

Fall 12-4-2014

Council of Chairs Meeting, December 4, 2014

Marshall University

Follow this and additional works at: http://mds.marshall.edu/cc_minutes

Recommended Citation

Marshall University, "Council of Chairs Meeting, December 4, 2014" (2014). *Council of Chairs Minutes*. Paper 29.
http://mds.marshall.edu/cc_minutes/29

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by the Council of Chairs at Marshall Digital Scholar. It has been accepted for inclusion in Council of Chairs Minutes by an authorized administrator of Marshall Digital Scholar. For more information, please contact zhangj@marshall.edu.

COUNCIL OF CHAIRS, 2014-15
Minutes of the Meeting on December 4, 2014
Drinko 402; GC 226; SOP Conference Room

1. Attendance:

16 Chairs/Division Heads: Michael Castellani (CHM), Harlan Smith (FIN/ECN/IB), Marty Laubach (SOC/ANT), Jeff Archambault (ACC/LE), Richard Garnett (SOC/ANT), Liz Casey (HS), Del Chrol (CL), Jeff Ruff (RST), Allyson Goodman (JMC), Karen McNealy (CD), Alfred Akinsete (MTH), Sandra Reed (ART), Tony Szwilski (CITE), Asad Salem (ENG), George Davis (PSC), Mike Cunningham (LS)

Guests: President Kopp; Gayle Ormiston; John Maher; David Pittenger

2. Mike Castellani called the meeting to order at 3:37 p.m. David Pittenger (Interim Dean of the Graduate College and Interim Associate VP for Outreach and Continuing Studies) discussed a proposal for streamlining and consolidating the paperwork needed to hire adjunct instructors at MU's off-campus sites (e.g., TVRC, MOVC). Dean Pittenger first laid out his proposal in an email to Mike Castellani (Council President) dated October 16, 2014, which I quote (with some editing) below:

"I am hopeful to streamline our processes for approving courses that are taught as a part of our Third Party Contract process. For the sake of context, let me review the current procedures. Each semester we identify courses that could be taught at our satellite campuses (e.g., MOVC or Teays Valley) or at one of the high schools as a part of the dual enrollment program. A member of the staff then circulates the "Course/Instructor Approval" form for approval by the department chair and the dean of the college. Once approved, the course is added to the list of course offerings for the following term. If the course is a part of the dual enrollment program or if the course is supported by a third party contract the chair and dean, among others, must sign a Contractual Agreement identifying approval of the course for the purpose of the contract. Although high school teachers are not paid extra to teach dual enrollment courses, the students pay a lower tuition. Therefore, this form is essential for the Bursar's Office to reclassify the course to ensure the high school (and not the student) is billed the proper amount for the course. If the instructor is to be paid by a third party, the form is essential for the instructor's compensation. Chairs familiar with this step will recall that this form may be brought to them some time after they signed the "Course/Instructor Approval" form and is then signed by a number of other people as required by our auditors.

As you can see, this two-step process is cumbersome and demands considerable time as staff from the satellite campus must drive to and from campus collecting signatures. Unfortunately, due to audit requirements, we cannot collapse the two forms into one. That said, we do have an option that will allow us to have both documents signed at the same time. Here are the steps I propose.

- 1) Those overseeing our satellite campuses and dual enrollment programs will identify courses and instructors for the upcoming academic term.
- 2) Erica Riley, who oversees third party contracts, will add the dual enrollment and third party contract courses to the prospective course list after the departments have submitted their schedules.
 - a. As always, all courses of this type will have a 0 enrollment capacity.
 - b. The courses will be added when schedules are in the "dummy" schedule period.
 - c. This step allows us to complete the Contractual Agreement document with correct course information including the course CRN.
- 3) The staff will bring to the chairs the Course/Instructor Approval form and, when needed, the corresponding Contractual Agreement for signature.
 - a. If the department does not approve the course, Erica will remove the course from the listing.

Although this proposed procedure does not reduce the number of documents the chairs and deans must sign, it does reduce the time and expense related to staff travel to obtain necessary signatures. Moreover, the process will allow us to better coordinate the registration of the high school students into their dual enrollment courses thus granting them access to campus resources (e. g., Blackboard, library, and other resources) earlier in the term.”

Dean Pittenger would like to implement this new plan for Fall 2015. Discussion was brief. The members present agreed that this new set of procedures should be implemented. Mike Cunningham, in particular, noted in an email reply to Mike Castellani that “I run a considerable number of Third-Party contract courses each term and I support the proposed changes. While I am not affected by the dual enrollment problem, I am very familiar with the process and understand that it does need streamlining. I see no harm in this proposed procedure.”

Dean Pittenger noted that he expects to implement this new plan for Fall 2015. Marty Laubach asked if the chairs could receive email notification of the courses that MU would like to put on their schedules, for planning purposes. Dean Pittenger replied that this would be easy to do.

3. John Maher, MU VP for Research, took the members through the Services Portfolio Review presentation he had prepared for the Campus Leadership Retreat held on October 17, 2014. John’s PPT presentation will be provided to all members as an attachment to the email through which these Minutes are distributed.

