amendment of Dr. Linde's misspelled name and Dr. Giese seconded.

Business Items:

Welcome and Introductions

Guest Speaker(s)

Dr. Tadlock

- Dr. Giese asked how Dr. Tadlock might view chair's role in preparing for HLC visit. Dr. Tadlock said that the chairs play a critical role getting information out to faculty and staff what the reviewers are looking for. There are certain things that they are expecting:
 - 1) Learning and learning outcomes: how the institution assesses learning proving that the students are getting out of the program as what the university expects them to do.
 - 2) Mission statement : how does everything we do tie back to a mission as an institution
 - 3) Peer Review: Many changes are made by HLC to address federal legislation regarding accountability that institutions must meet a standard

- PEAQ(Tenure Comprehensive Review Cycle) is going to be out and the university will have to decide one of two accreditation routes:
 - 1) Open Pathway
It is currently under construction, but it seems to be a blend of PEAQ and ACQIP (4-year cycle and 7-year review), but is larger review than ACQIP requiring major institutional project.
 - 2) ACQIP(Continuous Quality Improvement Process)
It is not a comprehensive university wide assessment. The university will have to assess itself. It is based on two or three projects that the institution chooses through strategic planning review and process. As an institution will identify what to work on and will submit an application to HLC. Once it is approved, we report during and at the end of the year and 3 reviewers will then visit one day every 4 years. We could also request it to be extended to another year if a project is not completed. It is all paper based and data upload. UPG, Strategic Plan, Academic Priotization, and several others studies that we have already been doing fit to an ACQIP project profile. This process is less expensive and intrusive.

- Dr. Shahan asked if each department could have their own mission, whereas the university has an overall mission. Dr. Tadlock said the mission in the department has to support and tie to the university mission.
- Dr. Giese had two inquiries:
 - 1) What is Dr. Tadlock's experience in two different department chair models: a chair hired by the national search and a chair reassigned from a regular faculty position?

Dr. Tadlock was informed that the chairs at NSU have an administrative responsibility in terms of faculty review and recommendations for promotion of tenures, but they are also colleagues within the department, which is a very awkward role for them to play. He prefers the chairs are the facilitators of departmental concerns and oversight of the academic quality of the programs so that it is all about collaboration and common thinking consensus oriented.

Dr. Tadlock is now requiring a lot of responsibilities for deans including decentralizing the budget, staffing decisions and equipment moneys so that the deans will in turn go to chairs. Reallocation has to occur first at the college level and the deans should go to the department chairs concerning faculty lines. Sun setting and creating programs will be also up to the deans and the department chairs, who know the programs best.

- 2) How does Dr. Tadlock view the chair's role in providing quality control for multiple section course offerings (ie 15 to 20 sections) in terms of common syllabi, texts, objectives, etc?

Dr. Tadlock told the deans that we must hit the class size average target 23.67 over the course across the campus, but frankly we would not afford that due to the fact that the level of tuition that has been charged and expenses for instructional cost so that he asked to raise the average 1 student per year in next two years without increasing instructional cost, although it would cost approximately \$500,000 to raise the average 1 student per year. No caps are set now because it is up to the department, who knows what the course needs are.

- Dr. Tadlock said that the university is planning some exciting features across the campus.
 - 1) Deans are looking at 3 programs moving into a college for extended learning for working adults on BA campus. That is an opportunity in Muskogee and BA to build out something to compete with University of Phoenix or any other institutions whose business to cater in working adults. Approximately 126,000 people who reside in Tulsa area had had some college education, but they have not completed their degree, and are currently in the workforce. There is a huge opportunity serving the population
 - 2) CTL(Center for Teaching & Learning) is being completely reconceptualized.
 - a) The steering committee is formed by faculty who are recommended by deans and given more release time will work with the staff that are currently in placed at the CTL, plus a group of student workers will be hired to become a tech support team to help you maintain and upgrade the websites and work with you on course development from the prospective of the student on your hybrid or online courses. An assistant vice president will be hired as a full professor level for Academic Affairs in place of a former director position of CTL. The assistant vice president will work

- with the student committee and CTL staff designing professional development for faculty and staff.
- b) NSU will buy membership in open source, which allows us to access to thousands of college level courses worldwide that have been putting on the open source market. We are looking at Smart Thinking, which is an online tutoring service for students in classes that faculty can restrict on that purpose.
 - c) 37 ITV classes have been taught in 22 ITV rooms on three campuses in the spring of 2010. Dr. Tadlock saw 715,000-dollar request to create new ITV rooms, but instead the money will be spent on new equipment (touch screen sensitive) device, which will replace the multiple remotes.
- 3) DARS will hopefully be implemented by the fall of 2010. Janet Kelly from Admissions and Records is updating the students' record. When it is fully up and running, faculty and the students can see the degree plans for advising purpose and degree audit.
 - 4) A consultant will be hired to do the ground work on the bid to implement the new data system.
 - 5) A committee is working on reviewing the tenure promotion process, which needs to become much more flexible and to find a way of how people identify the roles as a faculty member in the department that is recognized through the process as well.
 - 6) Dr. Tadlock will continue Brown bag discussion on the different campuses. "Delicious Dialogs and Debates" will be starting in September, 2010 on a monthly basis. Two faculty members will debate on a hot topic in higher education for 30 minutes and the next 30 minutes will be a dialog time with debaters. The first topic is "Is higher education a commodity and are the students customers?" Dr. Tadlock will have a provost blog on Academic Affairs' website. Please encourage people to be civil.
 - 7) The grad faculties teaching graduate courses are asking to receive a full credit load for teaching 3 three-hour classes.
 - 8) UPG and Strategic Plan have been well established and the revision is done.
 - 9) Dr. Cambiano had a question whether Post-tenure review should be a university wide process or just remain within the college. Dr. Tadlock's suggestion is that tenured faculty will decide their time allocation in percentage on research, service and scholarship among within their college and in the department at the beginning of the year. Dr. Tadlock personally does not wish to put people into a mold, but would rather see more flexibility in post-tenure process and differentiating roles.
 - 10) Dr. Tadlock values any ideas and decision making in all levels. He insists deans ought to move toward democratic decision making process in engagement and involvement. His philosophy is that all employees should be inclusive and invited making decisions. No one will be fired due to disagreement.

Dr. Carey – Honor Program

- The program is funded through the State. 52 students have accepted the honor's scholarship in the fall of 2010; however the number will change due to their decision to attend other institutions. 38 freshmen have enrolled in the program in the fall of 2009 and currently 135 in total are registered.
- Dr. Carey is open to discuss about how 6-hour honor research component would fit into a 124-hour degree plan. Currently there are 4 honor courses: 3401(Research I), 3402(Research II), 4402(Research III), 4401(Research IV) and the prefix is matched with each major. These hours could be used as free and major electives.

