

Present: Graciela Lacueva, Pam Mason, Rodney Hessinger, Mark Storz, Maryclaire Moroney, Dianna Taylor, Mary Beadle, Paul Shick, John McBratney, Sheri Young, Dwight Hahn, Dan Kilbride, Mark Storz, Todd Bruce, Kathy Lee, Mike Martin, Sheila McGinn, Martha Pereszlenyi-Pinter, Mike Setter, Penny Harris, Jeff Dyck

1. Announcements: Departments need to display their learning objectives for programs in a visible format preferably on the home page of department websites under *Learning Goals*. Currently the Assessment website lists a learning goals page that is in progress.
2. P. Mason is meeting with Integrated Marketing and Communications to improve the JCU website for prospective students and other institutions. Mike Richwalsky is requesting stories, pictures, and ideas to add to the webpages. Graciela Lacueva suggested listing columns for research. A handout was distributed on "Experiential Learning" that is bound to the best practices of the Ohio Board of Regents. Rodney Hessinger commented that Experiential Learning keeps reoccurring as a theme worth investing in.
3. G. Lacueva stated that her recent reviewing of the Bulletin brought up the subject of policy issues. Specifically, there is no mechanism for reviewing and interpreting policies. Suggested that chairs review the policies about academic honesty and teacher course evaluations. Associate Deans need support with revising and evaluating policies in a systematic way. Opened the floor for thoughts on what would be the best mechanism:
 - A. P. Shick reminded the group that any policy discussions would need to interface with faculty governance to interpret and implement. Chairs should bring academic policies in question to Faculty Council and not try to review on their own.
 - B. S. McGinn suggested to look at the policies most frequently applied and bring to the Chairs in September. M. Setter suggested approaching the subject in April or May to bring to Faculty Council in September. R. Hessinger suggested that all voices should be heard i.e. Asst. Deans, Registrar, Financial Aid, in order to review how these policies are viewed at the student level.
 - C. G. Lacueva suggest a mechanism to create collaboration between faculty and staff in order to evaluate and find solutions. Called for consistency in evaluation

Additional suggestions:

- a. Should be the task of a university committee, would be a good task for an Ad Hoc committee,
- b. Associate Dean's should be the point persons to collect data on policies that are not working and contact the areas that are most affected.
- c. Policies should be completely vetted before submitting to Faculty Council.
- d. Many were against forming another committee or putting additional responsibilities on CAP.
- e. P. Mason called for a competent and agile mechanism that would include the Associate Deans, Asst. Dean's, Registrar's office.
- f. D. Hahn stated that the structure was in place already and suggested that it is the job of the Associate Deans to submit to faculty council. Many were in support.

4. Two structures were suggested.
 1. Associate Dean's, Registrar and Advising and other groups relative to policies being reviewed give progress report to CAS chairs in Spring, Faculty Council in fall.
 2. Associate Deans, Assistant Dean's send suggestions to Faculty Council and Provost Council.
5. Motion was called for a vote by Sheila McGinn and seconded by Mike Setter. Motion #1 passed with 20 in favor and one abstention. Motion is as follows:

That the CAS Dean inaugurate an on-going working group to monitor academic policies and their administration. The working group members shall include the Associate Deans and representatives from the Office of the Registrar, Transfer Admissions, and other offices as from time-to-time seem helpful to the group's work. The group will refer appropriate items to the Chair of Faculty Council for review and discussion by Council, which will determine whether any of the items should be forwarded to one or more standing committees of the Council.

At least on an annual basis, preferably in April, the group will provide a progress report at a CAS Chairs Meeting. In addition, each September, the group will send an annual report to the Chair of Faculty Council for review and discussion by Council, which may recommend other issues for consideration by the working group.

6. New Core; the committee is working hard to bring the New Core into place with additions to the bulletin. The bulletin will continue to be in hard copy form. R. Hessinger called for consistency between the Bulletin and Banner.
7. Restricting transfer credit; Transient petition forms need to be streamlined and more user friendly. Need a form that stated that student did or did not get transfer credit. Need new form that will include the ability to attach a syllabus. Students who petition for multiple courses need specificity. Advisors need to do due diligence.

Meeting Adjourned: 5:00 p.m.