CAS Department Chairs &

Program Directors Meeting

Monday, October 2, 4 pm, CRUC 315

Notes

**In Attendance:** Keith Mellinger, Brooks, Kuykendall, Claudine Ferrell, Anand Rao, Betsy Lewis, Julius Esunge, Karen Anewalt, Jodie Hayob, Jonathan Levin, Miriam Liss, Grant Woodwell, Janet Atarthi-Dugan, Jon McMillan, Don Lee, Gregg Stull, Laura, Mentore, Dianne Baker, Joe Romero, Janet Asper, Melina Patterson, Kate Haffey, Kelli Slunt Caitlin Moore, Cristina Turdean, Rosalyn Cooperman, Patrick Catullo

I. Minutes at CAS Leadership meetings

a. An issue has been raised at UFC meetings regarding the fact that official meeting minutes have not been shared with all faculty

b. Do chairs think that Meredith should keep official meeting minutes and post them on the webpage?

Yes. Information from CAS leadership should be shared with faculty.

*Dean Mellinger*: Meredith will type meeting minutes and they will be posted on webpage.

II. Chrome River responsibilities

1. Budget office has raised concerns over the number of errors that are occurring in ChromeRiver reports. This has resulted in budget office spending many hours correcting these errors.

It was reported that most of these errors are the result of faculty entering pre-approvals and expense reports without assistance from office managers.

ChromeRiver entry is the responsibility of the office managers. They are trained to use ChromeRiver.

As supervisors, chairs should remind office managers to assist faculty with all ChromeRiver entries.

*Question*: So, we should tell office managers that are already overwhelmed that they have to do all ChromeRiver reports for faculty?

*Dean Mellinger*: Yes. If it’s in their EWP.

b.  *Betsy Lewis*: If you are spending department funds on undergraduate research projects or student conference attendance, please tell office managers to enter Activity code URGSCH in FOAP.

1) This will help track all the funds that departments are spending on undergraduate research.

2) More accurate reporting to IPEDS

3) Do not used the activity code with undergraduate research budget FOAP

III. Updates on budgets and enrollment, searches, FERIP

a. Enrollment

1. Census count of students is complete

2. 761 newly enrolled freshman undergraduate students this semester

3. President Paino has set the goal around 800 for next year.

b. Budget –

1. Some of the budgets that received money from strategic reserves funds will potentially be reduced in the new fiscal year: faculty $500, undergraduate research and faculty development supplemental

2. Working to make sure there are still funds for these budgets.

3. Good budget recently passed. E.g., UMW will purchase the Eagle Village mixed use building and this will help alleviate some budget issues as we no longer have to pay high rent to UMW Foundation for the space.

c. Tenure track searches

1. Searches have been approved for this academic year.

2. Studio Art, Biological Sciences, Computer Science and Theatre

d. FERIP

1. There has been some concern regarding language in FERIP paperwork that has been interpreted as meaning the university can delay pay out at any time once the application is agreement is approved and signed.

2. Once agreement is approved and signed, payout cannot be cancelled.

IV. Team Teaching and Co-teaching

a. Concern raised that there has not been a lot of team teaching at UMW because we don’t have the support and process in place.

b. Dean requested input needed from chairs on team teaching

Discussion:

Problem is that faculty members only get partial credit for team teaching. Or the perception is that faculty only receive partial credit.

There was a mechanism in the past for team teaching through the “teaching innovation program”. Funding from grants and exchanges. How do we have team-teaching approved?

There is a problem with splitting credit for team-teaching in our department. When splitting lecture and lab, one faculty gets credit for one teaching hour despite putting in three contact hours and the other gets credit for three teaching hours while also putting in three contact hours. This is one reason faculty have not wanted to team-teach.

Why aren’t team-taught classes cross listed?

*Dean Mellinger*: The issue with cross listing courses in Banner is that it creates a problem with reporting. Only one department is reported with enrollment for the course.

This is not a reason *not* to cross list.