- Dr. Keller mentioned that incorporating the research hours as major electives would take away full benefits from the students majoring criminal justice so that the students should select them as free electives in her department.
- Dr. Bighley said as long as they have music prefix, they could be embedded to music degree plans because their SPA would not allow any other prefix.
- Dr. Adams thinks all of the secondary education majors will have the same issue as elementary education majors do due to 124 hours required by the State.
- Dr. Ziehr has recently revised social education degree plan adding more classes to meet accreditation and assessment needs and designating two upper division courses to incorporate the honor research component.
- Dr. Carey appreciates if each department would communicate directly sending a copy of degree plan with specifically designated courses, in which the honors are embedded.

Dr. Laux – Review procedures and rights of tenured faculty (Faculty handbook 3.5.6)

- One of the faculty members, whose request for tenure has been denied twice, was asking for chair's memos, committee report, dean's memos, detail of deliberations, etc. Dr. Laux thought these memos should have been confidential; however, according to Section 24A.7C of the Oklahoma Open Records Act "Accept as may otherwise be made confidential by statute an employee of a public body shall have a right of access to his own personnel file." This is a state law issue and not a federal law issue. The RUSO guideline states the results of the vote of the tenure committee were to be kept out of the employee's personnel file. Even though the RUSO council was aware of the language of the open record, he did not wish the employee to get the information. However, Dr. Laux heard a conclusion from the university that from now on any employeemay have access to their tenure promotion memos, decisions, or post-tenure reviews, etc. retroactively. Dr. Laux suggested that it would be respectful to consider the decision carefully.
- Faculty handbook that is on the internet is old. Since the handbook is in the process of modification, this open act policy will be reflected in the revised handbook.
- Dr. Ziehr asked Dr. Laux how the university has been keeping track of those memos. Dr. Laux thinks that is a reasonable question, but he was informed the most of them have been lost.

Old Business – Letterhead update (Dr. Van Nostrand)

- Dr. Van Nostrand needs a clarification on whether that we could order a hard copy at the copy zone or that we have to use the electric version using our own printer all the time, which is costly.

New Business-

1. Topics for future discussion
2. Future meetings – August 26, 2010 at 3:00pm
3. Other new business

Dr. Giese made a motion to nominate two future chairs of the Chairs Council and Dr. Davey seconded.

Dr. Landry (2010-2011)

Dr. Keller (2011-2012)

Announcements

Adjourn

Next Meeting: August 26, 2010 at 3:00pm in ITV rooms: SH204, BA-C121, and SYN141

CHAIRS COUNCIL MINUTES

Meeting Date: August 26, 2010 at 3:00pm in ITV rooms: SH-204, BA-C121 and SYN141

Members Present:

Amy Aldridge Sanford
April Adams
Anne Davey
Leslie Hannah

Cari Keller
Fritz Laux
Darryl Linde
Kathryn Sanders

Kathlyn Shahan
Michael Turner
Richard Williams
Charles Ziehr

Guests: Dr. Bahr and Mr. Venneman

Call to Order: Dr. Keller

Handouts:

Approval of Minutes: Dr. Adams made a motion to accept and Dr. Shahan seconded.

Business Items:

Welcome and Introductions

Guest Speaker(s)

Dr. Bahr

- Background of Academic Prioritization

In 2003 the UPG (University Planning Group) was reconstructed and reformed. Dr. Ziehr, (maybe Dr. Sanders) and Dr. Bahr were involved in the UPG reorganization process and one of the criticisms from that process was primarily at deans and vice president's level. When they were working on the strategic plan, one of the process was to develop Academic Prioritization, which was to start with faculty and programs through the department chairs, who were representing those programs, on up to the deans and to the vice president, and to the president. They have looked at several models. "*Prioritizing Academic Programs & Services*" by Robert Dickenson was the book used heavily through the process. Dr. Bahr has attended the annual conference held by Higher Learning Commission in 2009 and one of the programs had used this book, but developed their own model. The reorganization committee looked at what the HLC had done and borrowed from them as well. Dr. Tadlock, who has just gone through Academic Prioritization process at the institution he was coming from, looked at our model and he added one small way to depict Academic Prioritization.

Dr. Venneman

- The committee was formed as a taskforce within UPG (University Planning Group), in which Christy Landshaw, Mark Kinders, Dr. Denise Deason-Toyne, Dr. Kim Cherry, Dr. April Adams, and Dr. Venneman were involved at that time. We have talked about how we evaluate the programs and what approach we were going to take. All of us have had an experience with Academic Prioritization and we were being requested to follow Dickenson's protocol for Academic Prioritization. There were 5 different groups of programs: the upper 20% were to receive preferential treatment, the next higher 20%, which are programs to be supported, the middle 20% are looked upon favorably, then the next 20% are to be examined with a close eye, and finally the lowest 20%, which are programs to be cut; however, the committee has decided not to cut any of the programs. We were not going to identify programs for preferential treatment, or for reduction, but instead we would evaluate the programs on the campus based upon their potential for future growth development of the institution. Their value to the strategic directions is identified by NSU. We will take the approach looking at their potential, value and quality. If it

is aligned with the university strategic plan, we may put resources to those huge potential programs that need to be enhanced in quality, although they may not have quite value at this point. The approach is to get a sense of how all the programs of the university stack relative to one another predicated upon potential value and quality to the institution as a strategic plan.

