

Joint Cabinet/Leadership Team
Iowa State University
MINUTES
January 11, 2005

Present: Tom Andre, J. D. Beatty, Letha DeMoss, Heidi Eichorn, Mary Gregoire, Suzanne Hendrich, Morey MacDonald Ruth MacDonald, Betty Rasmussen, John Schuh, Rick Sharp, Mack Shelley, Roger Smith, Jeanne Warning (repr. JaneAnn Stout), Jerry Thomas, Ann Thompson, Pam White, Mary Winter

Others Present: Ben Allen, Susan Carlson, and Julie Ham (Provost's Office)

1. Selection of New Dean

Ben Allen, Susan Carlson, and Julie Ham presented information regarding Dean, College of Human Sciences, search process. A handout was distributed outlining two proposed timelines and search committee membership. The group supported the maximum number outlined for search committee membership. That format includes six department representatives (at least one of those would be a department chair); two staff members, one from each college; and two ISU Foundation/Alumni Association representatives. The Foundation/Alumni Association representatives would not be the College Development Officers; the representatives would be selected by Dan Saftig and Jeff Johnson. The question was raised regarding how stakeholders and industry representatives would be involved. Provost Allen indicated that stakeholders/industry representatives could be part of the interview process. It is possible that they could a member of the search committee as alumni. It was also emphasized that K-12 representatives need to be involved at some point.

Provost Allen asked for suggestions regarding Chair of the Search Committee. It was emphasized that this search will be watched very closely, especially with the consolidation issues. Chairs of Dean Search Committees have usually been other deans. Dr. White and Dr. Thomas said they have discussed this, and felt Mike Whiteford, Dean, LAS, would provide good leadership as chair. Susan Carlson was also suggested as possible Chair; however, she will probably serve as one of the representative's from the Provost's office.

Susan Carlson will send an e-mail to College faculty requesting nominations for the search committee. The request will allow for self-nominations.

The two proposed timelines were discussed. Timeline A would be a very aggressive timeline with applications due by April 1. There would be the possibility of airport interviews to narrow the pool, followed by on-campus interviews occurring the week of April 25-May 6. It was indicated that Timeline A would be the preferred one, as this would complete the process before the end of the semester; Timeline B does not complete the process until September. Timeline A could present a real challenge in completing on time. It was decided to present the charge to the search committee with the idea of Timeline A; if they feel they can't meet that timeline, then the schedule could be revised. It is important to remember that the college may not have a dean in place by July 1 even if Timeline A is followed. It is likely the position would not be filled until sometime in the fall or January 1.

Use of search firms was discussed. Provost Allen indicated the university usually does not use search firms. It is possible to use a firm to do reference checks or to review/summarize matrix of qualifications. It was emphasized that the personal aspect in obtaining references is lost if a firm is used.

Susan Carlson asked if there are particular things that need to be included in the search in light of this being a new college. Topics discussed included: the need for an aggressive search; importance of involvement of faculty, staff, alumni and students, use of Web sites for conveying information; dissemination of information to relevant organizations through organization listserves. This is a great opportunity to get word out regarding the new college.

Activation of the College of Human Sciences Website is important, especially as a source for review by potential dean candidates and for student recruitment. The Website should also contain student orientation information. Dr. White indicated there is a group working with Diana Pounds on the

development of a new Web site. Provost Allen expects that the Provost's office will probably receive calls from potential candidates; it is important to have some "talking points" ready for response regarding the new college, budget, etc. Dr. Allen stated that an interim dean will need to be selected, if the new dean hire is not effective July 1.

If there are other comments or questions, send by e-mail to Susan Carlson, Provost Allen and/or Julie Ham.

2. Implementation Steering Committee

Susan Carlson stayed for the discussion regarding the implementation steering committee. The Provost's Office has been developing a list of these issues that need Provost Office input, and issues that will need involvement of other groups around campus. These include:

Administrative systems – group is already meeting and working on development of account numbers, etc.

Information management group – both paper and electronic

Space, Equipment and move space issues; renovation

Admissions and recruitment, (involving the Registrar's and Admissions offices)

Public relations and recognition. There will be statement in the new catalog regarding the combination of the two colleges.

Personnel transitions – group has met several times

Other committees/groups will be designated as needed.

The Implementation Steering Committee will be represented by chairs of university-wide committees dealing with the mechanics of the college combination. The Joint Cabinet/Leadership Team will serve as the internal leadership group focusing on issues within the new college. There will need to be interaction between the University committee and the Joint Cabinet/Leadership Team. Many decisions will be made by the internal group, with input from the external groups. A Committee on Committees will determine college committee structure. Input may be requested from the original college combination workgroups (much of their input is available in the reports submitted in the fall).

