Arts and Sciences Chairs' Council Meeting Minutes
May 4, 2009


Guest: M. Canfield – GE Assessment
Merle Canfield visited chairs’ council to recruit for scorers for general education assessment. Collection of data has just finished in: natural sciences, social sciences, western civilization and contrasting cultures – 700 are completed. Scorers are needed now – Merle has sent out a memo with that request. We need about 16 people – 4 in each area. Honorarium is $30/hr.; expect 10 – 15 hrs. needed to do the job, plus a couple hours of paid training. Interested people should let him know this week. Adjuncts are okay for this if they teach in that area. The scoring process is to be completed by July 1.

Meanwhile the committee is interpreting the data from a year ago right now – this needs to be speeded up.

GE committee discussed doing a better job of interpreting assessment results once they have them. Assessment analysis will happen this fall for this spring’s data.

Announcements:

* Winter session course proposals were due Friday, May 1 – should get them in immediately to Rhonda.
* A&S Curriculum committee election in Social and Behavioral Sciences – ballots due to the Dean by Monday, May 11. Uncontested nominations in both the Fine Arts and Humanities and Math/Sciences sub-schools.
* Retirement reception for A&S faculty and staff on Friday, May 15: 2:30 – 4:00. We hope chairs will try to attend.
* Spring 2010 course schedules due to Dean by August 26.
* WEB-grading access available May 5 through May 18 at 10:00 a.m.
* Summer session begins Wednesday, May 20.
* S. Asumah – looking for participants for Infusion of Diversity into Curriculum – to be held May 18 – 20.
* R. Kendrick: Revised annual report – is it firm? Per Bruce Mattingly, the provost has agreed to charge OIR with this duty. We await the President’s memo on annual reports.
* Richard, Karla and Mel – this is their last chairs’ council – a round of applause for their contributions over the years.

Summer Session:

Summer I low-enrolled course lists went out to chairs today. Bruce will meet with Joy Mosher on May 13. Let Bruce know this week if there is a reason why low-enrolled
courses need to be retained. Cut off is 6 students for GR courses, and 8 students for UG courses – pro-rate rule applies for lower enrollment. Mary Cervoni will send out a list of single digit enrollments to be checked.

**Associate Dean's Report:**

J. O'Callaghan – Catalog review process; he is extending the deadline to May '11 for catalog review sign off sheets due to him (chairs' sign off sheets).
- Sick leave rosters – April, May and June.
- Explanation of Threat Assessment Team – membership and role.

**Personnel:**

B. Mattingly: From the President’s Open meeting for new faculty last Friday: Erik’s point is that there are no plans for lay offs or reductions at this time. He announced that we will restore travel and half-year sabbaticals on a limited basis. It is not likely that we will see any tenure-year track searches in 2009-2010. No elimination of lines, they remain vacant.

**Facilities:**

Bowers – new Architect contracted to do design phase. Will review existing programming.
Dowd – no news.
Second phase of Moffett may happen in three or four years.
Route 281 widening – may result in a traffic light at the parking lot - close off other 281 entrance to campus.
Plans to replace one central boiler, with satellite system.
Continue to discuss usage of McDonald building – possibilities include international visitors (Clark Center), Migrant Education, Counseling disorders, lab space, student exhibit.

**Budget:**

Looking at the same budget next year – flat budget – like this year.

Fund-Raising Concerns:
NeoVox hosted a teach-in event recently. Students wanted to raise money for charity and sold t-shirts. You cannot add money from fundraisers to state accounts – should use SGA or ASC accounts instead.

**Curriculum:** None

**Old Business:** None

**New Business:**
• **Sabbatical Leave Procedures**

Handout and discussion of proposed policy text. Criteria for sabbaticals remain as before, per Board of Trustees.

S. Anderson comment: small departments are disadvantaged in the department’s ability to satisfy teaching and service responsibilities.

