

Minutes
Provost's Council
November 2, 2010

The Provost's Council met on Tuesday, November 02, 2010 at 9 a.m. in the President's Conference Room in Sheridan Hall 306.

Members present: Mark Bannister, Jeff Briggs, Paul Faber, Dennis King, Chris Crawford, Rob Scott, Lynn Haggard for John Ross, Tim Crowley, Cindy Elliott and Larry Gould.

A. Call to Order

The meeting was called to order by the Provost.

1. Discussion Items

a) Operationalizing Lectures and Senior Lecturers

Action: According to the MOA, the same merit criteria will be used for Non-Tenure Track (NTT) faculty as other faculty. The annual statement of responsibilities could affect the criteria for merit. The departments will be required to look at the NTT criteria the same as other criteria for faculty and use it to evaluate the NTT. It is OK to have different criteria for NTT faculty while taking into consideration the perimeters of accreditation requirements. The deans can use the current administrative calendar for the deadlines and submission of the promotion files. The Instructor rank should be used for pre-tenure track or tenure track appointments and the lecturer title for professional teachers. The qualifications do not have to be different than those of the terminal degree requirements. For promotion, we will use the promotion calendar with modifications. It was decided to wait until next year because MOA will be requesting a stipend for promotion. If we have instructor positions and there is an interest in being promoted to lecturer positions, the departments need to meet and determine if certain faculty want to be moved from instructor to lecturer. Next year's administrative calendar will include NTT deadlines. We will use current promotion criteria for tenure-track faculty until promotion criteria has been developed for the NTT. The current criteria could be modified to reflect the NTT promotion criteria.

2. Strategy Items

a) Academic Affairs website

The provost is in the process of revising the provost's website, the university catalog and the course management system. The point is, "task completion priority." There are three things most people think of when they go to a website: 1) Do you have what I want? 2) What kind of a career can I get with this degree? and 3) What kind of financial aid can I get? It was noted the University's current

search engine is not very functional. It doesn't get you where you need to go. The Council reviewed the website for the Penn State distance education program. It was suggested including the information on the left-side of page and to bury the academic affairs information deeper on the page; The Council needs to determine who our audience is. Are students clicking on the Academic Affairs page to find out about degrees or is our site for the external user? It was determined the site should be geared toward the external user. The hierarchy should be from academic affairs, to the program, to the degree, to the description and to the department. It was suggested using the following format: What do you want, how can we help you get it and what can you do with it? The mission statement should be on the Provost's page, not on the academic affairs page. It was suggested adding testimonials to the Academic Affairs page. Possible direct them to a search?? Chrome is the fastest growing browser and our website should be constructed to use it since a large number of people no longer use Internet Explorer. The Amazon.com site is a good model to emulate. It is a combination of learning, education and setting expectations. It also uses the personalization feature.

B. Announcements/New Business

a) Items from the October KBOR agenda. The first item is another example of the large number of requests to authorize out-of-state schools to deliver instruction in Kansas. You can imagine how astounded the Regents are by the numbers of requests and Gary Sherrer's concern about offering more distance education classes.

Item two: Background information for the reason the Regents changed the degree requirement minimum to 120 hours.

Item three: The latest version of the Academic Program Review document. This is the latest version of the document to bring the chartering document up from 1993 to 2010. There were a couple of changes to the document that were reviewed. The decisions are still made at the campus-level. We may have to make modifications to our document once the final version is approved by the KBOR.

b) Incompletes. There will discussion about this issue at the next meeting.

C. Adjournment

Action: The meeting adjourned at 12:15 p.m.

c: Dr. Edward Hammond
Dr. Tisa Mason
Mr. Larry Getty

Dr. Joey Linn
Dr. Rita Hauck
Mr. Tyler Thompson
Ms. Casey Rohleder
Provost's Council Secretaries