**Executive Committee CoCD**

**9/28/21**

**Minutes**

1. Debriefing on last meeting with Provost Tatum

He has been getting up to speed on the transfer process

Andrew participating in a committee with staff from transfer office and provost.

Chairs are questioning whether the slow down really with the department.

They don’t know how long it takes the students to come to us.

This is step 5, step 3 is the transfer evaluation, and that is where it can take 6-8 weeks and it seems to be a problem with not having enough people at certain times to input the courses from transcripts.

Can they identify which department they are waiting on?

Is there data that shows the problem is at the department review? All present believe when we get a course, it gets reviewed within a day or two.

Andrew will share out the bullet points.

There has already been an assessment of the process

Have any of the problems identified changed?

The committee on this a couple of years ago turned to a very broad discussion of how to become a beacon of transferring, so didn’t get into the specifics

Technology is one solution, but there still needs to be a staff member uploading the info.

Committee reviewed what we know about the workflow

Elizabeth sent out email to chairs-who is your slate reviewer—

Elizabeth got an email from Camden about this—we are aiming to have Sept. 17, so we can grant access and begin training

Elizabeth sent out to all of us, did get a response from all.

Slate is launching this semester.

To us, it really seems there needs to be temp staff, in addition to this workflow

Alfred suggested a transfer advisory board, but we don’t understand why that would help.

Suggest feedback-—let’s see what slate can do, if issues persist we can consider what needs to happen

Maybe transfer office rep needs to come to a chair’s exec meeting.

In the past, chairs suggested to transfer office that they deputize the advisors to do it, but they refused.

Some chairs also asked at that time why can’t they enter the info themselves into Banner

1. Program proposal question from the provost

He raised a question about whether there should be more faculty reviewing Phase I

There have been issues of proposing and putting a lot of work into designing curriculum

Was this more of a problem with grad programs because of cash-funded aspect

Undergraduate programs – review process , what is the problem here? How will adding faculty to the phase I solve a problem, what is the problem?

Elizabeth is going to talk informally with the Provost about clarifying questions, what he wants to do going forward. Not ready to bring to full CoCD

1. Other things for CoCD meeting agenda
2. Nick Pistentis, Kevin Taylor, IT, working on “Workday” (30 minutes? Maybe less)

October 11 is when student schedule goes live and that’s when workday goes live

Wants to train the advisors the week before

This will replace the “class scheduler” for the students

HR-probably next Fall will be able to use new PAF system

Also discussed the Senior/Junior partners

Question—about whether that person will also be the one for student employment

Workday changes completely done by 2025

What will we see on the faculty side?

1. Question came in from a chair--How does Chair’s service work?

Question was—does being Chair count as service? No-

Will not be bringing this issue to the body, as it doesn’t seem to need clarification.

1. Question about faculty workload proposal

Can we have Deborah update us?

1. What issues, what do we need to work on? What are the challenges? Where should we focus our energies?
2. Committee updates—let’s have time for all committee reps to report out.