Topic of a joint faculty/staff meeting was discussed. Susan Carlson has volunteered to be facilitator for a meeting. It was discussed that the joint meetings could serve the purpose of the open forums for discussion of characteristics for the position description for the dean. The possibility of biweekly or monthly e-mails to faculty and staff were discussed; perhaps an e-mail from the two deans with updates. Additional discussion regarding the Human Sciences Website indicated that the Website should not include the minutes, discussions, etc. It would be best to have College information there, with a link for faculty and staff, and one for students.

The question of letters being sent to appropriate groups, (schools, counselors, etc.) was raised. Dr. White indicated that Admissions Office has already sent letters to counselors and new students/transfer students. Development of new brochures will be handled by individual units.

We may need a separate mailing to Iowa school principals about the continued commitment to the education curriculum at ISU (Tom Andre is following up.)

3. Distribution of Savings from Consolidation of Colleges

The 1st year savings will go toward remodeling. The 2nd year would have funds available for programs and new initiatives. Proposals could be written now and submitted to the interim deans. This would be helpful to the new dean to show the synergies between departments/programs. Roger Smith emphasized it is important to recognize the differences in the colleges and departments and to discuss these as planning for the new colleges occurs. Dr. White suggested that department chairs might meet periodically for discussion.

Dr. Gregoire raised the question whether we could look at what was submitted for the capital campaign as possibilities for proposals and build on those; some cross-cut across departments, some do not. Tom Andre stated that the criteria for evaluation proposals needs to be reviewed carefully and the missions of the college need to be considered. Dr. M. MacDonald asked whether a statement could come from the deans related to understaffed programs and how those would be considered for funding of new

initiatives in addition to programs. Dr. Thomas indicated the proposals need to support and strengthen the missions of the new college (outreach/teaching/research.) The proposals also need to link to the strategic plan.

The interim deans will draft an outline for a call for proposals, meet with department chairs to get input, then develop a call for proposals and involve the Associate Deans.

4. Space Issues

5. Tentative list of agenda items for joint meetings

The list of agenda items (see attached) was discussed. A list of priority items that need to be addressed by July 1 was developed:

--Space, renovation, moving

--Research support process, grants and contracts

--Calendar for new college

--Brochures/recruitment brochures

--Information for external and internal groups

--Budget

--Personnel Issues: Drs. White and Thomas are already working on PIQs/PDQs, and meeting with appropriate University personnel for review and discussion. It was indicated that letters must go to people by April 1 related to change of employment. Positions will be advertised and filled beginning with the highest P-level positions. The decision regarding filling Merit positions will not be made until all PDQs are completed and reviewed by Human Resources and all P&S positions are filled. Carla Espinoza will then work with the AFSCME Union to finalize the merit procedure.

--Committees: Following discussion it was decided to have the Committee on Committees start with committee makeup – then decisions will be made as to which committees can/will operate separately or jointly the first year. The governance document subgroup discussed some of this in their report to the planning committee. Decisions also need to be made regarding whether each department should be represented on college committees, and whether there are committees that can be combined, discontinued. Dr. Hendrich stressed that most committees will still need dept. representatives. --Other issues outside committee structure: technical support, distance education – these are handled differently in both colleges.

Jerry and Pam will work on getting people assigned to the committee on committees, communication and marketing, and other committees as needed.

--Role/Authority of new Dean – discussion centered around the role of the new dean in decisions related to budget, remodeling. It was voiced that the college needs to be proactive; this could be done before the dean arrives. The college needs to move ahead on discussing the future of the college -- priorities, new initiatives, etc.

6. Other

Next Joint Meeting: February 1 – E262 Lago.

Topics for Discussion at Joint Cabinet meetings during Spring 2005 (CFCS and COE)

Implementation Committee – Who is the committee? Should we recommend to the Provost that the Joint Cabinet be the committee, and involve others as needed? Make use of existing committees in the two current colleges, if applicable?

Selection of new Dean - based on strengths and where we currently see new college going

Role/authority of new Dean – what should new dean have right/authority to decide; what do we deal with before new Dean is appointed

\$500,000 savings distribution: after 1st year when savings dollars go for renovation, what is the plan for distribution of savings: providing support vs. new initiatives? How will decisions be made? Will funds be used:

For new positions for new initiatives

To support current under-staffed programs

To enhance support staff for grantsmanship (see combination proposal from Research group)

If affecting positions, these will need to be advertised next year.

Movement of people; space issues; remodeling of east wing of MacKay; has Ben located the other \$75,000?

Recruitment materials (new brochures, etc.) – costs? Who pays?

Department Chair visits to each department

SEA/CEES funds distribution

Research support

Distance Education – who will do it? Where will it be located? Associate Dean for Research?

Computer issues

Adoption of uniform annual report system

Technology infrastructure

Advising Models – differences in the 2 colleges; staffing issues

Teacher Education: placement, fees (this may be a subgroup discussion)

Development issues; Donor relations; Ring of Life; Scholarships – at college level

Archiving – Tanya Zanish-Belcher, University Library

Legislative Relations – Jon Murphy (Washington, D.C. liaison)

Coordination of calendars in both colleges

Dean's portraits/art collections

4-H youth development