Council of Directors Meeting Minutes
November 18, 2019

In attendance: John Meyer, Matt Casey, Ann Marie Kinnell, Cyndi Gaudet, Ward Sayre, Stacy Reischman Fletcher, Pat Sims, Lachel Story, Jake Schaeffer, Andy Sung (proxy), Bernd Schroeder, Joe Griffit, Marvin Bouillon, Kimberly Goodwin, Jamye Foster, Sandra Nichols (proxy), Scott Piland, Sara Jordan, Jerome Kolbo, Teresa Welch, Elizabeth Tinnon, Tisha Zelner, Heather Annulis, Derrick Patten (phone).

Guests: Deans Gould, Masterson, Winstead; Dr. Maureen Ryan; Dr. Steven Moser, Provost

1.0 Call to Order
Pat Sims called the meeting to order at 1:00pm. She welcomed the deans and announced that Dr. Gaudet would be retiring at the end of the semester and Dr. Heather Annulis will become the Interim Director.

2.0 Guests
2.1 Dr. Steven Moser, Provost
Provost Moser reminded the council to be consistent in implementing the new employment policy.

Provost Moser spoke to the School Policies and Procedures documents. He referred to Initiative #7 that addressed consistency and coherence across schools. He mentioned that a variety of templates and outlines may have led to confusion. The Provost requests that institutional goals and objective (the Academic Master Plan), and college and school strategic plans and goals are included in our documents. The Provost and his team will work to create one template (not an outline) that we will then use for school documents. This will be done in January. Consistency in format is a goal.

Directors expressed concerns about this being anything other than cutting and pasting.

The Provost addressed concerns about how we frame service in our documents and how we may be missing considerations for “the scholarship of service.” This will be an issue to address later.

Pat Sims mentioned implementing Annual Evaluations under the newly approved review period: When is the bridge year? The Provost reported that these changes are effective immediately. This means that Spring 2020 will be included in the calendar year 2019 review period. Faculty submissions will be at the end of the Spring and will be for Spring 2019, Summer 2019, Fall 2019, and Spring 2020. (In other words, this is the bridge year). Pat mentioned that we should check in with new faculty in the spring 2020 semester so that they get feedback prior to the 2019-2020 review period. One director suggested new faculty meet with the faculty mentor. Another director suggested broadening that input to include more people. The Provost suggested a meeting be with the school director early in the spring semester.

One director mentioned that schools selected their governance options prior to moving to this new review time frame. There were questions about how early in May (if at all) meetings can be held. There are questions about how quickly directors can get teaching
evaluations. Dr. Moser indicated that the process is in the works for faculty to access teaching evaluations as soon as grades post allowing for the evaluation process to begin mid-May. Dr. Sayre indicated that change in evaluation dates could be modified in the Faculty Handbook.

A short discussion ensued about the 3-point scale (3-tiered scale) for annual evaluations. While there may be some points of disagreement, the decision was vetted and approved, and it is not under re-consideration.

There was a question and discussion about the roles and compensation for Program Coordinators and Assistant Directors. Perhaps there are multiple levels/options at the institution. One director mentioned that reassigned time is based on size and complexity of program coordinated. Dr. Moser indicated a one-size fits all approach will not work. Discussion about developing a broad framework around roles and compensation may help directors and deans in recommending appropriate reassigned time and/or compensation.

Pat Sims mentioned an upcoming issue with school representative on governing bodies. One area that we need to rethink is representation on Academic and Graduate Councils. It seems there needs to be a representative from each school for each school with undergraduate programs, and one representative per school from schools with graduate programs. Making changes like these will require revising the bylaws of these governing bodies.

