Council of Deans

Unapproved Minutes

January 22, 2001

Members:

McKellips
Atwater
Burgess
Dawe
Goode
Harrison
Neale
O'Keeffe (Absent)
Soelle
Young

1. McKellips informed the group that it is now firm that HOW 106 will be the NCA resource room. We will probably need to have one more meeting of the Deans Council before the NCA team gets here and we may need to have the meeting somewhere other than this room. We will rapidly be converting this room to the Resource Room and we don't want to disrupt that. McKellips asked if everyone had copies of the schedule of meetings for NCA and the reply was "yes."

2. McKellips stated that the first item he wants to talk about is the on-line course situation and also about the survey form he sent to the deans.

a. McKellips asked if the deans could decipher what he was asking for. After the course number, title and developer, there are two blank columns that the deans are to fill in. The information in those blanks will tell McKellips when a course will be developed and how it is planned to be delivered. Then the instructions on how to complete the survey were also sent as an attachment to the e-mail. McKellips stated that there is apparently some confusion about the survey. The purpose of the survey is for McKellips to know how much money he has to come up with between now and July 1 to cover release time or overload compensation and then start to determine how much money we will have to have after July 1. He did not ask the deans to put dollar figures in the survey but to tell him when the people are going to be doing the work and how they want to be compensated. They can be compensated with overload pay or release time. McKellips can do a reasonable estimate if he has this information.
Soelle mentioned that she did not receive the e-mail. McKellips stated that she was on the e-mail addressees but he will get the survey forms to her.

b. Several questions were asked about compensation for developing on-line courses.

(1) When four people develop a course, how are they compensated. Reply was that we cannot compensate each of them for the same course. That would have to be looked at but they would probably have to split the compensation four ways.

(2) Another question - if someone is developing a course and they expect to finish it in the summer, is there a possibility they would be compensated before the summer term? Reply was that we have a state law that says we can pay for services rendered but not before we receive them. McKellips knows that there will be faculty working on courses this semester but we don't want to pay them for something that hasn't happened. We ordinarily would pay at the end of the semester they completed the preparation of the course.

(3) Another question - What is required as evidence of completion? Reply was that there is an evaluation process in development and the course has to be put through before it is called complete. We are looking at what some other schools are doing. SREB has some standards that courses have to meet and we will be looking at those and others and try to get copies of what has been developed. We certainly are not going to take anybody's word for it.

c. We are negotiating with the Army and Price-Waterhouse who has the contract for Army On-Line. We have been in contact with them and while we are not signed up with them yet, we probably will. Lengthy discussion followed about various associate degree programs where substantial portions will be delivered on-line, locations that are possibilities for Cameron to deliver on-line, i.e., Europe, Viet Nam, etc., and the components of the programs.

d. McKellips mentioned that we are going to have to take extreme initiatives to stay in the ballpark with respect to what the Army and Price-Waterhouse want. What McKellips will be doing is working to try to bring the courses forward that meet their requirements. McKellips feels that he will have a better feel for how we are doing as soon as he has the first round of the survey completed and after we sit down and decide what we have to push and take a look at what it will cost us. Then he will come up with a best estimate on how much will be available this year, next year, etc. This will be on-going for a long time. While there is urgency about the first part, we need to spread this out over several years. After he gets with Eduprise to see what kinds of services they offer, he will know what we want to out-source and what we can do ourselves.

3. Lengthy discussion was held regarding resources for the new Enterprise software for the Library, delivery of documents electronically, upgrading other Library systems. There is a piece of equipment that will take a microfilm document and digitize it so that you can transmit it electronically rather than make a copy from the microfilm and then fax it.

4. McKellips reminded the group that we are entering into the critical time for faculty reappointments, rank and tenure recommendations.

a. McKellips stated that he had read the memo that is usually sent out. The memo was incorrect based on a previous policy so he has rewritten it and the new one will be correct. In the past we have done things two different ways.
The way the policy is written, if a tenure-track faculty member does not get a letter of non-reappointment, then they know they are to be reappointed, however, the faculty are not very comfortable with that. In the past we have given them a letter telling them they have been recommended for reappointment. With the new policy it gets more complicated because there are different notification dates depending on the number of years of service.

b. McKellips asked if anyone had any input about the necessity for sending out reappointment letters. We all know that the recommendations are really not final until after the June Board of Regents meeting. Of course, the non-reappointment dates come earlier. Is it important that the faculty members get a letter telling them the President is going to recommend they be reappointed? Faculty get nervous about that time if they don't have a letter in their hand that says they are recommended for reappointment. Discussion followed.

c. McKellips stated that this is a complicated process and reviewed the dates for notification of non-reappointment.

(1) A tenure-track faculty member who is not to be reappointed for a second year of service must be notified no later than March 1.

(2) A tenure-track faculty member who is not to be reappointed to a third year of service must be notified no later than December 15 of the second year of appointment.

(3) A tenure-track faculty member who is not to be reappointed to a fourth or subsequent year of service must be notified no later than May 31 of the year preceding the final year of appointment.

d. McKellips stated that the deadlines which were in the old Faculty Handbook for submitting rank and tenure material won't be in the new Handbook. Question was asked when the material for promotions was to be submitted. Reply was that promotions and tenure are due on March 20. For the non-reappointment dates of March 1 and May 31, McKellips needs that information in his office by February 20 and April 15 in order to allow time for review by the President. Lengthy discussion followed.

COMMENTS

Burgess - No comments.

Neale - No comments.

Soelle - No comments.

Dawe - No comments.
Goode - No comments.

Young - No comments.

Atwater - Gave update on arrangements for NCA team visit on February 5-7. Asked if arrangements for the hotel, transportation, and that sort of thing had been taken care of. McKellips stated he will be working on assigning individuals to help with some of that. The hotel arrangements have been made. He will need to see about getting the team members picked up at the airport and get them to the hotel, but he can't do anything about that until he gets their arrival schedules. There will be two of our vans at the hotel for their transportation while they are here.

Harrison - No comments.

O'Keefe - Absent

Adjourned 12:05 p.m.