Meeting Minutes

Academic Council

February 26, 2013

Fireside Conference Room

12:00 – 1:30 p.m.

Members: Randy Bachmeier, Darlene Bricker, Christine Cremean, Jay Howland, Greg Kegel , Lisa O'Neil, Norton Pease, Rosalyn Templeton, Lanny Wilke

Member(s) gone: Larry Strizich (training)

Chair: Rosalyn Templeton

Minutes: Chris Bond

1. Minutes reviewed – February 19, 2013 Darlene made motion/Norton 2nd and voice vote approved
2. Business faculty position – discussion
    a. Some hurdles –
        i. Breakeven point is 20.35 students
        ii. Past funding method cannot be used – funds used for overload cannot be used for this position
        iii. Salary adjustments would be needed
        iv. Needs help to grow business side
        v. Wait until Program Review but funding is still needed
        vi. LOA funding comes from Salary pool
        vii. Rosalyn is looking for funding options
    b. Welding position requested
        i. Has not been moved forward yet
        ii. Waiting for Virgil Hawkinson's retirement letter – have not received one
3. Policy: 404 Degree Check Requirement ;
    a. Motion made/2nd to accept - discussion
    b. Changes shown in red were gone through and discussed

      c. For consistency in 6 c and d change the word "information" to "program sheet"

      d. Degree Check Policy wording put on hold to discuss Alisha's graduation draft policy

      e. Graduation "Draft Dream" tabled to discuss Draft 1 – can be discussed later

      f. Graduation policy, traditional one, discussion of Draft 1

          i. #4 scratch out "(if applicable)" in either Draft

          ii. Change the word "Policies" to "Procedures" – cannot do according to Chancellor's office

      g. Both Graduation Drafts were tabled so the material can be read and processed and to get a corrected Dream Draft without words lined through

4. Early Alert/Midterm grades – Information for Academic Council

      a. Noel Levitz is back the beginning of March

      b. Rosalyn and Stuart co-chairing a committee about early alert system

          i. After brainstorming and work group should have new early alert system

      c. Looked at current Early Warning System from Northwest Progress report

          i. According to Noel Levitz only 25% of MSUN faculty have used this system

          ii. Has response rate changed since the system was updated

          iii. TRIO Grant required tracking the students that are at risk

          iv. Requiring tests in the first week of class to see student standings

          v. Can't the Desire 2 Learn be a platform for all faculty?

              1. Midterm grades are already calculated in this system

              2. How many use the D2L system?

                  a. Early alert system could be placed within the shell

                  b. Can't faculty be made to use the system and the grade book and as their email?

                  c. Randy-75% of faculty are using D2L but not grade book

                  d. Some requires that syllabus be posted electronically

      d. Samples and studies in info packet for members to go through

      e. Who is in charge/oversees the process will be ironed out with Noel Levitz

          i. MSUN needs a system – should be in place Fall 2013

5. Learning Communities – Christine chairing

      a. Set up Core courses in strategic areas– doing activities with groups of students

          i. Nursing

          ii. Diesel

          iii. Criminal Justice and/or with Community Leadership

          iv. Native American studies/Community Leadership

          v. Education?

      b. Will come together and learn how to put communities together and the different models available

6. Enhanced Advising – big gap

7. Financial success

8. Service excellence

9. Chair and Dean Evaluation – Discussion and input
   a. Chair Evaluation comes from the CBA 6.5.E
      i. No form was set up
      ii. On form is actual duties of the Chair
      iii. Would like to put this out this Spring for each College to rate each Chair
      iv. Norton suggested that the form, as is, does not give him the feedback he could use
      v. Suggested using a scale of 1 to 10 or 1 to 5 to be more specific
      vi. Question: Will create a scale from 1 to 5 for the Chair Evaluation
      vii. CBA says Chair will be evaluated annually – using exact duties from CBA
      viii. Norton wants to know if faculty should have input into the evaluation form – wants form to go to college faculty meeting to discuss this form
      ix. Motioned and seconded to move the updated (scale) form to the College Leadership and faculty meeting. Input and discussion will come back to Academic Council for a document to be created. More faculty input may be needed for finalizing the evaluation form. Friendly amendment to update using scale.
      x. Once faculty has had input into the form it could be taken to the Union leadership
      xi. Passed with voice vote
   b. Dean Evaluation comes from duties listed for each Dean – much heated discussion
      i. Removing the part that says "working with the Provost"? Faculty may know already
      ii. Will change to scale as in Chair Evaluation
      iii. Greg is wondering why faculty is evaluating the Dean. Should be Provost reviewing the Dean?
      iv. Evaluations should only go the evaluated as formative for the Chair/Dean
      v. Darlene – why are evaluations so feared? Rosalyn agreed. Faculty is evaluated all the time to see what students think.
      vi. Rosalyn will evaluate Deans
   c. Both forms will be brought back to Academic Council with scaling added

10. Meeting adjourned at 1:35pm