- Academic Prioritization, which was distributed to a task force a year ago, has heavily relied on the Dickenson book and on the process of the American University. Process begins with every program in September doing whole self study document reports following series of criteria, which should support and posture us as high quality, high potential and high value program to the university and its mission and its direction. The object is to be honest in representation and in evaluation. In mid-September all the program chairs will report to the dean, who can gauge value in each program based upon PQV (Potential Quality Value) assessment indicator. Then, the deans will report all the self study documents to Dr. Tadlock by the end of September. There is a PQV matrix and each program will be on the matrix. The value system has established for those criteria that are going to be determined the values based upon:
 - 1) Consistency with the university mission
 - 2) External and Internal demand for the program identified by documented data
 - 3) Program inputs, outputs, and students' outputs quality indicators – 6 or 7 criteria and sub criteria
 - 4) Productivity in past 3 or 4 semesters that has diversity in ranges of values of criteria
 - 5) Cost – what is the cost to build a program and what kind of level of support does it have a present?
 - 6) Academic efficiency – categorized critical information
- Dr. Venneman explained the process. The self study documents will be examined by the individual graders: program people, chairs, deans, cabinet members, and provost. There are also criteria that quantitatively identified as far as their value. Dr. Bahr said it was not easy to figure out cost of a program because there were not only salaries and benefits, but the operational and offsets of enhancement fees that need to fit into formula. The main focus was to keep consistency across the university in the data that were provided to you. After gauging on specific indicators and giving them a number of values, all the numbers of category are averaged and the PQV rating system was established in 3dimensional matrix: low (1 and 2.3), Medium (2.3-3.6), and High (3.6-5). Dr. Tadlock finally would color code those numbers and put them on the graph for everyone to review.
- Dr. Aldridge-Sanford asked if the committee would use the matrix for cutting sources and for allocating resources. Dr. Bahr said the primary purpose was not to identify programs to be cut, but rather to look at resources in different programs how to enhance the programs that are needed to be enhanced and to readjust resources. However, the reality is if 15% decrease (from the state revenue) occurs next year, we must do something drastic as a university. Dr. Venneman said the PQV matrix is used in the cabinet level to make a correct decision dealing the financial challenges that we are being faced and concerning the strategic direction. It is a management tool that gives us knowledge base. Dr. Aldridge-Sanford asked the matrices needed to be completed by chairs before going to the dean. Dr. Venneman was having the chairs in his college do self-assessment utilizing the matrices based upon self study documents. Dr. Adams said her department was large so that they were dividing into programs and working as a group. Dr. Aldridge-Sanford said there was a 60-page self study documents from a program. Dr. Bahr encouraged everyone to build it upon realities of data, not to be anecdotal. Dr. Turner thought the data was very minimal. Dr. Bahr would resend the correct data to everyone because

some might not have received a whole data set. Dr. Davey said it would be difficult to figure out the financial part. Dr. Bahr told to just go with that data for what was asking in the document and try not to parse out subsets. Dr. Davey was wondering how to figure out program generated revenue. Dr. Bahr told that in her budget the programs should have net revenue generated such as clinics and outside contracts. Dr. Davey's concern was whether that it could be well distinguished if faculty were teaching multiple majors and split the cost from the budget reports. Dr. Turner asked if a donation from a student to a specific program should be considered as an external generation. Dr. Bahr said it would be the program's strength because he could solicit so much in terms of outside fee. Dr. Aldridge-Sanford asked if it could be used the argument in the narrative. Absolutely, Dr. Bahr replied. Dr. Laux thought there was an error in the adjusted value table. Dr. Barh would review and send the correction. Dr. Ziehr said it would be a challenge how to figure out the cost on the low productive courses in terms of number of students because of their contribution to other programs. Dr. Bahr said to look at by course at number of majors in the various programs that require that course. Then, try to establish a cost based upon the percentage of majors in that course. Dr. Venneman said some of the interdisciplinary courses might not have any cost or resources involved at this point, but we might want to put some resources to build them. Dr. Keller suggested we establish Blackboard for chairs centralizing information, since chairs come and go.

Old Business

New Business-

1. Dr. Les Hannah –

a. Composition 2 as a prerequisite for other programs.

Dr. Hannah had an issue in a past few weeks that the graduating seniors have come in crisis mode to his office that they had to have Comp II in order for them to graduate so that they asked him to override the limitation. Comp II appears not to be a prerequisite for any majors according to the course catalog. Comp II, however, is a general education requirement; therefore they must complete before graduate. Dr. Hannah was told several times that the NSU students could not write well. He would like to see some enforcement on Comp II somehow in the catalog preventing from graduating seniors waiting so long. He suggested Comp II be a prerequisite for majors. Dr. Ziehr thought that was on the catalog somewhere Comp I and II had to be completed before 75 hours. He said it needed to be discussed in higher level instead of departmental level because it seemed to be more of a fundamental issue. Dr. Turner looked up the catalog on the computer and it stated "Students are required to complete all the general education courses by the time they complete 90 semester hours of college work." OSAGE may have a mechanism to block students who have not had Comp I and II by the certain number of hours, but Dr. Turner said since advisors complained that it was too much work to take off an advisor block on each student, the mass unblocking has taken place in the recent years on OSAGE. Dr. Keller asked Dr. Aldridge-Sanford if this could be brought up to the general education committee. Perhaps Chairs Council should request them to take a close look at the catalog and make Comp II mandatory. Dr. Keller said Comp II requirement could be implemented in DARS because they have been data testing and putting restrictions where they were supposed to be. Dr. Aldridge-Sanford suggested Dr. Hannah work with Janet Kelly, a DARS specialist to make it happen quickly and if it would not be enforceable, Dr. Hannah could come back to this body for further discussion.

b. A third English class as a gen ed.

Dr. Hannah said College of Education has been requesting that Introduction to Literature would be a third English requirement because students are tested over the literature in OPTE (Oklahoma Professional Teaching Examination). There is a committee in the literature

department working on ENG1113 (Comp I): expository writing, ENG1123 (Comp II): argumentation and rhetoric style of writing and ENG2113 (Introduction to Literature): intensive research writing in literature area. In order to cover what College of Education is asking, Dr. Hannah thinks 3 more faculty positions may need to be added due to the fact that he is considering adding 7 to 12 ENG2113 courses per academic year. He is also preparing a proposal to present to College of Education. There will be 3 general education courses offered from the English department. Dr. Kelly made a motion that Dr. Landry would send a request to the new general education committee considering the third English class as a gen ed requirement. Someone seconded and everyone approved the motion.

2. Topics for future discussion – Tobacco-free campus policy by Dean Boren
3. Future meetings – September 30, 2010 at 3:00pm
4. Other new business

Announcements

Adjourn

Announcements

Adjourn

Next Meeting: September 30, 2010 at 3:00pm in ITV rooms: SH204, BA-C121, and SYN141

CHAIRS COUNCIL MINUTES

Meeting Date: September 30, 2010 at 3:00pm in ITV rooms: SH-204, BA-C121 and SYN141

Members Present:

Amy Aldridge Sanford
April Adams
Mark Giese
Fritz Laux

Deborah Landry
Darryl Linde
Kathryn Sanders
Kathlyn Shahan

Michael Turner
Richard Williams
Charles Ziehr

Guests:

Call to Order: Dr. Landry

Handouts: Chairs Meeting “Reports We All Do”

Approval of Minutes: Dr. Giese made a motion to accept with an amendment and Dr. Sanders seconded. The correction was “University Planning Committee” instead of “Academic Prioritization Committee” in the first sentence on Page 1, where it stated, “In 2003 the Academic Prioritization Committee was reconstructed.....” Also, Dr. Aldridge-Sanford corrected “proposal” vice “infrastructures” in the sixth line on page 4.

