

Deans Council Minutes

Boardroom, BA 290

August 10, 2011, 9:00 – Noon

Approved and Distributed: August 26, 2011

Dr. Larry Lemanski began the meeting with a few comments about the Institutional Effectiveness Manual that Dr. Randy McBroom is completing before his retirement. He also mentioned the Procedure on Strategic Planning and Institutional Effectiveness. Dr. Lemanski indicated he would contact Dr. McBroom to see where he stands on completing the manual and revising the procedure. When Dr. Lemanski asked if the Institutional Effectiveness committee members were functioning, Dr. Waller indicated there were issues and some committee members probably need to be replaced. Recommendations for individuals to add to the committee were solicited. It was noted this committee should meet regularly.

1. Assessment - Dr. Dan Jones

Dr. Jones began with few general statements about the need for concern with the university's current status with SACS. Our preparation for our reaffirmation of accreditation is here, with our compliance certification due in September of 2013. He went on to talk about assessment and the need for it to be done daily. We must begin to act. Next, Dr. Jones discussed the expedited search that is underway for an associate provost for IE and Planning.

Dr. Jones referenced an email from Dr. Rusty Waller that was distributed. He asked Dr. Waller to make some remarks.

After identifying his institutional effectiveness and research credentials, Dr. Waller went on to say that institutional effectiveness at A&M-Commerce is "dead in the water". He indicated that you cannot go backwards. It is urgent that we complete our current IE cycle and begin the FY12 cycle in earnest. The process needs to be reviewed. The university should not have a knee jerk reaction. He said that deadlines need to be set, and identified them as follows:

- September 30, 2011: All 2010-11 IE units should be completed for submission to the COEHS IE Committee for review. By this date, 2011-12 units should also be developed through the assessment methodologies.
- October 31, 2011: All COEHS 2010-11 IE units and COEHS 2011-12 IE plans will be submitted to the University IE Committee for review.
- November 30, 2011: The University IE Committee will submit results of the university IE review to the President and Provost.

Dr. Waller continued by saying that a functioning Institutional Effectiveness committee is needed at each unit level, i.e., college and departments. There was discussion about the value of peer review of units.

Dr. Waller talked about what was needed for training. We have a need for training on designing institutional effectiveness units specifically, not just on software. Training committees on IE audits are also needed. He went on to say that he believes our general education is the weakest of all of the units. General Education needs to be great or else we can really be negatively impacted by the failure of this unit to work on institutional effectiveness. There was general discussion about who can provide training and the process. There was some discussion about mapping curriculum. Mrs. Barbara Forbes provided insight into how the training process has worked in the past and that we should now go beyond working on the software. Training is needed on missions, goals, and objectives, learning outcomes, assessments, action plans, and results.

As part of the dialogue on training, the group discussed the possibility of mandatory training in the format of a conference. It could have a general assembly and then breakout sessions. Dr. Waller said that Marila Palmer is a terrific presenter; her presentations are action specific, not just philosophical. He recommended we consider getting her. **Action Item:** He will contact her about fee and availability.

Dr. Langford added comments about audit teams asking individuals to show them examples of where they had failed and how you took action to make changes.

Dr. Headley spoke about the graduate program reviews. He asked whether or not undergraduate program reviews are occurring. Dr. Waller reminded the group that certifications must also have IE units.

IE is related to quality improvement. Strategic planning ties IE to expenditures of the budget.

There was dialogue about whose responsibility it is to work on IE. Comments were made about having one designated individual versus shared responsibility. Dr. Langford indicated he supported that one individual in each department be given reassigned time to be responsible for entering data into WEAVE. Dr. Jones stated that there is danger in doing this and that it is one of the department head's core job functions to see that this is coordinated. Dr. Lemanski commented that IE reports from WEAVE would be beneficial as a learning tool. All agreed it is not the responsibility of an administrative assistant. Dr. Langford told the group that his college will begin to implement eCollege Learning Outcomes Measures in the spring semester of 2012.

