**Council of Chairs and Directors Monthly Meeting**

**Minutes 11/3/21**

In Attendance: Deanne Pytlinski, Andrew Bonham, Elizabeth Ribble, Jess Retrum, Grant Denn, Mark Yoss, Brian Hutchinson, Sheryl Zajdowicz, Andrea Borrego, Maria Akrabova, Kevin Zeiler, Annie Butler, Greg Clifton, Theresa Buxton, Arthur Fleisher, Doborah Horan, Adriana Nieto, Dan Lair, Nicole Vowles, Kathy Whitmore, Jacob Welch, Chris Jennings

Guests: Shawn Worthy and Fred Holmes

1. Fred Holmes, new AD for Athletics for Student Athlete Advising
   1. Shared processes including:

Student athletes must be enrolled in 12 credits

Send out progress reports and got 62% back this semester

Help them transition to college, resources, think about jobs after college

NCAA restriction—Coaches may reach out to faculty, but they **must** copy Fred Holmes on that email.

* 1. Shawn Worthy also spoke

Stressed commitment to academics, and Chairs of Math and Chemistry shared that the student athletes are among their best students because of the structure that athletics provides.

Struggle now with developing a freshman orientation, that helps them with that transition to being a college student.

* 1. Question—how many student athletes are there? Answer about 280-300
  2. Greg Clifton, Chair of Accounting, announced he serves on the Athletic Advisory Council, so invited any chairs to contact him as he is a liaison.

1. Connie Sanders, Registrar
   1. Updates on transfer processes and the move to Slate will be forthcoming
   2. New electronic workflow process for Change of Majors/Minors

Registrar solicited feedback from the CoCD, and several members spoke

Questions came up about whether there should be required advising before approval.

Should this be initiated by student? Concerns about students making mistakes.

Concerns about identifying one primary approver, which is a necessity in this workflow process. Perhaps a different process in future would have more flexibility.

The workflow process is what is used now for Petitions for Degree Exceptions, so discussed some of the challenges of that.

Some departments require acceptance into a program before student can get in, so the communication about that needs to happen rather than automatically allowing them in. At the same time, we don’t want them to think the major doesn’t exist or discourage them.

Broad support for something electronic, but concerns shared about the logistics.

1. Handbook change recommendations-Deanne Pytlinski on the committee, needed feedback.
2. Current charge from Provost to look at the following:

Section X. Disciplinary Procedures and Sanctions​

·            Clarify the difference between minor and major misconduct​·            Expand description of types of sanctions appropriate for minor and major misconduct​

Section II. Category I Faculty – Policies and Procedures​

·            Clarify when disciplinary sanctions can be considered as part of an evaluation portfolio​

·            Clarify how an ongoing Performance Improvement Plan (resulting from a Post Tenure Review) should be considered in a Promotion application ​

·            Make reconciliation meetings discretionary rather than mandatory​

·            Remove language that states that “adherence to all contractual requirements” is a prerequisite for a success RTP/PTR evaluation​

1. Handbook revision committee is starting with the first two bullet points, and to that end, the following draft language has been created. We are seeking constituents’ feedback, including whether we are on the right track. Proposed revisions were shared on the screen and sent out to Chairs after the meeting.
2. Feedback from Chairs:

Greg Clifton—Not confident this is a helpful direction. So many issues are on a case-by-case basis, what may appear minor in one case might not be minor. This attempt to clarify may restrict management. Also thinks the iterative process is important but creating a laundry list will never be exhaustive. We have no reason to believe that an iterative disciplinary process, which is already laid out, won’t happen. Don’t see the problem with the handbook language that was worked out a few years ago.

Jess Retrum—Asks what the issue is, what is the problem being addressed?

Brian Hutchinson—Any language will be subject to interpretation. For instance, what’s gross vs. not gross misconduct?

Chris Jennings—Had a different viewpoint. Does think there needs to be more definition, accountability. There are some contradictions in AAUP code of ethics, for instance about how you treat others (colleagues) but collegiality is not supposed to be factored in promotion. If something happens and it is part of the review, committees outside the department were not necessarily in agreement. So seeks clarity and support for disciplinary actions across the board.

1. Network/Happy Hour

Look out for this invite later. Eric Olsen of HEaT offered to use their space.