Business Items:

Dr. Giese

- Tobacco Free Committee was formed approximately two years ago. A number of organizations such as Cherokee Nation, Health coalition, and student service group have contributed the ideas to the committee before. As of last summer the committee recommended NSU would become a tobacco-free campus, but it was postponed to give more time to the NSU community.
- Reports we all do
 - 1) Regent’s Program Review
 - 2) Higher Learning Commission
 - 3) Yearly Report to the Dean
 - 4) Academic Priority Report
 - 5) NCATE
 - 6) Individual Accreditation Report – please let everyone know about your SPA and any other accreditation reports in your department
 - 7) Others
 - 8) What are common data elements you many need?

By next meeting have a list of data you need. Dr. Giese might establish a flow chart where to retrieve data information. Dr. Adams think some of the data we have received is misleading and other issue is that the data she needs is not available. Dr. Turner said it was more than misleading. Dr. Adams said some of them were inaccurate and she would rather have no data than inaccurate ones because they might lead you to make a false decision. Dr. Sanders said her department has come up with their own data doing by hand in green bars that were generated by credit hours. The result was different than the data set electronically distributed earlier. Dr. Giese said there may be issues on this data set because not all the departments have the same prefix and faculty load among the programs; however, student credit hours and FTE should be accurate. Dr. Adams said, for instance, student credit hours in Science Ed program generated were smaller than it should be because courses that were counted were the

ones that they specifically take for that degree and there were only two of them. Therefore, all the credit hours taken by Biology, Chemistry, and College of Ed were incoming because those students being in program were not included in the counts. Dr. Giese asked her if she has explained that in Academic Prioritization, but Dr. Adams said she could not because it was a number. She could state it in the documents, but it will only be evaluated by numbers. Dr. Giese understands some inaccuracy in the data, but we may still be able to find the way to obtain the valid data. Dr. Adams said we could calculate our own FTE, but we would not be able to rank it with the rest of university due to no capability. Dr. Giese concluded that no one had confidence in this set of data. Dr. Ziehr thought it was misleading for any interdisciplinary programs such as Social Studies Ed, American Indian Studies, Science Ed and Math Ed. Dr. Adams mentioned there was an offset problem for those programs who had multiple options that those options were not evaluated separately, but they all evaluated as a whole so that the numbers were looking better than they would, if certain options were done separately. Dr. Laux has never expected the data support for Academic Prioritization to be very ideal, but rather we should have a continuous improvement perspective in this process. Dr. Adams knew the idea (for the process) was to attain some kind of objective and independent measurements. She appreciated all the works and brain storming meetings that Dr. Sawyers has done in the past, but a whole group of people, faculty and budget staff, concerned about the data set, which was not measuring well. The issue was that sometimes data was projecting inaccurate picture, if we use it blindly to make decisions about programs. Her fear was that relying only on those quantifiable numbers to compare across programs might lead to a false evaluation. Dr. Adams has been frustrated at this point. Dr. Giese and Dr. Sawyer might come up with a single flow chart where to obtain the information instead of relying on the information itself and we stick with an element with a less effort such as enrollment and graduation rates. Dr. Turner suggested that Information Technology Services might need the information as well because they ought to be the people who are able to find the way to transfer the data into the 21st century format. Dr. Adams and Dr. Linde were told that both Science Ed and Math Ed bachelor's degrees were not required to do State Program Review due to NCATE visit. Dr. Landry was relieved as well, when she received Dr. Barh's e-mail.

Dr. Laux – Discussion of Documentation Procedure for Tenure Committee Votes

- Dr. Laux has been following up on concerns regarding guidance we've gotten on how to administratively process tenure votes and recommendations.

In the latest version of the faculty handbook on 3.534

“On or before November 10, the . . . *department chair shall report* in writing *the results of the vote, separate from his or her own recommendation, to the Dean who will forward that recommendation as well as the Dean's own recommendation to the chief academic officer* on or before December 1. All recommendations become part of the faculty member's personnel file.”

In subsection 3.536 it then says

The results of all balloting will be confidential and will not be included in the faculty member's personnel file.

Dr. Laux's question is how we can "report in writing the results of the *vote*" or "report the results of the vote in writing unofficially?" According to RUSO guidance "the results of the tenure report are to be held confidential", whereas the legal opinion from the legal counsel tells us "all the reports are subject to be released to the employee" because of Open Records Act. There seems to be a conflict between RUSO policy and our legal counsel's interpretation of the Open Records Act.

When last time Dr. Turner was to send a memo with the results to the dean, the interpretation of the results was not to include a number, but simply to state "in favor of" or "not in favor of." Dr. Ziehr thinks we ought to request a written clarification from VP's office. He would prefer guidance from a superior. Dr. Laux agrees with Dr. Ziehr 100% and he did ask Dr. Tadlock, but he has not been given any answers, yet. Dr. Laux also suggested a written recommendation as a solution to the problem. Dr. Adams received an e-mail from Dr. Tadlock via dean that we were not supposed to include tally. Dr. Laux quoted the e-mail, "Again communicating the results to the dean is confidential and does not need to be included in the official letter you send forward to the dean." Dr. Laux was given guidance of two options either that the written documents to the dean saying yea or nay was supposed to be held unofficial and not to go beyond the dean, or that the communication of the yea or nay through the dean were supposed to be verbal as opposed to writing. Dr. Landry agrees that we ought to request a clarification in writing within a week and we don't hear from them, we will ask again.

Dr. Giese

- Dr. Giese appreciated Dr. Kohen and his crew came to College of Education today. They were open and transparent talking about budget as precise as they could be.

Old Business

New Business-

1. Topics for future discussion
2. Future meetings: October 28, 2010 at 3:00pm
3. Other new business

Announcements

- Dr. Landry mentioned that Dr. Tadlock would like to visit our next meeting to hear our concerns or questions.

Adjourn: Dr. Landry made a motion to adjourn and Dr. Sanders seconded.

Next Meeting: October 28, 2010 at 3:00pm in ITV rooms: SH204, BA-C121, and SYN141

CHAIRS COUNCIL MINUTES

Meeting Date: January 27, 2011 at 3:00pm in ITV rooms: SH-204, BAAS 215 and SYN141

Members Present:

Amy Aldridge Sanford
April Adams
Mark Bighley
Renee Cambiano

Bill Corbett
Mark Giese
Les Hannah
Cari Keller

Darryl Linde
Joyce Van Nostrand
Kathlyn Shahan
Richard Williams

Guests: Dr. Chuck Ziehr

Call to Order: Dr. Cari Keller

Handouts: Minutes from September 2010 meeting

Approval of Minutes: Dr. Cambiano made a motion to accept and Dr. Giese seconded with amendments. The corrections were “thinks” instead of “think” in the third sentence of #8 on Page 1 and “other” to “another” in the fourth sentence of #8 on Page 1, where it stated, “Dr. Adams think some of the data...and other issue...”

