

**Department Head / Program Director / Associate Dean Group
Organizational Meeting
September 11, 2008
Meeting Minutes**

Context for Group – Gilda Gely

Gilda explained she was approached last year to put this team together. Some department heads and program directors approached her and thought it was a good idea. Some asked her not to form the group. This is a pilot year for the group. If it works, great; if not, that's okay, too. At the end of this year, the group will assess its work and let Gilda know whether it should continue in the future.

Introductions – Everyone introduced himself or herself.

Discussion of Team Charter

A draft team charter was distributed, and everyone had a chance to read it. Several key issues were raised about the charter. They were:

The Name of the Group – Several members did not like the proposed name, Curricular Leadership and Advisory Team, because of its acronym CLAT; they thought it sounded like a venereal disease. Some members wanted to reinstitute the name of ALT – Academic Leadership Team. (There was some discussion about the value of the old ALT meetings. Some members felt it had great value; others felt it had its strengths and weaknesses.) Others proposed different names, including Curricular Leadership Team. The name of Academic Leadership Council, or ALC, was proposed, and there was a consensus that that name was acceptable.

The Focus of the Group – Many members felt that the focus on operational issues in the charter did not do justice to the curricular leadership that is an important part of the department heads' and program directors' and associate deans' work. There was consensus that the charter needed to be revised to include more of a curricular focus. There also was much discussion of how this group's work differs from that of AGC. Some members also questioned how much real authority and decision-making ability this group would have.

The Membership of the Group – Some members felt that the Provost and Deans should be members of the group. They felt that, if the group is advisory to the Provost's Office, then the Provost should be there. Others felt that, due to the curricular and operational focus of the group, the current membership made most sense, as they are most intimately involved with these issues and no one else knows them better. Some members questioned whether the Associate Deans would speak candidly and forcefully to the upper administration; others were not concerned about this issue. All Associate Deans

indicated that they had no problem speaking candidly to the Deans or Provost. There was not consensus on the membership issue.

The Processes to Be Used by the Group (e.g. Voting) – As discussions were proceeding, many members questioned the processes by which the group would do its work and make decisions. There was discussion and differences of opinion on what “consensus” means. There were differing opinions on the level of formality that would be needed in matters requiring a vote. The group ultimately decided to discuss processes via email and try to resolve the issue via that medium. In the interim, the group agreed that it would work by consensus, and rather humorously agreed that we would say we have a consensus as long as no one claimed that an idea or action would make him or her “throw up.”

Setting Priorities for This Year

The group brainstormed issues that it would like to discuss/work on in the upcoming year. These were:

- Curriculum review and revisions
- Actual CARP documents and process
- Year-long schedule
- Faculty evaluation (full-time and adjunct) – note: this is a contractual issue
- Professional development
- Semester start-up issues
- Room assignments
- Class schedules (times)
- Off campus growth
- Textbook selection process
- Adjunct hiring/orientation/start-up
- Program review
- Equitable facilities – resources at off campus sites, evening vs. day
- Allocation of technology dollars
- Facilities for program growth
- Idea sharing – what’s working in one department helps others
- Classroom technology
- Space allocation
- Student advising
- Student advising day
- FT to PT faculty ratio
- Late enrollment
- Class size

The group agreed that it would prioritize these issues via a Zoomerang survey before its next meeting.

Meeting Dates and Times

It was suggested that this group meet on Tuesday afternoons when AGC is not meeting. This suggestion led to much discussion about the number of meetings, as well as their length, that department heads and program directors have to attend. Some group members asked if all DH's/PD's needed to attend this new meeting or just a representative group. Others replied that all members benefit when all DH's/PD's attend. The issue of eliminating one AGC meeting a month and replacing it with this new meeting was raised. The point was made that this new group has no authority to change AGC's bylaws. Then it was suggested that if all of the new group members voted to eliminate one AGC meeting a month, the motion would carry. Others said that they could not support that action, were it proposed. Ultimately, our group decided to meet once a month – on the first Tuesday of each month – for an hour and a half. After seeing how this schedule works this semester, we will revisit the issue at the beginning of next semester.

Agreed-Upon Next Steps for Group and Facilitator

- Time for Celebrations and Idea-Sharing will be built into each meeting agenda.
- There will be snacks at each meeting.
- Laurie will share with Gilda the proposed new name, the proposed curricular emphasis of the group, and the views expressed about including her and the deans in the group.
- Laurie will revise the charter and share it with the new group at the next meeting.
- Laurie will establish an email group for us. Then, members can discuss and finalize group process issues via that medium.
- Laurie will have a Zoomerang on group priorities created and sent.