ARTS AND SCIENCES CHAIRS’ COUNCIL MEETING MINUTES
10/22/07


Announcements
- Administrative Conference today at 3:00 p.m.
- Student nominees for USA TODAY competition

Associate Dean’s Report
- J. O’Callaghan will send the link regarding USA TODAY competition to Chairs
- Applications should be sent to V. Levine by 11/20/07
- CCRC has discussed the “special topics” aka x29 issue.
  o Discussion on special topics – Do we have data on how often 29s became a regular course? Issue of bottlenecks in process -- not clear that the GE committee is such a bottleneck. There is a history of GE committee allowing on rare occasions an x29 course into the schedule. The GE issue is seen on the CCRC committee as more difficult than LAS and WI attributes. Annotated version of Provost’s x29 policy allows WI as an exception to the general rule.

Facilities
- Continued patience is appreciated! The crew is working hard.
- New kiln delivered to OM today

Personnel
- 11 searches are ongoing
- Gallery director search
- BIO – one search – 45 applications
- NMD – one search
- CHE – three searches – applications are coming in
- COM – phone interviews – four applications
- ENG – two searches – applications are coming in
- HIS – one search – ongoing
- MAT – one search
- PHY – one search – to replace R. Wheeler

Budget
- Stabilization funds from Provost - $12,400
- Academic Equipment Replacement funds from the Provost - $14,900 – see guidelines: cortland.edu/business/guidelines. Requests should be sent to M. Prus
- Temporary service costs are hitting new highs - $1.8M – partly reflecting reliance on visiting professors
- Point made that impacts of extra students are felt in the departments – but compensation (e.g. stabilization money) is not adequate. Too many adjuncts

**DSI Evaluation System**
- Discussion revolved around a sample quantitative evaluation system:
  No system in the document for the evaluation of the arts --We will try to come up with something. BIO does not agree with the proposal and supports Spitzer response and adds some concern regarding requiring CTEs

- Dean Prus: Drs. Spitzer, Steck, and Best critiqued the proposal in a memo to the President. Spitzer memo has some good points regarding relative weights in the sample. The Handbook is explicit about publishing weights used in DSI criteria by everyone other than the Provost. Equal weighting of three areas: teaching, research and service. Some controversy about that.

- Discussion continued: Large criticism is this is not a good idea, not something that can be fixed by adjusting the weighting. Too much work added on to chairs, nothing taken away. Grants are practically impossible in the Arts, etc. Tying evaluations to funding is problematic. Philosophy Dept is very upset regarding the quantitative-based assessment in DSI. The Handbook does refer to “objectively”. Supports qualitative judgment by the Chairs

- Dean Prus: Scheme is appropriate to intentional balancing of performance in all 3 areas. No choice allowed by the Board of Trustees. All 3 areas must show contributions.

- Discussion continued: DSI is not about required combination of 3 areas. Commonality in Social Science is not there for a cookie cutter approach. Memos from President Taylor did apply percentages in years past. Would that be OK regarding the handbook? This approach is not necessary – should be more flexibility. SOC department has used a similar scheme but supports the choice to use or not. Shouldn’t we wait for a new Provost? Continual tweaking will it to be grow to a large and complex policy to allow the variation in A&S.

The meeting adjourned at 2:30 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,
Jerome O’Callaghan