Business Items:

Dr. Ziehr

- Dr. Chuck Ziehr is currently serving as Interim Vice President for the Center for Teaching and Learning. His retirement date is July 31, 2011. Currently, 30 applications have been received and are being reviewed for the position. He stated that no one knows what the job is to entail. It will be a “learn as you go” experience. The person in this position will be directly responsible for CTL. The person in this position will provide stability, while enabling a move forward. Dr. Ziehr provided some background and history on CTL. Dr. Ziehr also advised on new technologies that CTL has acquired. As of Summer 2011, Blackboard will be upgraded to version 9.1 and will go live with it in Fall 2011. Blackboard has bought Wimba, so it will be integrated into BB. Wimba Pronto is a way to communicate online that incorporates text, video and whiteboard. Dr. Ziehr also state that a new position has been budgeted for CTL. This new position is for an Online Instructional Designer. This position will be much broader than the former “Director” position. Kip Finnegan is currently chairing the search committee. This position will require online teaching experience, but not a faculty position. A degree in Instructional Design or a closely related field would be desirable. Dr. Ziehr highlighted some of the programs that CTL has provided this semester:

Webinar on “Conflict Resolution”

Film Series: “Race to Nowhere” – Feb 7, 2011 (BA)

“Waiting for Superman” – Mar 7, 2011 (BA)

Dr. Ziehr stated that the chairs can have tremendous influence on the portion of this position which is not yet formed. He also stated that the Help Desk @ ext 5678 will encompass help for ALL technology and calls will be routed appropriately. The Help Desk will be staffed more with full-time professional staff rather than with students, as in the past. He also noted that there will be training available for Wimba, such as online tutorials and links to aid in the use of Wimba. Dr. Cambiano asked why Wimba was chosen when it isn’t compatible with Apple products. Dr. Keller answered with the statement that in the Wimba demonstration, the Wimba representative

stated that Wimba is addressing this issue and expects to overcome it in the near future. Dr. Ziehr stated that there is a CTL newsletter coming soon, in which the question of Wimba support issues for Apple products will be addressed. Dr. Ziehr also noted that the new Dialogues and Debates series will fall under the umbrella of CTL. Dr. Ziehr also stated that Linda Summers has been named as a half-time Teaching and Learning Fellow. Quality Matters: faculty across the country will define what constitutes a good online course; for example, course criteria, rubric and standards.

Dr. John Schleede is heading a task force on Online Education. They will make a series of recommendations to make online courses more successful. It is being suggested that enrollment be limited to 30-35 students in online courses, and that larger courses be split and a teaching assistant added to ensure quality.

Dr. Amy Aldridge Sanford questioned the status of applications due in October for stipends for developing a new online course. Dr. Ziehr stated that more questions are being asked before approval, and there has been a problem with large amounts of plagiarism in syllabi. He stated that more about the status of those applications will be known by Feb. 4.

A Steering Committee is in the process of evaluating the applications for the \$1000 Teaching and Learning Fellows stipend for Service Learning.

There is a 1 year grace period before the Quality Matters rubric will be enforced for online courses.

Dr. Ziehr stated that he would send out the links for the Conflict Resolution webinar.

Dr. Linde stated that he found Dr. Ziehr's report to be very informative.

Dr. Martin Tadlock

- Dr. Tadlock stated that the final draft of the proposed promotion and tenure rubric has been sent to the Cabinet, Academic Affairs, and the Deans' Council. All updates/changes have been made and it goes to council on Tuesday, Feb 1 for final approval. It will be in the Faculty Handbook for Fall 2011. He stated that everyone seems to be pleased with the new Tenure and Promotion rubric.

Dr. Linde asked about how new policy defines by-laws. Dr. Tadlock stated that it will be flexible for the departments. It will be a peer-reviewed, faculty driven process for tenure and promotion.

Dr. Tadlock stated that overall university travel is \$23, 000 less than the previous year. He also stated that there is a more efficient way to handle travel paperwork in process. There will be NO MORE travel without PRIOR approval.

Dr. Amy Aldridge Sanford questioned whether or not there is a travel checklist in existence.

Dr. Tadlock stated that there will be a cut in funding of 7-8% minimum, and could possibly be as much as 12%. He stated that the university needs to increase revenue building programs and move away from state funding. He asked for recommendations for accommodations that would make being chair/program coordinator more reasonable & desirable, a way to even out inconsistencies across the programs.

A new fee structure has been proposed and approved across campus. It will be sent to RUSO for approval. If approved, there will be “bucket fees” – fees per credit hour which will be given back to the college from which they were generated, and how those fees are distributed among the departments will be determined by the Dean of that college. If approved, these fees will go into effect for Fall 2011.

Dr. Joyce Van Nostrand questioned whether the guidelines for Technology fees were changing. Dr. Tadlock stated that to his knowledge they haven't and aren't, and that those guidelines are set by RUSO, not the university.

Old Business

New Business-

1. Topics for future discussion – Tenure and Promotion
2. Future meeting: February 24, 2011 at 3:15pm

Announcements

- Dr. Keller stated that she would email the new Request for Equivalency/Substitution form out to all members of the Chairs Council. It was requested that if a faculty member is asking a Chair in another department for equivalency, substitution or exception, that they provide the proper documentation in addition to the form. She also said that she would send out the final draft of minutes prior to the next meeting.

Adjourn: Dr. Keller made a motion to adjourn and it was seconded by Drs. Aldridge Sanford and Bighley.

Next Meeting: February 24, 2011 at 3:15pm in ITV rooms: SH204, BAAS 215, and SYN141

CHAIRS COUNCIL MINUTES

Meeting Date: January 27, 2011 at 3:00pm in ITV rooms: SH-204, BAAS 215 and SYN141

Members Present:

Amy Aldridge Sanford
April Adams
Mark Bighley
Renee Cambiano

Bill Corbett
Mark Giese
Les Hannah
Cari Keller

Darryl Linde
Joyce Van Nostrand
Kathlyn Shahan
Richard Williams

Guests: Dr. Chuck Ziehr

Call to Order: Dr. Cari Keller

Handouts: Minutes from September 2010 meeting

Approval of Minutes: Dr. Cambiano made a motion to accept and Dr. Giese seconded with amendments. The corrections were “thinks” instead of “think” in the third sentence of #8 on Page 1 and “other” to “another” in the fourth sentence of #8 on Page 1, where it stated, “Dr. Adams think some of the data...and other issue...”