Dr. Jones asked who will chair the Academic Institutional Effectiveness Committee. It was decided that Dr. Weeks will serve as the interim chair until the new associate provost is hired.

A priority list of action items needs to be prepared:

- Committee structure in place (Following the meeting, Dr. Weeks sent recommendations to Dr. Jones.)
- SACS web site to be established (SACS now has a link on the Provost webpage.)
- University to commit one or two days for mandatory training. This conversation tied back to the possible workshop. This workshop should precede the October conference at which Dr. Belle Wheelan is to speak. (Again, Dr. Waller suggested Marila Palmer as a possible speaker for the general session.) **Action Item:** When asked for a volunteer to plan this conference, it was decided Dr. Langford will take the lead, with the assistance of Dr. Weeks, and others.

Dr. Jones addressed the group on other topics.

- He stated that a better process to handle reassigned time is needed. A system to evaluate requests is needed that includes developing criteria upon which to base approvals. He also stated that criteria need to be fair and that it can vary across departments. He went on to say that individuals who are department heads and are buying out time with grant funding will be approved. A timeline should be established that has a deadline that coincides with class scheduling for the semester that will be impacted.
- Dr. Jones shared with the group that a six figure amount of funding has been included in the budget for merit pay. However, distribution will not be a percentage merit pool, but rather a lump sum will be provided for each division to distribute. Not all will get a raise. It is intended that supervisors designate a specific percentage minimum to be distributed

that will ensure that those receiving raises will get a significant increase. **Action Item:** Dr. Romero pointed out some potential issues. It was decided that Dr. Romero will follow-up with Bob Brown to make certain no policy or procedural violations occur.

- Dr. Jones shared with the group that he wants to establish a Center for Academic Innovation with a budget of \$50,000. Faculty can apply for grants (seed money/\$2,500 to \$5,000) to develop innovative/cutting edge projects. Examples were given such as to develop a means for better use of technology or improved outcomes for academics or administrative processes. This is not intended to fund research projects. Criteria need to be set and the process for review and awarding grants must be developed. He asked for input from the deans in these areas, as well as how the center might be structured. He wants to announce the center at the fall faculty meeting. (It was mentioned that input from the Faculty Senate would be wise.)

Dr. Weeks thanked Dr. Jones for his commitment to the accreditation process.

2. WEAVE - Barbara Forbes, Jack Harred, and Dr. Rusty Waller

Mrs. Forbes distributed a (WEAVE) 2010-2011 Audit Report. In her presentation, she indicated that training is needed on how to distinguish between objectives and goals. Everybody needs to know how to use WEAVE. She recommended that members of departments (units) get together to utilize the assessment in WEAVE as a means to track assessment. Mandatory training is needed on how to complete assessments. Peer review of programs would be very beneficial, especially for units that are not as well versed in building IE units in WEAVE. (Dr. Attardo indicated how much he benefited from seeing a good model.)

3. Faculty Residence – State Authorization – Hal Langford

Dr. Langford distributed a handout entitled State Authorization Requirements for Public Colleges and Universities published by the Florida College System and a list of faculty who reside in a state other than Texas, but teach (or have taught) for A&M-Commerce. He indicated he was not talking about the new federal regulations regarding students in other states taking our online classes but rather the university being in compliance with state regulations to teach in their states. Some of the discussion revolved around an individual state's definition of having a presence in that particular state. **Action Item:** Dr. Langford has prepared a folder for each state with the documentation for the state. He asked for someone to take on the project of determining what is needed for compliance for each state.

4. Student Scholarships – Susan Grove

A status report of FY12 scholarships awarded through August 9 was distributed. Dr. Lemanski told the group that Mrs. Grove and Mrs. Spradling, under his direction, worked on the scholarship awards in an effort to award more scholarship dollars to deserving students. Dr. Lemanski and two of the deans served as committee members ranking each scholarship recipient. Dr. Lemanski reminded the group that Dr. Jones needed the scholarships to be awarded because it is hampering the university's ability to solicit new funds when exiting dollars are not given in scholarships. Dr. Lemanski asked that the list be reviewed line by line. He questioned the various deans about specific department balances, asking that particular department heads be contacted by the dean. There was dialogue about how to expand criteria that is too restrictive. There was also talk about departments requesting additional material that kept some awards from being made. Mrs. Grove was asked about deadlines to make awards. She indicated they could continue to be given on a rolling basis, but late awards can complicate matters for students as some awards are tied to a total

award package. Dr. Johnson suggested two award periods rather than one, April and then again in July.

