

*College of Education and Human Services*

CHAIRS/DIRECTORS MEETING  
JANUARY 24, 2008  
CMU 216 2 PM  
NOTES

---

IN ATTENDANCE: Dean Walseth, Wendy Frappier, Jane Giedt, Shawn Ginther, Peggy Rittenhouse, Britt Ferguson, Lynn Mahlum, Karen Danbom, Bruce Hanson, Boyd Bradbury.

1. In what areas are better processes needed?
  - Faculty evaluation process sheet – revisions?
    - i. Chairs were given outlines of the evaluation process and asked to give any feedback for changes, etc. to Margie
  - Wendy's forms
    - i. Wendy Frappier has created a special form to assist her with establishing teaching loads, copies of which were presented to the group. Dean Walseth encouraged the others to adopt this form if they thought it would help them, and asked everyone to share with the group any other forms or processes they have discovered that assist them in their work as Chairs.
  - Tenure and promotion procedures
    - i. Each Chair outlined their department's procedures for tenure/promotion; there doesn't appear to be a consistent process within the College.
      1. **STL** – appoints a sub-committee of three. One person is selected by the faculty being reviewed, the second by a lottery process and the third through consultation with the Chair. This committee reviews the candidate's materials and meets with him/her to discuss. Then materials are made available for the entire department to review. The candidate writes an overview of his/her accomplishments, and after reviewing the materials, the other faculty can either sign the letter prepared by the Chair on behalf of the department, or they can write their own letter.
      2. **HPE** – The candidate can choose to create a committee or not. If not, everyone in the department reviews his/her materials and gives their comments. The Chair prepares a letter on behalf of the department, everyone is asked to sign. Wendy thought they could improve their process so that the candidate has better preparation and support in this process.

3. **Nursing** – Previous process was more ‘loose’ and similar to HPE because there were so few people in the department. Now that the department is growing she thought they could institute a more rigorous process.

Discussion generated the following points:

- A good committee will lead to better support of the candidate in this process
  - The process is very time consuming for a large department
  - Faculty should participate in development of department’s process
  - The process should be in writing
  - Helpful for the faculty to learn what others are doing
  - There are no surprises at the end
  - Adds a degree of formality for probationary faculty
  - The process should be consistent
    4. **Social Work** – their process is ‘friendly-formal’. The candidate’s summary is put out on the front desk to be reviewed by the whole department. The whole department meets with the candidate and the candidate goes through the five criteria and discusses them with the group. Then the candidate steps out and the group has a discussion, the candidate returns and the group presents their feedback. The candidate selects a colleague to write a letter on his/her behalf, and the Chair prepares a letter on behalf of the department.
    5. **SLHS** – They follow the contract as it is written. The department is small, so everyone in it is the ‘committee’. They review the candidate’s materials and give him/her their comments. The group then votes, and the Chair writes the letter on behalf of the department.
    6. **CNSA** – They have a written, formal process, on which they vote to keep or change each year. They require written documentation be available for full review for a certain number of days. A formal meeting is held where the candidate makes a presentation, and the committee votes. Besides a letter from the department Chair, the Administrative Coordinator also prepares a letter. Others in the department are free to write their own letters if they wish.
2. Annual reports
    - i. Beginning this year all departments and programs will complete a “Department Work Plan” planning and reporting process. This will be an annual process and will replace the biennial reporting process used previously. All documents needed to complete the reports are available at: [www.mnstate.edu/acadaff/Departments/academicplanning-reporting.htm](http://www.mnstate.edu/acadaff/Departments/academicplanning-reporting.htm). These reports are due to the Dean by May 1<sup>st</sup>.
  - Next accreditation
    - i. Dean Walseth asked that departments who will have an accreditation visit coming up – next year – to let her know so she can budget accordingly. If there are specific needs, i.e. technical support, etc. let her know as these will also need to be budgeted.
2. Tech fee proposals – ASAP
    - Generally for software requests; get requests to the Dean as soon as possible.

3. Transfers – recruitment – retention
  - SG proposals put forth
    - i. **Deferred to a later meeting**
  
4. Accountability – think LEAN!
  - Talk with faculty
  - Maybe offer a course once a year
  - Share courses between programs where subject overlap exists
  - Supervision ratios
  - Look closely at bottleneck courses, courses with high attrition
  - Need to keep traditional programs going and classes filled
  
5. Student Academic Conference
  - Andrew Conteh gave a presentation regarding the upcoming Student Academic Conference
  - He expressed his sympathy on the passing of Harry Weisenberger, whom he called a great colleague
  - This is the 10<sup>th</sup> anniversary of the Conference
  - The conference celebrates the achievements of both faculty and students
  - Requested CEHS be well-represented
  - Nominations to Andrew by February 11
  - Conference to be held on April 9<sup>th</sup>;
  - Next year, for the first time, classes will not be scheduled the day of the conference

Meeting adjourned.