Business Items:

Dr. Ziehr

- Dr. Chuck Ziehr is currently serving as Interim **Assistant** Vice President for the Center for Teaching and Learning. His retirement date is July 31, 2011. Currently, 30 applications have been received and are being reviewed for the position. **Dr. Ziehr indicated that this position will be much broader than the former “Director” position.** He stated that no one knows what the job is to entail. It will be a “learn as you go” experience. The person in this position will be directly responsible for CTL. The person in this position will provide stability, while enabling a move forward. Dr. Ziehr provided some background and history on CTL. Dr. Ziehr also advised on new technologies that CTL has acquired. As of Summer 2011, Blackboard will be upgraded to version 9.1 and will go live with it in Fall 2011. Blackboard has bought Wimba, so it will be integrated into BB. Wimba Pronto is a way to communicate online that incorporates text, video and whiteboard. Dr. Ziehr also state that a new position has been budgeted for CTL. This new position is for an Online Instructional Designer. Kip Finnegan is currently chairing the search committee. This position will require online teaching experience, but not a faculty position. A degree in Instructional Design or a closely related field would be desirable. Dr. Ziehr highlighted some of the programs that CTL has provided this semester:

Webinar on “Conflict Resolution”

Film Series: “Race to Nowhere” – Feb 17, 2011 (BA)

“Waiting for Superman” – **Mar 7, 2011 (Tahl) & Mar 10, 2011 (BA)**

Dr. Ziehr stated that the chairs can have tremendous influence on the portion of this position which is not yet formed. He also stated that the Help Desk @ ext 5678 will encompass help for ALL technology and calls will be routed appropriately. The Help Desk will be staffed more with full-time professional staff rather than with students, as in the past. He also noted that there will be training available for Wimba, such as online tutorials and links to aid in the use of Wimba. Dr. Cambiano asked why Wimba was chosen when it isn’t compatible with Apple products. Dr. Keller answered with the statement that in the Wimba demonstration, the Wimba representative

stated that Wimba is addressing this issue and expects to overcome it in the near future. Dr. Ziehr also noted that the new Dialogues and Debates series will fall under the umbrella of CTL. Dr. Ziehr also stated that Linda Summers has been named as a half-time Teaching and Learning Fellow. Quality Matters: faculty across the country will define what constitutes a good online course; for example, course criteria, rubric and standards.

Dr. John Schleede is heading a task force on Online Education. They will make a series of recommendations to make online courses more successful. It is being suggested that enrollment be limited to 30-35 students in online courses, and that larger courses be split and a teaching assistant added to ensure quality.

Dr. Amy Aldridge Sanford questioned the status of applications due in October for stipends for developing a new online course. Dr. Ziehr stated that more questions are being asked before approval, and **there are problems with some syllabi that do not conform to information required in the HLC template. He also indicated there has been a problem with large amounts of plagiarism in course materials.** He stated that more about the status of those applications will be known by Feb. 4.

A Steering Committee is in the process of evaluating the applications for the \$1000 Teaching and Learning Fellows stipend for Service Learning.

There is a 1 year grace period before the Quality Matters rubric will be enforced for online courses.

Dr. Ziehr stated that he would send out the links for the Conflict Resolution webinar.

Dr. Linde stated that he found Dr. Ziehr's report to be very informative.

Dr. Martin Tadlock

- Dr. Tadlock stated that the final draft of the proposed promotion and tenure rubric has been sent to the Cabinet, Academic Affairs, and the Deans' Council. All updates/changes have been made and it goes to council on Tuesday, Feb 1 for final approval. It will be in the Faculty Handbook for Fall 2011. He stated that everyone seems to be pleased with the new Tenure and Promotion rubric.

Dr. Linde asked about how new policy defines by-laws. Dr. Tadlock stated that it will be flexible for the departments. It will be a peer-reviewed, faculty driven process for tenure and promotion.

Dr. Tadlock stated that overall university travel is \$23, 000 less than the previous year. He also stated that there is a more efficient way to handle travel paperwork in process. There will be NO MORE travel without PRIOR approval.

Dr. Amy Aldridge Sanford questioned whether or not there is a travel checklist in existence.

Dr. Tadlock stated that there will be a cut in funding of 7-8% minimum, and could possibly be as much as 12%. He stated that the university needs to increase revenue building programs and move away from state funding. He asked for recommendations for accommodations that would make being chair/program coordinator more reasonable & desirable, a way to even out inconsistencies across the programs.

A new fee structure has been proposed and approved across campus. It will be sent to RUSO for approval. If approved, there will be “bucket fees” – fees per credit hour which will be given back to the college from which they were generated, and how those fees are distributed among the departments will be determined by the Dean of that college. If approved, these fees will go into effect for Fall 2011.

Dr. Joyce Van Nostrand questioned whether the guidelines for Technology fees were changing. Dr. Tadlock stated that to his knowledge they haven't and aren't, and that those guidelines are set by RUSO, not the university.

Old Business

New Business-

1. Topics for future discussion – Tenure and Promotion
2. Future meeting: February 24, 2011 at 3:15pm

Announcements

- Dr. Keller stated that she would email the new Request for Equivalency/Substitution form out to all members of the Chairs Council. It was requested that if a faculty member is asking a Chair in another department for equivalency, substitution or exception, that they provide the proper documentation in addition to the form. She also said that she would send out the final draft of minutes prior to the next meeting.

Adjourn: Dr. Keller made a motion to adjourn and it was seconded by Drs. Aldridge Sanford and Bighley.

Next Meeting: February 24, 2011 at 3:15pm in ITV rooms: SH204, BAAS 215, and SYN141

CHAIRS COUNCIL MINUTES

Meeting Date: February 24, 2011 at 3:15pm in ITV rooms: SH-204, BAAS 215 and SYN141

Members Present:

Amy Aldridge Sanford
April Adams
Renee Cambiano
Bill Corbett

Les Hannah
Cari Keller
Darryl Linde
Joyce Van Nostrand

Kathlyn Shahan
Richard Williams
John Yeutter
Deborah Landry

Guests: Dr. Denise Deason-Toyne

Call to Order: Dr. Cari Keller

Handouts: Minutes from January 27, 2011 meeting

Approval of Minutes: It was a unanimous decision to let minutes from the previous meeting stand as is.