The Service Portfolio Review began in the aftermath of the October 2013 Campus Leadership Retreat. The goals are to take a university-wide approach to reviewing current services provision, focus on services that will support increased net revenue, capture cost savings for MU, enhance services provision at the university level, and address current choke points in the current services landscape. The approach taken would be deliberate and comprehensive, with a focus on sustainability. The actual work of the Services Steering Committee, done via a set of six Rapid Response Teams (RRT’s), began in May 2014. Each RRT prepared an Action Plan, which was delivered to President Kopp on September 2, 2014. These plans contain 53 specific recommendations, designed to save \$9 - \$10 million dollars during FY16. These recommendations will form the basis for the next phase of the Portfolio Review – the upcoming implementation effort.

To guide the implementation effort the Steering Committee did a Quadrant Analysis that split the recommendations up into four categories: (1) High Impact/Difficult; (2) High Impact/Easier; (3) Low Impact/Difficult; (4) Low Impact/Easier. At this point the Steering Committee has agreed to put the Low Impact/Difficult recommendations aside and will focus going forward on the other three categories.

The Steering Committee is currently preparing for the implementation phase. A new set of teams will be set up; team members and charters will be set before the Holiday Break; the kick-off will be in January. By June the Steering Committee expects implementation to be well underway.

Discussion focused, at first, on the nature of the \$-savings (in terms of amount and time-frame) to be generated. John emphasized that the savings identified in the presentation are obtainable during FY16. The RRT’s have determined that these savings will flow from changes that are, in their view, “realistically implementable.” Members asked if savings would be generated through terminations and/or layoffs. The answer, according to John and President Kopp, is No. But the savings have not been generated yet; as the implementation phase gets underway the new teams will finalize the original list of recommendations and work to understand how savings are being generated by the recommendations implemented – with the focus on sustainability over time. Del Chrol asked if this approach can be summed up as the university’s long-term

view of how work will be distributed. John said Yes – and that as the recommendations are implemented options and opportunities for change in work-load distribution and job descriptions will open up.

President Kopp and John Maher referred repeatedly to the Steering Committee’s idea of using a “Business Services Model” approach to the provision of services, in order to reorganize and realign the service infrastructure in terms of specialized functions that could be provided by the same individuals to different entities across campus. To do this MU must identify the limits of what technology will permit, and the skill sets of our service-providers. Can we enhance our people’s skill sets, and/or identify new technologies, in ways that will increase efficiency?

One member noted that Secretarial PIQ’s may not currently permit going to the Business Services Model approach in the short run. PIQ’s and Job Descriptions will have to be re-written. John agreed, and noted that MU’s HR Director Bruce Felder will be directly involved in the implementation phase.

A comment was made about the need to make sure that services enhancements benefit the students, too, not just the university’s bottom line. John noted that the student perspective is definitely one that the RRT’s kept in mind, and that it will be kept in mind going forward.

4. Gayle Ormiston (Provost & Senior VP for Academic Affairs) reviewed with those present the current state of the Academic Portfolio Review (APR), which also emerged from the October 2013 Campus Leadership Retreat. Gayle’s PPT presentation to the Campus Leadership Retreat on October 17, 2014 – which he reviewed with us today - will be provided to all members as an attachment to the email through which these Minutes are distributed.

Gayle noted that the APR is ongoing. Current discussions include Reassignment Time provided for Administrative purposes, the use of Adjunct Instructors, Class size, Course Rotation Plans, and Position Reallocation. The Deans’ Program Planning & Priorities documents (completed on August 15, 2014) are also forming the basis for continued discussion.

The APR has identified four potential enrollment Growth Areas for MU: (1) International Students; (2) Transfer Students (particularly CTC students); (3) Adult Learners & Degree Completers; (4) Master’s-level programs in professional areas. With respect to (2), Gayle circulated after the meeting the recently approved HEPC Series 17 policy document “Procedural Rule on Transferability of Credits and Grades.” A comment window will remain open through the end of 2014; anyone with comments please send them to Gayle ASAP. With respect to Point (3), Gayle noted that the RBA program should be supported and enhanced, as our prime vehicle for drawing back to school those with some college attendance in their past. Right now 16% of MU students graduate from the RBA program – making it the largest UG degree program on campus. And there are some 93,000 adults in the region who have attended college in the past but have not completed degrees. MU hopes to capture at least some of these students through enhancements to the current RBA.

Other aspects of the APR include an Academic Advising Audit, a Student Recruitment Plan (our current yield rate is 57% - 59%), and a new RRT on Continuing Education & Online Programs, to be led by Karen McComas of the CTL. Discussion then turned to the topic of Scholarships. With 51% of MU students being Pell-Grant-Eligible, the university is shifting its scholarship focus from merit to needs-based. The Office of Recruitment has begun implementing this approach already, and the MU Foundation has launched a major initiative designed to raise funds for needs-based scholarships. As President Kopp acknowledged, a key component of success will be how well we are able to educate our donors on the reason for this shift in our scholarship programs.

To the extent that merit remains important in scholarship offers, the university is thinking about awarding merit-based scholarship to current students, based on their performance here at MU.

Rewarding good performance in Years 1 and 2 of a student's time at Marshall, should enhance retention as well.

Discussion then turned to the cost of attending MU. Probably the #1 reason students drop out is cost, and our current Student Loan Default Rate is 15.6% - which penalizes our current students because now these funds cannot be disbursed until after the semester begins. Members actively discussed the textbook-buying implications of this new requirement, and how departments and programs might find creative ways to help the affected students.

The meeting adjourned at roughly 5:15 p.m.