B. Mattingly noted that Math (a larger department) faced the same issue, when it had 3/9 out on sabbatical – that’s a big hit. He is sensitive to the struggles of small departments.

S. Anderson: Full-year sabbatical is very difficult for his department.

B. Spitzer: in the text the phrase “President’s cabinet will determine” – that needs to be struck. Note the fifth bullet, this puts too much weight on financial dimension; in the “time-frame” area, the rationale for one semester requests needs to be struck (it’s superfluous).

R. Spitzer: On page 3 – three months time frame for report is not consistent with the Handbook.

B. Mattingly: The statement about the President’s cabinet is a descriptive fact. The idea is to identify who will have authority in the end. Regarding page 2 – the “time frame” area – the proposer should suggest why it is doable in that time frame. On page 3 – the three month reference is not new.

C. Cirmo: Re: president’s cabinet – delete the parenthetical phrase.

R. Kendrick: Regarding page 2 – agrees with B Spitzer. Suggest changing the “department’s” ability to cover... to the “college’s” ability to cover (p. 1).

B. Mattingly: If the department has the ability to cover without adjunct help, that is not necessarily a bad sign, i.e. it is not necessarily a sign of “over staffing”. Adjunct support is college based, not department based.

B. Mattingly: disciplinary expertise and department’s ability to provide the curriculum – they are relevant factors in the decision.

G. Bhat: Agrees with R. Kendrick. Have to claim to be in “desperate need” all the time – shouldn’t be punished for efficiency. There is a lot of variability in student enrollment, especially in GEs.

R. Kendrick – Keep the focus on the college’s responsibility.

K. Alwes: Administration treats sabbaticals as “vacations”. Department sees them as essential to what they do. Provost sees the down side of departments being able to cover a sabbatical. The handbook states sabbaticals are at the President’s discretion. Disagree with Bob re: policy for all times shouldn’t be based on crisis.

M. King: Administration does not value sabbaticals for faculty.

P. Ducey: The draft refers to Chairs’ “priorities” – does that mean 1-2-3, numerical ranking? Could it be high vs. low?

B. Mattingly: 1-2-3. You don’t want me to decide between your applicants.

P. Ducey: The blame will fall on chair if a faculty member is ranked #2.

S. Steadman: Give chairs option to prioritize or not.

R. Spitzer: Prefers not to have to numerically prioritize.

B. Mattingly will take these comments back to the deans for consideration – new process to start in the fall.

• **TEC Representation:**
It has been a difficult year to TEC – bylaws have been under discussion for a year. In that context the question of representation arose and it poses a real question in Arts and Sciences.

B. Mattingly: we do not have a one to one correspondence between departments and programs in two areas: 4 science departments have 2 coordinators; 1 SST coordinator is linked to 8 departments. We would like to have the chairs and coordinators involved. So how should we be represented?

B. Mattingly – TEC attendance has fall way off in the last couple of years. Regular participation is needed, not just blocks that are absent 90% of the time. What is reasonable for real participation: SST and the sciences especially?

C. Cirmo – chairs are surprised to have a vote now.
R. Kendrick – we don’t offer a teacher education program to their majors.
S. Steadman – Has had two students in ten years in SST – not really for her.
R. Kendrick – agree with Sharon. Very few students in SOC-SST. No real ramification for their students in TEC decisions.
G. Bhat – It is the coordinator’s task to attend. One representative who provides information to the department.
AAS – get informed by Gigi. That is fine.
ECO – Gigi can do it for them.
CHE – never got the emails, no invite.
BIO – we need the vote.

B. Mattingly: where one-to-one – ENG, MAT, ICC, representation is simple. SST is different. For the sciences – the chairs run their programs, AES, etc. So they want a vote. So representation would be via two coordinators and four chairs. For SST – 1 coordinator and 1 chair (perhaps a tag team approach)

Respectfully Submitted,

Jerome O’Callaghan
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