Business Items:

Dr. Denise Deason-Toyne

Dr. Deason-Toyne asked for any specific concerns or questions concerning the Retention, Tenure and Promotion process. Dr. Keller stated that she had received a question from a faculty member in regards to secret ballots and a potential conflict in how to disclose the vote outcome. Dr. Deason-Toyne stated that a letter from the Department Chair to the Dean goes in the faculty file and can be viewed, but the ballots are NOT to be disclosed, ONLY the letter has to be disclosed. Under the new policy, the mentoring committee makes written recommendations. Dr. Corbett asked when the new policy would go into effect. Dr. Deason-Toyne stated that it would go into effect with the Fall 2011 semester. However, departments should encourage current new hires to embrace the new policy. She also stated that policies and procedures in the new RTP rubric are mandatory. Dr. Linde stated that he had been given to understand that they were merely advisory and did not override departmental by-laws. Dr. Deason-Toyne said that she would check for clarification. Dr. Deason-Toyne also said that for the sake of consistency, mentors need to remain in place, not change. Dr. Renee Cambiano thanked the Faculty Council for drafting the RTP document. Dr. Deason-Toyne stated that she will email the RTP document to all faculty.

Discussion of Chair's Handbook

In the previous meeting, Dr. Cambiano suggested a Chair's handbook. Dr. Keller asked what would go into this handbook. Everyone agreed that the role and responsibilities of a chair should be included. Dr. Keller asked what the other chairs wanted her to do in regards to a Chair's handbook. She said that she would check with Monica Barnett about a handbook guide document and find out what is in place currently.

Other

Dr. Keller stated that Chuck Mize, the CIO for ITS wants to meet with faculty for some training and brainstorming.

Dr. Keller said there is a possibility of Wimba scheduling some training in Wimba for Department chairs. Everyone present was receptive to the idea.

Dr. Keller also stated that departments or programs with BlackBoard organizations for their majors need to contact Chris Lofthus about putting graduates into a separate organization so that we can continue to track them.

Dr. Keller moved to adjourn the meeting and it was seconded by several members.

Next Meeting: March 24, 2011 at 3:00pm in ITV rooms: SH204, BAAS 215, and SYN141

CHAIRS COUNCIL MINUTES

Meeting Date: March 24, 2011 at 3:15pm in ITV rooms: SH-204, BAAS 215 and SYN141

Members Present:

April Adams
Mark Bighley
Mark Giese
Les Hannah

Cari Keller
Deborah Landry
Darryl Linde
Joyce Van Nostrand

Robin Pursley for Amy Sanford
Kathlyn Shahan
Mike Turner

Guests: Dr. Tom Jackson and Dr. Fritz Laux

Call to Order: Dr. Cari Keller

Handouts: Minutes from February 24, 2011 meeting

Approval of Minutes: It was a unanimous decision to let minutes from the previous meeting stand as is.

Business Items:

Dr. Tom Jackson

Dr. Jackson stated that the Graduate College will be adding 4 new Master's degrees. Also that there will be an assessment of the new general education curriculum, which will be conducted via a construct validity assessment of mission and core values, which will be a 4 year process.

Dr. Fritz Laux

Dr. Laux presented a slide show in regards to a chairs handbook. Copies of the presentation are attached to these minutes. Dr. Laux asked how detailed the minutes generally are and stated that they should be a simple summary, rather than detailed minutes. He also stated that in order to be effective, Chairs need to be able to delegate.

Dr. Bighley questioned why Dr. Laux rather than Dr. Tadlock, was presenting this information.

Other

Dr. Keller stated that she would send the shared governance document to all members of the Chairs Council, so that it could be reviewed and thoughts could be shared on the proposed role for Chairs in the shared governance.

Dr. Keller also stated that she would check into a possible retreat for Chairs, and annual structured Chair training.

Meeting Adjourned

Next Meeting: April 28, 2011 at 3:00pm in ITV rooms: SH204, BAAS 215, and SYN141

CHAIRS COUNCIL MINUTES

Meeting Date: April 28, 2011 at 3:00pm in ITV rooms: SH-204, BAAS 215 and SYN141

Members Present:

Mark Giese

Anne Davey

Cari Keller

Darryl Linde

Joyce Van Nostrand

Amy Aldridge Sanford

Kathlyn Shahan

Renee Cambiano

Guests: Dr. David Linebarger

Call to Order: Dr. Cari Keller

Handouts: Minutes from March 24, 2011 meeting

Approval of Minutes: It was a unanimous decision to approve minutes from the previous meeting with the correction of Robyn Pursley and Amy Aldridge Sanford's names.

Business Items:

Dr. David Linebarger

Dr. Linebarger handed out syllabus formats (templates) for General Education courses. He stated that there should be common student learning outcomes for general education courses and in all syllabi, those outcomes that are common to general education courses, should be marked with an asterisk.

Red Balloon Project Update

Dr. Keller advised that The Red Balloon Project is a degree assessment tool to be used in evaluating both the Bachelor's and Master's level programs. It is a learning outcome and assessment model.

Other

Dr. Keller stated that she had emailed Dr. Tadlock in regards to Chair training and that CTL will work on Chair training. She stated that she will be working with Dr. Chuck Ziehr on this.

Dr. Keller asked whether the other chairs felt they should have a presence in the Faculty Council and all agreed that Chairs Council should have a seat in the Faculty Council and they should be a voting member.

Dr. Keller also asked everyone to take another look at Appendix E of the RTP Guidelines and think about ways to align chair expectations in terms of compensation, release, etc.

Meeting Adjourned

CHAIRS COUNCIL MINUTES

Meeting Date: August 25, 2011 at 3:00pm in ITV rooms: SH-204, BAAS 215 and SYN141

Members Present:

Mark Giese	Darryl Linde	Kathlyn Shahan
Anne Davey	Joyce Van Nostrand	Deborah Landry
Cari Keller	Amy Aldridge Sanford	Mike Turner
Mark Bighley	Bill Corbett	Rick Williams
April Adams		

Guests:

Call to Order: Dr. Cari Keller

Handouts: Minutes from April 28, 2011 meeting

Approval of Minutes: It was a unanimous decision to approve minutes from the previous meeting. Dr. Giese made the motion, and it was seconded by Dr. Davey.

Business Items:

Update on Chair concerns dialog with Academic Council

Dr. Keller asked for a list of what concerns/needs chairs want presented to Academic Council, and the following things were listed:

- Included in shared governance
- Permanent seat in Academic Council
- Permanent seat in Faculty Council
- Also consistency in pay & delegation for coordinators
- Chair training

Dr. Keller stated that Dr. Bahr had asked for a written list of what Chairs Council would like to have Academic Council consider. The major item is the inconsistencies between Chairs and Coordinators, such as differences in pay, release time, etc. CC also wants consistency on authority across the board, and clarification/consistency on the issue of whether chairs are faculty or administration. Clarification as to what is meant by authority...if no one recognizes the administrative functions that chairs perform, it undermines their authority with faculty. Also needed is a clearly established outline of responsibilities, and a system of merit raises. There should also be incentive offered to faculty who do program reviews. There also needs to be more support from administration and recognition of the administrative role that chairs play from top level administration. There is need for better communication with people who track data and better support and data provided for reports instead of faculty having to manually gather data. And finally, there needs to be some 2-way dialogue between Administration and CC since Administration is not hearing the needs of chairs.

