

**Chair's Council
Meeting
16 October 2007**

I. Jo Gerst – Admissions and Records, Assistant Director

- Scheduling
 - Reinforced giving department secretaries adequate time to enter schedules. They are usually due the 1st week of the term, which is already the most hectic and difficult week for secretaries. There are typically 3-4 months that secretaries have access to enter the schedule prior to the 1st week of classes. Suggestion – provide courses that are frequently the same term to term (i.e., Fall to Fall, Spring to Spring, Summer to Summer).
 - Comment – general education courses impact planning of department schedules.
 - Comment – late course additions create domino effect in schedules.
 - Question – If a schedule is similar term to term, does it have to be re-entered or can it be rolled over?
 - Answer – They must be re-entered each semester. This was attempted a few years ago with disastrous results and required an additional three weeks of fixes. However, it will be taken into consideration.
 - There is a webfocus report (SS0001RB – Department Schedule Reports) that allows departments to review the schedule at any time.
 - Two areas are NOT locked down for updates – faculty changes and enrollment changes (section caps).
 - Question - Is there an option to have a window in which departments can review the schedule prior to it going live to students?
 - Answer – It would mean the schedule will be delayed going live to the students in order to allow review time by the records office. Currently schedules are due in mid-September (for Spring) and mid-January (for Fall and Summer). The proposed delay would move student access to mid-October and mid-February.
 - Academic registration calendars are available on the Internet in the Registration and Academic Guide <http://www.ferris.edu/admissions/registrar/schdbook/>
 - Question – why cannot off campus sites send schedule updates directly?
 - Answer – they do not own the programs, therefore the changes must come from the department that owns the programs directly.

- Pre-requisites
 - Banner recognizes an “F” as a grade and will allow students to move forward if it is received in a pre-requisite course. In November '06, Colleges were invited to send a list of pre-requisite courses that required a higher grade to the VP office (vs. following the Curriculum Change Process) and the change would be made in Banner so this would not happen.
 - Flags can be made in the Banner system tying a specific grade or completion of a pre-requisite course.
 - Comment – Do we need a University wide policy for a passing grade to continue on? C? D-? How to transfer grades fit in? Departments are handling this differently at this time.

Most transcripts are also currently evaluated at the department level. Inconsistency has been identified.

- There is a report available (SS0003RB Course Prerequisite Checker) so that departments can manually drop students from courses if they have not achieved an acceptable grade in a pre-requisite course. It is advised that a letter be sent to the student explaining the course of action.
- Question – Is it a problem for the records office to add “instructor approval required” to courses?
 - Answer – No, however there cannot be mixed requirements such as certain majors must receive instructor approval and other majors can register by themselves. A suggestion for that scenario would be to restrict a section to certain majors, then students in other majors cannot access the course without permission from the department/instructor.

II. Faculty Institute – Comments, Suggestions (Don Flickinger)

- There were a number of initial ideas / comments as to why faculty (new and other wise) may not be participating in the faculty Institute to the degree to which we would like or expect. Some of the comments are focused directly on the issue of participation and some of the comments, although tangential, are related and meaningful. Thoughts were that participation might be enhanced if:
 - An assigned faculty “professional workload” or a “professional development workload” were assigned to new faculty,
 - Negative perceptions that might exist about the Center could be changed,
 - The time frame could be adjusted and frequency of meetings could be diminished—perhaps meeting every other week,
 - Multiple faculty groupings could be formed so that truly “new” teaching faculty and “experienced” teaching faculty could be addressing relevant concerns rather than uniform concerns,
 - There weren’t an “overkill” of assessment topics, even though that is a university-wide focus,
 - Attendance (75% mentioned) at the Institute be rewarded with professional development funds, perhaps a matching grant from Timme,
 - Time constraints were addressed meaningfully—no committee work for first-year faculty (The problem here, of course, is that faculty have become so attuned to the fact that committee work is an essential component of promotion and tenure that, if faced with a choice between committee attendance or Faculty Institute attendance, faculty will opt for committee attendance.),
- Other related issues that were raised were the following:
 - A structured and thoughtful review of faculty travel funds should be done. It should include a review of 1. the funding process, 2. the levels of funding, and 3. a consideration of competitive funding rather than a first-come, first-serve system.
 - Tenure and Promotion are overwhelming concerns of faculty. Thus, their priorities are to those issues when it comes to professional development.
 - Perhaps most professional mentoring for new faculty takes place at the Department level. How can / does the Center collaborate with Colleges and Departments to address this?

- There should perhaps be ongoing professional development for long-term temps and adjunct faculty.
- Are temps and adjuncts included in faculty use of the center and in the weekly Institute?
- Meaningful professional development may not necessitate a food budget. Do faculty have to be enticed with food?

III. Future Meetings

- Suggestion – Discuss Transfers (Don noted he is currently researching information at other institutions and transfer sites)
- Tuesday, October 30 - 8:30 a.m. Mecosta Room
- Post or E-mail other suggested discussions/topics prior to meeting.