2.2 Tracy Barnhill, Graduate School
Tracy will visit our January 2020 meeting.

3.0 Old Business
3.1 No old business

4.0 New Business
4.1 No new business

5.0 Discussion Items

5.1 Annual evaluation bridge year
5.1.1 Evaluation Criteria: 2019 or 2020
See 2.1 above.

5.1.2 Process for evaluating pre-tenure faculty
See 2.1 above.

5.2 Faculty Handbook Committee – Ward Sayre
5.2.1 FH 5.8.1.2.1 Letters to candidates
The issue is when candidates get school committee letters versus director letters. Faculty Senate is concerned with the potential for directors to meddle in the faculty committee letter. There were many perspectives on how involved the director is at the
school committee level. There also issues with who should sign the letter. Everyone on
the committee should sign the letter. One director mentioned that this may be a result
of how chairs have been replaced by directors. Pat will send Qualtrics survey to the
council for a vote on this proposed Handbook change.

5.2.2 FH 5.7.1.5.1 Extension on probationary period
The council supports the proposed change.

5.2.3 FH 5.2 Pre-tenure review
A short discussion ensued, but overall the directors seemed to have no overwhelming
points of disagreement with the proposed change.

5.3 School representation on Undergraduate and Graduate Councils
See 2.1 above.

5.4 Budget and staff reallocation processes
Budget: One director asked if we are going to see the framework or the product that will
be implemented. Pat reported that the Provost’s Office is trying to find a way to “rank”
research in terms of research. Other components are graduation rates, SCHs, research
productivity, instructional efforts, instructional FTE, enrollment. There were concerns
about service programs, dissertation efforts.

A discussion ensued related to workload. Is the norm 40/40/20? Or is service 5-10%? Do
we negotiate it with each faculty member? Can we reassign professional service? Who
supports this? Directors shared a variety of difficulties we encounter in trying to assign
percentages. It seems that consistency would be helpful. Pat Sims suggested we report
back to Provost’s Council on this.

School staffing structures: Conversations are just underway with Dr. Amy Miller and a
committee.

5.5 Updates to workflow
The Executive team reported to the Provost current frustrations with workflow
processes, including approving change of majors. There is a lack of information that was
previously afforded directors in helping directors make decisions for such requests.
Additionally, dropping labs and lectures which have co-requisite status needs to be
linked. Currently students can drop a co-requisite lab or class without impacting the
other. This defeats the rationale of co-requisites. As it stands, the enrollment process
works fine (SOAR prevents students from adding a lab without a lecture). When it comes
to dropping a class or lab, that link is lost.

Pat reported that the Provost stated the those creating the workflow processes do not
know what the end users need. Pat asked directors to send her items/issues that she
will share with the Provost.

5.6 Interim grades
Grades should be entered for all students for all classes.
5.7 Southern Fund
The Provost requests ideas for the use for the Southern Fund. Ideas include spousal hires, retaining faculty, reassigning time for service, professional development for directors. One suggestion is to create mechanism for spousal hires. Some institutions use a 1/3 funding process: 1/3 salary from school hiring the primary candidate; 1/3 salary from school hiring the spouse; 1/3 salary from Provost’s office.

5.8 Academic Impressions: [https://www.academicimpressions.com/my-account](https://www.academicimpressions.com/my-account)
5.8.1 Create an account with (your @usm email address), you may use that and then change your password. If it asks for the institution code - AIPRO_DCBBEB

5.9 Contractual obligation policy
Pat Sims shared the process that led to the new policy, specifically that is came out of the Provost’s Office. The Council did not create the policy, but went through an extended process of collaboration to create recommendations to share with the Provost.

6.0 Upcoming Dates/Announcements

6.1 WORKSHOP on pulling Digital Measures administrative reports.
   **Monday, November 25, 1:00 - 2:30 pm** Asbury Hall, Room 120

6.2 Crucial Conversations Training for Directors
   **Wednesday, December 18, 8:30-4:30,** Asbury Hall, Room 123

6.3 Next CoD meeting: **Monday January 13, 1:00-3:00,** OMH 102

7.0 Good of the Order

8.0 Adjourn
The meeting was adjourned at 2:53 pm.

Respectfully submitted,

Stacy Reischman Fletcher