V. External grant – new form

a. Form is now completely electronic

b. Go to <https://provost.umw.edu/grantsoffice/files/2023/09/Checklist-and-Coversheet-Combined-Form_Aug23.pdf>. Fill out and sign digitally.

VI. Overlap in majors leading to the same SCHEV degree

a. SCHEV policy: There must be 25% overlap in non-general education credit hours for any two major programs leading to the same degree

d. Provost’s Council is settling on a policy that we will use “40 credits” as required for general education courses

c. Requirement is then that 20 credit hours overlap between the two majors leading to the same degree

e. This policy will be added to the Directory of Academic Procedures

Discussion:

*Dean Mellinger*: SCHEV is only reviewing these changes when you add new programs.

UMW can add a major to a degree without SCHEV approval. Documentation of internal policy must be prepared.

* Concerned about testing the limits of this rule. SCHEV is not flexible.
* Hidden pre-requisites cause problems in calculating the number of credit hours that overlap between majors. Do “hidden” prerequisites count toward the credit hours that overlap? Will this result in increasing the number of hours required for a major? This would be another problem.

*Dean Mellinger*: This problem is the result of internal faculty rules. It can be changed.

* It would create another problem if there was inequity in the requirements for credit hours in a major if some exceed 48.

*Dean Mellinger:* It is a challenge to put two programs that are very different together.

* Could some methodology courses offer different topics and still meet same course requirement?

*Dean Mellinger*: Yes. As long as it is the same course, it can have a different topics. FSEM is an example.

* SCHEV creates and enforces rules so as at to make it impossible to make changes to academic programs.

*Dean Mellinger:* Most of the changes that we make to our academic programs will not be noticeable to students.

VII. Update from the Academic Organization Working Group – some comments from Brooks Kuykendall who is on the working group and also a chair.

a. Benefits of changes to the Deans’ workloads

b. Challenging environment for humanities and social sciences programs.

c. General humanities degree is not a good option

1. Data from University of Richmond general humanities degree

2. Only 1 student enrolled.

d. Due to many external factors, students are not choosing to take humanities and social sciences courses

1. We have to change our curriculum to meet changing student demands

2. The goal is to not eliminate low enrollment programs completely

e. Enrollment problems are not indicative of poor-quality instruction or programs

f. Marketing problem for programs

1. We must do a better job of marketing our courses and majors to students

2. Many students might take classes in low enrollment programs if they knew about them

Discussion:

* Concerned that academic departments will be split without being consulted.

*Brooks Kuykendall*: We are not at the point of breaking up departments.

*Dean Mellinger*: All developments from AWOG will be communicated to chairs and faculty in weekly emails.

* It is going to be difficult to decide how different departments fit and are located within a new academic model. Some departments would not be happy about being forced into a new model that doesn’t fit.

*Dean Mellinger*: We haven’t decided if we need to restructure departments yet, let alone how to do it.

* We need more details about the proposed hierarchical structure of the organization than what is contained in the AOWG document.
* How will creating additional divisions in the academic structure increase collaboration and interdisciplinarity?
* SCHEV has such strict guidelines that it prohibits us from being innovative in thinking about academic reorganization

*Brooks Kuykendall:* Approval from SCHEV for any change is not certain.

* Question about “College of Education & Health Sciences” in the AOWG document. Would biomedical sciences be moved to this new college?

*Dean Mellinger:* No, or at least *probably* not. Health sciences refers to health profession programs that state wants us to create. Might not be possible.

*Dean Mellinger*: We need a new SCHEV liaison. PC is discussing that.

*Dean Mellinger*:

1) If faculty want to meet with a third party and discuss ideas for interdisciplinarity in programs, please contact the AOWG.

2) If faculty members or chairs have a new ideas for restructuring academic programs, send the proposal to AOWG.

3) Proposals can be shared in Friday emails from AOWG

* This is only a problem with departments that have low enrollment, so why are all departments being forced to make changes.

*Brooks Kuykendall*: So many programs are in the red. This isn’t a judgment on the quality of these programs. It is simply an accounting of what students are signing up for.

*Dean Mellinger*: This is a problem that the whole university has to address in order to meet current challenges in higher education.