Bb organization page

Dr. Keller stated that she will be setting up a Bb page for the Chairs Council and enrolling all members of Chairs Council in said organization.

RTP Update

Untenured chairs are ex-officio members for purposes of voting, but are part of the procedure. Is additional protection needed for untenured chairs? Dr. Corbett pointed out that the necessity of a mentoring faculty member is gone with the advent of the mentoring committee.

Other

Dr. Keller said that guests for the next CC meeting will be Sue Catron and Christy Landsaw, who will answer budget related questions.

Conflict management training will be offered. Contact Linda Summers for more information.

Faculty Council will meet on Sep. 9 at 3 p.m.

Next meeting Sept 29, 2011 @ 3 p.m.

Meeting adjourned.

Meeting Adjourned



CHAIRS COUNCIL MINUTES

Meeting Date: September 29, 2011 at 3:00pm in ITV rooms: SH-204, BAAS 215 and SYN141

Members Present:

Amy Aldridge Sanford
Renee Cambiano
Cari Keller
Mark Giese

Darryl Linde
Joyce Van Nostrand
Anne Davey
Mark Bighley

Kathlyn Shahan
Deborah Landry
Mike Turner

Guests: Sue Catron

Call to Order: Dr. Cari Keller

Handouts: Minutes from August 25, 2011 meeting

Approval of Minutes: It was a unanimous decision to let minutes from the previous meeting stand as is.

Business Items:

Sue Catron-Banner Finance demonstration

Sue Catron demonstrated Banner Finance for the Chairs Council as a courtesy to those who had not had any prior training.

Academic Council Representation

Dr. Keller stated that the Academic Council seemed to be open and receptive to Chairs Council having a representative attend meetings. It was decided that it would be the Chair of the Chairs Council unless that person is unable to attend, then someone would be delegated.

Next Meeting: October 27, 2011 at 3:00pm in ITV rooms: SH204, BAAS 215, and SYN141



CHAIRS COUNCIL MINUTES

Meeting Date: October 27, 2011 at 3:00pm in ITV rooms: SH-204 and BAAS 215

Members Present:

Robyn Pursley for Amy Aldridge Sanford

Jason Junkens

Cari Keller

Mark Giese

Bill Corbett

Audell Shelburne

Mike Turner

Mark Bighley

Deborah Landry

Guests: Darren Tobey, Library & Literacy Center

Call to Order: Dr. Cari Keller

Handouts: Minutes from Sept 29, 2011 meeting

Approval of Minutes: It was a unanimous decision to let minutes from the previous meeting stand with one correction.

Business Items:

New Business

A. Guest: Darrin Tobey, Library & Literacy Center

B. Academic Council Update

C. Red Balloon Project – Discussion regarding Specialized Knowledge Learning Outcomes

- A. Library & Literacy Center: Darrin Tobey informed the group of the Library printing policy. It is 400 pages per person per term, whether student, faculty or staff.

Darrin also shared some information about the Literacy Center and what services they offer. They have computer assisted tutoring in reading, math, science, spelling, history, etc. They open from 8 a.m. – 5 p.m. Students can set up appointments for services. They offer Rosetta Stone classes in Chinese, Japanese and Spanish.

Dr. Keller asked who would be the person to ask about getting other language programs for Rosetta Stone and Darrin said that would be Steven Rice.

- B. Academic Council Update: Dr. Keller said that there will be opportunity to submit concerns about NSSE survey results to the respective college Deans.

She also indicated that the RFP is expected to come out this semester and if anyone has a plan that would meet the initiatives they should submit it to their Dean.

- C. Red Balloon Project: Dr. Keller gave some history on the Red Balloon Project and its mission. It is about defining degrees—identifying problems and coming up with innovative solutions. It uses a Lumina degree qualification profile. It concentrates on learning outcomes and how to assess them at the degree level. What should students know and how should it be assessed?

Specialized knowledge
Applied knowledge (learning)
Broad Integrative knowledge

Civic learning
Integration

Dr. Mark Giese indicated that he believed that passing certification or gaining licensure would meet criteria and demonstrate competency for Specialized knowledge component.

Dr. Mike Turner stated that some other fields such as Math, English, etc are already incorporated into the assessment models and used in all assessments due to General Education requirements.

Meeting adjourned.

Next Meeting: November 17, 2011 at 3:00pm in ITV rooms: SH204 and BAAS 215



CHAIRS COUNCIL MINUTES

Meeting Date: November 17, 2011 at 3:00pm in ITV rooms: SH-204 and BAAS 215

Members Present:

Mark Bighley

Anne Davey

Audelle Shelburne

Renee Cambiano

Chris Garland for Kat Shahan

Joyce Van Nostrand

Bill Corbett

Peggy Lisenbee for Deborah Landry (BA)

Rick Williams

Guests: Dr. David Linebarger, Humanities and Dr. Martin Tadlock, Interim President

Call to Order: Renee Cambiano

Handouts: Minutes from Oct 27, 2011 meeting

Approval of Minutes: It was a unanimous decision to let minutes from the previous meeting stand with Dr. Davey making the motion and Dr. Shelburne seconding.

Business Items:

New Business

A. Guests: Dr. David Linebarger and Dr. Martin Tadlock

B. Academic Council Update-Dr. Keller posted update in Bb site and emailed same

C. Other

A. Gen Ed Task Force

Dr. Tadlock stated that tools have been added to improve student retention and that what happens in the classroom is more important than any tools.

Dr. Linebarger suggested finding ways to encourage students to take an introductory course in their expected/perceived major to help boost retention. He also stated that a list of intro courses is needed for each major in order to facilitate this process. He said it would be a good idea to develop such a course if there isn't one already available. (CRJ already has one for each major option in the program.)

Some chairs indicated that their departments will have concerns with enrollment figures and faculty (shortage) if intro courses become a requirement.

Dr. Bighley asked about the feasibility/practicality of major-specific college strategies sections.

It was decided that for scheduling purposes, if no intro courses were available within a department, there would be listed a contact person and contact information for that department.

Dr. Linebarger stated that he would contact Dr. Keller re a list of departments and the introductory courses they offer.

B. Academic Council Update: Dr. Keller posted the update on the Blackboard site and emailed it to council members.

C. Other: It was indicated that Career Services will be expanding greatly

Motion to adjourn was made by Dr. Corbett and seconded by Dr. Davey. Meeting adjourned.

Next Meeting: January 26, 2012 at 3:00pm in ITV rooms: SH204 and BAAS 215