Call to Order
The meeting was called to order at 1:01pm by President-elect Dr. Lachel Story.

Guests

2.1 Dr. Steven Moser

2.2 Dr. Amy Miller
   2.2.1 Advisement Center.
       Dr. Miller shared details and updates. The goal is a 24/7 holistic advisement center for incoming students and some transfer students. The intent is to partner with existing advisement in programs. This should alleviate faculty of some of the “technical details” involved in advising. The Advisement Center is also planned as a place where students can get advice at a more general level and in a “neutral” way. An example given was students who are unsure about what they want to major in.

       A three-year phased implementation is starting this semester in targeted programs/colleges. The eventual location will Cook Library, 2nd floor; renovations are underway, but the program will start in a temporary location until renovations are complete. Four professional advisers have been hired; four more are being hired now. A search for a director of the Advisement Center is underway.

       Directors had questions about how the Advisement Center impacts summer orientations. (It will, and Dr. Miller is in favor of a summer 2020 advisement task force in order to sort this out.) Overall, students seem to have expectations for their summer orientation sessions that are not matched by what they are actually experiencing.

       Some first semester transfer students will meet with their programs from the start of their course of study at USM. This seems most likely in professional programs. Dr. Miller stated that online programs/students will be included in all discussions about advising. These issues, and others, are identified areas that will be investigated as new processes are implemented. Dr. Miller reinforced that discussions with programs is a necessary and important part of this process.

       Relatedly, Dr. Miller talked of new electronic workflow process for Change of Major. It will be live September 30, 2019. An email describing the process was sent to CoD on 9/16/19. The directors are reminded that comments we enter are visible to students.
Adoption of Agenda
The agenda was adopted as circulated.

Approval of Minutes
There were no changes to the minutes from the August CoD meeting.

Committee Reports

Executive Committee Report
The Executive Committee Report will be covered in 8.0.

Ad Hoc Committee Reports

Faculty Handbook Committee – Ward Sayre
Dr. Sayre reported that tenure and promotion details are most pressing. Second, the change to the review period for Annual Evaluation also remains under scrutiny. The Handbook committee is resistant to faculty service during the summer. Directors talked of the positive impact Digital Measures will have on this.

Old Business

New Business

Discussion Items

Annual Evaluations. See 5.2.1 above.

Council of Directors – Administrative versus Governing Body.
It is confirmed that the CoD is an advisory body that can recommend policy. Dr. Moser added his thoughts that within shared governance an advisory group is just as important as a representative body. One Director mentioned that we are now cut out of deliberative processes since we are not a governing body and not allowed to be on Senate. Dr. Moser reaffirmed that Directors in the current model still hold a strong voice in institutional decision making.

Dr. Story mentioned that Senate is discussing term limits for Directors. Directors recommend that individual concerns about director be address instead of implementing term limits. There was no verbalized support for term limits for Directors.

Academic Integrity Facilitation Process
Our concerns about the new policy were shared with Dr. Moser. He reported that there was no intention to not include the directors, but to alleviate work for us over time. Primary concerns were that the entire process could happen without directors knowing and that this might be a missed opportunity to mentor new faculty. The other concern is that in the new process faculty members pick the faculty facilitator. Dr. Miller shared her experience of a lack of consistency in faculty awarding XFs. Directors are encouraged to have conversations with their faculty about XFs and Fs to see if we share perspectives and practices across programs.

Teaching Track Faculty
Directors are encouraged to promote equality across teaching track and tenure track faculty. Our culture should support all faculty the same. Dr. Moser is very concerned that we’ve set up a model that we are not implementing well. Teaching track are not second-class citizens. The intent is to create a diverse set of roles and responsibilities across our faculty. Teaching track faculty are here to lead pedagogy in
programs and to be highly engaged in undergraduate education. Teaching track are “laser focused” on the high quality education of our undergraduates.

One director mentioned that salaries should be equitable across tracks. Is this something the CoD wants to revisit?

8.5 Faculty Contractual Obligations Policy
What reactions have been had from faculty? There were some positive reports. New faculty seem less phased by the policy. The policy is seen as a tool to be used in some conversations that need to be had. Some highly engaged faculty were offended. The Provost reinforced the importance of how directors manage/frame this in schools. Faculty reactions seem positive in schools where discussions were had prior to the release of the policy.

8.6 Clarification of Coast Area Coordinator Responsibilities
The Executive team discussed Coast Area Coordinator responsibilities with the Provost. Clarified is this: area coordinators are intended to help steer students to the right people, to facilitate, and to work on scheduling. This is intended to be transitional as more decisions will be made in the future. There are some areas of nuance and this year we will be working through issues as they emerge. Another goal is to have people on the ground who can hold people accountable. Who handles personnel issues? It depends on the issue. The aim is consistency in how we handle similar issues. Directors are concerned with clarity of the faculty who are on the coast.

8.7 Formative Director Evaluation.
The idea for an evaluation process that would help to develop directors in addition to the administrative evaluation we get from our Deans was brought up. Is the Dean evaluation enough? Will future evaluations that incorporate more data be more helpful? One Director mentioned that the continuing development of the CoD might be the next step before developing a new, formative director evaluation process. Can the Dean can be more tied to faculty in the annual evaluation of directors? Can it be optional, or periodic? How much can self-assessment fit in? One director mentioned the Opposite Strengths process. The CoD will explore something along these lines. We can then plan development opportunities around group results. The goal of any of these ideas would be to increase the overall success of directors.

8.8 Director Development
8.8.1 New Directors
A separate meeting with new directors is forthcoming. Issues will be solicited via Qualtrics. Potential issues include creating faculty development plans, how to hold your friends accountable, and others. Directors are encouraged to share with the Executive Team areas for development at any time.

8.8.2 Needs Assessment

9.0 Announcements
9.1 CoD October 14th @ 1:00 in OMH 102
9.2 New website https://www.usm.edu/council-directors/

10.0 Good of the Order

11.0 Adjourn
The CoD was adjourned at 2:38pm.
Respectfully submitted, Stacy Reischman Fletcher.