Minutes

Present: Anderson, Behrmann, Bon, DeMulder, Ford, Taboada

I. Approval of March 2, 2010 Minutes

Approval of the minutes from the March 2, 2010 meeting will be considered at the May meeting.

II. Emerita/Emeritus Faculty Recommendations

The Council recommended that retiring faculty members Carol Kaffenberger and Lloyd Duck be awarded Emerita/Emeritus status for their extraordinary service to the college.

III. Marketing Needs

The Council discussed the need to increase resources for incoming Dean Mark Ginsberg’s external relations/fundraising agenda. There are currently no personnel designated for marketing, publications, alumni affairs, and outreach. It has been recommended that the college institutionalize the Marketing Committee in order to capitalize on the collective talents of the faculty. Although there is no concrete plan yet, Martin indicated that Mark envisions adding a full-time position that would broadly cover outreach and marketing to provide an infrastructure for promoting the college. In addition, Marc Broderick of University Development and Alumni Affairs has evidently indicated that a half-time position in his office will be dedicated to CEHD. It was suggested that if a new marketing/outreach position is created, the responsibilities should not overlap with Shernita’s role as Director of Development.

The Council identified the important marketing needs of the college that could be addressed with increased resources:

1. In order to promote the college and its programs, we need a storyteller who would dig up college, program, and student success stories, write them down, organize them, and make them available to marketing, outreach, and development sources. We also need a “dream teller” (“Here’s what we could do if we had…”).

2. There needs to be a greater effort to capitalize on interconnections among development, alumni affairs, and marketing.

3. We need more media attention to compete with the growing external market.
IV. Technology Support Needs

Martin indicated that there is increased demand for sophisticated technology support that requires additional personnel in Brenda’s office. There used to be two full-time technology support employees in the office; currently Brenda is the only full-time employee. Council members expressed their appreciation for Brenda’s excellent work as Director and offered wholehearted support for providing the additional personnel needed. The Council agreed that an additional full-time permanent position was justified to meet the growing demands and suggested that this position report to Brenda. Council members felt that the ideal candidate would be versatile, technical, and a fast learner.

David Anderson reminded the Council that the Mason Media Lab closed last year and that some of the technology needs of the college might be met by running our own media lab and by collaborating across Centers to share resources. These opportunities will become even more feasible when many parts of the college are consolidated in Krug and Thompson Halls.

V. Criteria for Making Resource Allocation Decisions

Since the Provost has no discretionary funds to allocate to the new Dean other than those associated with enrollment growth, CEHD has been attempting to conserve funds so that the Dean has the ability to make needed investments in the college. The Council discussed potential criteria for determining which programs should receive additional resources. It was suggested that programs that have had increased enrollment growth with no faculty growth be given priority. The Council identified factors that should be taken into consideration when hiring for programs:

1. Make sure that tenure lines have a strong empirical research agenda and productivity/potential.

2. Look at junior rather than senior faculty for cost effectiveness.

3. Maximize candidate skill sets by identifying crossover in particular disciplines.

VI. Minimum Acceptable Performance Standards for Program Coordinators and Directors

Martin asked Council members to consider whether the college needs to identify minimum acceptable standards for the performance of coordinators and directors. Council members agreed that identifying minimum performance standards would be advantageous, but it was also suggested that it would be difficult to define and enforce minimum acceptable standards. The question was also raised, “Performance acceptable to whom?” The following two suggestions were made to enhance performance effectiveness:
1. A periodic (e.g., annual) review of coordinator/director performance by program faculty and staff would be useful to identify problem areas that coordinators and directors could/should address for continuous improvement. This review could be achieved using a survey tool. The issue of who should receive the results was not resolved. A post-review counseling session with one of the Deans and a six-month follow-up was also deemed potentially useful.

2. Coordinators and Directors could be assigned for three-year terms to be reevaluated after three years and/or to rotate the responsibilities.

The Council identified potential areas of performance about which minimum acceptable standards should be considered under the heading of interpersonal and professional responsibilities:

- Physical and virtual presence
- Timely response
- Treatment of staff (e.g., respectfulness, professionalism)
- Representing the program faculty

Respectfully submitted by: Betsy DeMulder