5. Nominations (3) from Academic Affairs to serve on Search Committee for Associate Provost for IE and Planning – Dr. Larry Lemanski

Dr. Lemanski announced that Bob Brown is chairing the committee. He is working to finalize the job description. Dr. Romero asked for clarification on the title. It was decided that associate provost for IE and Planning is appropriate. The group was asked to make committee appointments for the following positions:

- a. Dean –Dr. Sal Attardo was appointed
- b. Department Head – **Action Item:** To Be Determined
- c. Faculty Representative – Dr. Lavelle Hendricks

6. Departmental Instructional Functions – Dr. Sandy Weeks

- a. Fall Schedules and Enrollment Numbers: Department heads were once again asked to look to see that caps are appropriate, keeping in mind that, in most cases, 35 was the cap to be used for online classes. Dr. Weeks stressed that deans need to make certain the caps on face-to-face courses are not capped at low numbers.
- b. New Faculty Lines (Cynthia Rhodes): Mrs. Rhodes provided two handouts. One was the original request for new lines and the other was the second call for new lines. Mrs. Rhodes asked the deans to review both sheets to see if some lines were duplicated. She asked the deans to revise the latest spreadsheet, making certain lines that have already been placed in the FY12 are no longer listed on the request sheet. Ms. Rhodes reminded the dean of the email sent by Dr. Weeks asking that the justifications be strengthened in terms of very specific information.
- c. GA Allocation: Dr. Weeks informed the deans that, although we realize the allocation does not meet the amounts requested, the amount of funding is to cover the 12 month period. No new funds will be available in summer of 2012 that are specifically designed as GA allocations.
- d. Textbook posting requirements for Higher Education Opportunity Act: we have a process in place that needs to be followed. Department heads, not Mrs. Spradling, should take the lead in making certain faculty members are in compliance.
- e. Submitting Summer II grades: A list of faculty teaching SSII was distributed. Deans were asked to stress to department heads the need for faculty to submit grades online in a timely manner. New Coordinating Board rules state “...students in classes that are not assigned grades may not be reported on the CBM00S report by some Student Information Systems (SIS) which will result in fewer contact hours and less state funding.” It is important that you inform your administration and faculty that timely posting of grades will become a critical step if your institution wishes to report all contact hours and receive all formula funding associated with those contact hours.
- f. SACSCOC monitoring report: deans were asked to submit narrative incorporating the University mission into sufficient faculty statement. Only one has been received. At a session at the summer institute Dr. Weeks located a calendar that lays out a timetable, as well as a model template that is used by reviewers to quickly assess compliance with IE. The model was distributed.

7. Procedure 15.99.03.R0.02 The Use of Copyrighted Material – Dr. Weeks-- postponed
8. The proposed dates for the Deans Retreat are September 15 and 16.
9. Open Forum
 - a. Dr. Lemanski provided information about a visit yesterday by a small group of individuals to Parker University which has among its programs a Doctors of Chiropractic degree. We are looking at signing a 3 + 3 agreement whereby our students would spend the first three years here, transfer to Parker University, and complete the doctorate in three years. At the end of the first year at Parker, we would accept reverse transfer credits and award students a bachelor's degree. We are also looking at some research interactions.
 - b. Dr Lemanski shared information in the letter from the National Science Foundation thanking the university for participating in the Higher Education Research and Development Survey. It was noted that Natalie Henderson was recognized for her efforts in survey. Dr. Headley was asked to let Ms. Henderson know her work was acknowledged by this group.

Meeting adjourned.

Next Meeting: August 30, 9:00 a.m. to Noon