Deans Council Minutes
January 8, 2018
1:30 PM
Presidents Conference Room, Lee Hall

<u>Members Present:</u> Judy Bonner (chair), Richard Blackbourn, Lori Bruce, Frances Coleman, Terry Dale Cruse, Randy Follett, Kent Hoblet, Julia Hodges, George Hopper, Jason Keith, Layton Little, Sharon Oswald, Allison Pearson, Peter Ryan, Becky Gardner for Chris Snyder, Rick Travis, Jim West
<u>Others Present:</u> Tim Chamblee, John Dickerson, Brandon Jolly, Meredith Jackson, Marion Montgomery Chancellor, Teresa Gammill
<u>Minutes Taken By:</u> Dinah Jenkins

I.   Dr. Judy Bonner opened the meeting and asked for a motion to approve the November 20, 2017 minutes. Dr. Richard Blackbourn gave a motion to accept the minutes as written and Dr. Jim West gave a second. The November 20, 2017 minutes were approved with no corrections or objections.

II.   Meredith Jackson – Mandatory Enrollment Date
   1) Duo, the two factor authentication, was configured in July to work with the ITS CAS for Category I data in banner such as mybanner, mystate and mycourses.
   2) Category I data group currently has 3,232 uses enrolled which consists of faculty, staff and students. 1,096 uses have not enrolled with 511 of those being faculty members.
   3) IT Council recommended enforcement of Duo for all Category I users beginning February 1st. Instead of getting a nag screen asking you to enroll and being able to continue, beginning February 1st you will have to enroll before you can go further.
   4) Important to get message out before February 1st for users that do not have a smart phone in order for them to obtain a fob from ITS.
   5) Emails have been sent to the Category I users but assistance is needed to make sure they enroll before February 1. Any business manager can run a report in Banner, pwrcduo, that will show individuals who have enrolled.
   6) Will look into emails going to students informing of enrolling for their protection.

III.   Community Engagement – Dr. Cade Smith
   1) Carnegie CE classification was piloted in 2006 and 2008 as a learning process. It was formally conceptualized in 2010 and is when MSU went through the initial classification process.
   2) It is open every 5 years for institutions that do not hold classification, but once the institutions earns the classification it has to re-apply for re-classification every 10 years.
   3) Administrative Home initially was the University of Massachusetts, Boston and moved last year to Brown University.
   4) Formal purpose of Carnegie Community Engagement
      a. Advance partnerships between universities and public/private sectors to reciprocally share knowledge and resources to do many things.
         i. Enrich research and scholarships, enhance curriculum and learning, and foster engagements and responsibility in citizens.
      b. Carnegie Intent
         i. Create a sense of urgency and drive institutional self-critique and transformation by engaging faculty & students with communities to advance social justice.
         ii. Ensure CE is supported by university administrators.
         iii. Recognize and reward faculty for community engaged work.
   5) Types of institutions that hold the Carnegie CE classification
      a. Increasing CE with increasing size, scope and intensity of universities activities.
   6) Statements from chief Carnegie Academy CE administrators.
      - *If your instruction does not explicitly include community engagement in the faculty P&T process or annual evaluations then seriously consider if you should apply.*
      - *Passively supporting CE as one possible avenue for tenure is not enough.*

7) MSU CE Committee describes CE as a collaboration between MSU and partnering communities for the mutually beneficial exchange of knowledge and resources in a context of partnerships and reciprocity.
   a. Communities in this sense are not geographically confined areas but include special interest groups, educational and health care communities, groups defined by situational similarities, commodity groups and agricultural groups.
   b. At MSU CE is a thread woven through the fabric and consists of teaching and learning, scholarships and engaged service.
   c. Communities consist of groups affiliated by geographic proximity, special interests or situational similarities at the local, regional/state, national or global levels.
8) Types of Community Engagement Partnerships at MSU are Outreach, Consult, Involve, Shared Leadership and Community Driven.
9) Recognizing faculty work is the framework for Carnegie 2015 faculty roles and rewards. MSU must provide compelling answers to questions such as:
   a. Is there an institutions-wide definition of faculty scholarly work that uses community-engaged approaches and methods?
   b. Are there institutional level policies for promotion (and tenure at tenure-granting campuses) that specifically reward faculty scholarly work that uses community-engaged approaches and methods?
   c. Are there college/school and/or department level policies for promotion (and tenure at tenure-granting campuses) that specifically reward faculty scholarly work that uses community-engaged approaches and methods?
10) CE Committee recommendations
   a. Have CE as part of the faculty annual evaluation process.
   b. Committee is working to identify departments who are leading in CE work.
   c. A university wide CE Survey will be rolled out January 31st to all employees and be open through February to all employees.
11) Discussion
   a. The hiring process involving CE will not be appropriate for every faculty member. For those in which it is, statements on position description will be helpful.
   b. The Carnegie re-application will be scrutinized differently than in 2010, in that Carnegie has stated over and over the bar is higher now.
   c. Including CE will require a rewrite of annual evaluations of P&T policies. CE Committee is working with Faculty Senate, then will work at department level for who should be doing it. Dr. Randy Follett stated they will consider how to accurately document what we already do with CE process.
   d. Dr. Bonner encouraged the deans to invite Dr. Cade Smith to speak to department heads so more understand its importance.

IV. AOP Approval – Dr. Peter Ryan
   1) AOP 12.38 – Undergraduate Academic Advisement w/Resolution 27 – A resolution to encourage the university to offer a standardized training program for academic advisors.
      ▪ Dr. Ryan asked for a motion to approve recommended changes to AOP 12.38 and Sharon Oswald gave the second.
      ▪ Item 7 was clarified to more clearly outline the different resources available on campus to train new academic advisors.
      ▪ Dr. Terry Dale Cruse inquired if language could be changed in item 3 for Meridian students. New language was added as item 4 to address concerns.
      ▪ Due to an incorrect copy of AOP 12.38 being distributed at the meeting, the corrected AOP with the suggested revisions was sent via email for an email vote. Email vote passed none opposed.

Meeting Dismissed at 2:22 PM