CEHD Council Meeting
George Mason University
December 8, 2009
1:00-3:00 p.m.

Minutes

Present: Anderson, Baker, Bon, DeMulder, Ford, Isenberg, Rodgers, Taboada

I. Approval of November 12, 2009 Minutes

A motion to approve the minutes was made and seconded. The minutes from the November 12, 2009 meeting were approved.

II. Separate GSE and RHT Faculty Listservs

There has been a request from RHT to separate the CEHD faculty listserv into one listserv for GSE faculty and one listserv for RHT faculty in order to reduce e-mail clutter. The listserv for the entire College will remain in effect. A general e-mail on the listservs and separate e-mails to each faculty member confirming he or she is on the correct list will be forthcoming.

III. CEHD Faculty Meeting Agenda for January 14, 2010

The Council discussed the proposed agenda for the CEHD faculty meeting on January 14. Proposed topics include:

1. Bylaws change – the Ad Hoc Committee on Faculty Evaluation and Standards will discuss the proposed change in procedure for evaluating faculty on the tenure track. Also, governance elections will be held in the Spring for the next academic year.

2. The NCATE Leadership Team will provide a brief status report.

3. A discussion will occur of CEHD’s vision and strategic plan. The University has created a new 2014 strategic plan, and each college has been asked to create an aligned plan. It is anticipated that new deadlines will emerge from the university’s central office. As a College, we need to respond by adopting a mission and revising our strategic plan. The CEHD January meeting will provide an opportunity to seek faculty input to guide the development of the CEHD vision and overall revision of the strategic plan.

It was suggested to use a full group discussion model to facilitate the gathering of faculty insight and input regarding the vision statement. To promote involvement and input, the Co-Deans should e-mail the faculty in advance of the CEHD January 14 meeting, providing the draft strategic plan and the university plan. In addition, the e-mail should explain the goal of revising and editing the draft CEHD plan for purposes of aligning it with the University’s 2014 strategic plan. Overall, the goal is to send a clear message
about the future vision and mission of the College. Ellen will provide the draft mission and vision for discussion and the Dean-Elect will be included in the discussion.

IV. Annual Evaluation Scoring Criteria

- Proposed total possible score = 100
- Weights in each area

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Genuine Excellence</th>
<th>Approaching Genuine Excellence</th>
<th>High Competence</th>
<th>Approaching High Competence</th>
<th>Needs Improvement</th>
<th>Unsatisfactory</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TEACHING</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RESEARCH &amp; SCHOLARSHIP</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SERVICE</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Martin explained that an unsatisfactory judgment has to result in an overall unsatisfactory evaluation. The proposed evaluation scoring provides a developmental approach. These proposed criteria appear to fit more clearly with the intent in the new system to align annual evaluations and tenure and promotion reviews. Traditionally, annual evaluations allow individuals to benefit from activity in progress, whereas only completed activities and achievement count for promotion and tenure reviews. Martin and council members agreed that it would be too difficult to come up with something formulaic, thus it would be better to trust the Faculty Evaluation Committee to assess and determine appropriate weights. David will share this information with the ad hoc committee discussing the annual evaluation process.

V. Allocating Scarce Resources

CEHD has been encouraged to allocate new resources from the University and determine criteria for use of the funds. Council members discussed how to distinguish between the compelling needs that have been identified, and they identified several possible criteria for making the decision. Joan suggested that we align the use of funds with strategic goals. Bob and council members agreed with this approach. David also suggested that CEHD focus on pooling together resources to ensure that support is provided across the College, rather than solely within units.

VI. Rechartering CEHD Centers

Rechartering the CEHD Centers is typically a three-year process, but allows five-year terms assuming there are no problems. Performance is assessed by the center’s mission,
and centers are supposed to be funded by external money. The number of core faculty is a variable that is examined. One question is should we continue a flexible approach or provide greater guidance during the rechartering process? David suggested that we examine the purpose of centers and how they benefit CEHD. Council members discussed whether CEHD should establish parameters for centers and use specific criteria to judge the merit of the centers. Currently there are about 11 centers and about one-third are thriving, one-third are doing all right, and one-third are struggling or inactive. Ellen suggested that we examine to what extent the centers are aligned with their original charter and/or whether there is a need to redefine the purpose, goals, and missions of the centers. Council members agreed that part of the rechartering process should provide centers the opportunity to engage actively in the process of identifying missions and ensuring that activities of the center are aligned with the mission, goals, and purpose of the center.

VII. Dean-Elect Involvement

Although the Dean-Elect, Mark Ginsberg, will not be officially starting for several months, council members discussed how the leadership team can best reach out to Mark. Martin suggested inviting Mark to come and begin informal meetings with faculty to begin getting orientated with the culture of CEHD. This would help him to lay groundwork for beginning in August 2010. Council members agreed that it makes sense to promote opportunities for Mark to gain insight and establish valuable foundations and connections with CEHD. Martin discussed setting up a systematic approach for Mark to gain access to faculty members and learn about the College.

VIII. Course Evaluations and On-Line Model

The University would like to move to an on-line model for completing course evaluations. Ellen asked whether CEHD is willing to use the on-line course evaluations in spring 2010. Numerous council members expressed significant doubts, and the general consensus was to hold off until the University officially adopts the new system in Fall 2010 (most likely the date of adoption).

IX. Tuition Increases

There is likely to be a 10% increase in tuition beginning in Fall 2010 because of the budget issues in Virginia and the University.

Respectfully submitted by: Susan Bon