

Present: Mary Beadle, Cecile Brennan, Rich Clark, Jeff Dyck, Margaret Farrar, Dwight Hahn, Penny Harris, Matt Johnson, Dan Kilbride, Anne Kugler, Graciela Lacueva, Kathy Lee, Kathleen Manning, Mike Martin, Pam Mason, John McBratney, Sheila McGinn, Keiko Nakano, Martha Pereslenyi-Pinter, Cathy Rosemary, Paul Shick, Mike Setter, Brenda Wirkus, Sheri Young

Not Present: Tina Facca, Kathy Gatto, Dianna Taylor

-
1. Colleen Treml, General Counsel and Kendra Svilar, Title IX Coordinator, gave an overview of title IX civil rights law prohibiting gender discrimination. There are training requirements and the focus now is on education and prevention. Responsible employee training instructs on identifying harassment, reporting, and documentation. C. Treml noted that there are compliance issues and general insurance requirements. Faculty training will take place January 15 with an online follow-up training in the fall. Department chairs were asked to promote the training to all faculty (including part-time), academic staff, and student employees. J. McBratney asked if the sexual harassment board was still active, K. Svilar confirmed that it is. M. Setter asked if the training was mandatory for employees. K. Svilar responded that JCU must have a training available to everyone. C. Treml added that there are liability issues aside from Title IX. M. Martin asked if graduate students are also trained. K. Svilar replied that they are working on an online program for graduate students.
 2. Margaret F. announced that the Center for Service and Social Action is now accepting nominations for the faculty service award and asked chairs to publicize the award.
<http://sites.jcu.edu/service/pages/recognition-awards/curtis-miles/>
 3. Fall and Spring courses + 4-year plans for departments. Margaret F. announced that the Student Union passed a bill requiring departments to note if classes are offered fall or spring. Larger plan for students – Peter Kvidera will be asking for four-year plans. With the new core, there is confusion about what students should take and when. Plans to help guide advisors – Dr. Farrar encouraged chairs to provide plans in order to help students during summer advising sessions. In addition, there is a need to know how many linked courses to offer to meet student needs.

Comments:

- a. Paul S. – four-year plan meaning – scripted set of students. Students with AP credit – goal for what courses students should have at what point in their time. Would be more helpful than block schedule approach so it is flexible.
- b. Anne K. – advisors need to know what appropriate entry course is. Understandable to all advisors so they can give meaningful suggestions
- c. Sheila M. - appropriate time to take linked courses
- d. Martha P. – asked about times for chairs meetings for next year – Yes, will remain at same time at least for the next year.
- e. Deadline is in March in time for registration. Send to Peter Kvidera
- f. Jeff D. – asked if template could be provided? What is right level of detail?

- g. Paul S. – advising office provide link to faculty with everything on one site? Margaret – trying to decide the best place – registrar and advising.
- h. Mike S. – 4 year plan for students
- i. Sheila M. – clarify student union asked for 1 year

Margaret F. – some majors/concentration only offer courses every few years, students need to know so they can complete the course. Specificity will depend on major – some are more regimented, need aid in planning.

4. Selecting new chairs and chair development for 2016. The Dean will be meeting with departments to discuss chair selection process. There will be opportunities for department chair development – discretionary fund to do this next year. There will be a workshop council of independent colleges. Minneapolis and Louisville – 5-6 people. Would like to have a group go, learn from each other.

Comments:

- a. Dan K. – attended training, found it useful to speak with people with varying degrees of experience.
 - b. Could also do support group once a month – read article, talk about problems that chair's face. Next year.
 - c. Sheila M. – in favor of assessment, but right now demands are constant. Canvas as vehicle of collecting data, but need more support. Need IT support for doing assessment in Canvas. Doesn't feel like right task for chair. (Chetan?)
 - d. Margaret F. – what can we do institutionally to help?
 - e. John M. – change petition process? Yes – testing Friday.
5. APR process: what's happening and what's next? Margaret F. - thanked those who have already gone through process. Reviewers were impressed – very positive from her perspective. 24 this year including Boler. The reviewer's report will come to CAS office – will be sent immediately to dept. chair, Todd Bruce and, Jeanne Colleran. Departments can respond to factual errors. Suggested that departments start working on action plans e.g. things that require resources vs. non-resource dependent changes. Consider a response that is clear and cogent and timely. Might be good idea to do in non-department setting, then look at all 24 to review needs on large scale. Would also include APR from last year. Could also be helpful for departments going through the process next year.

Comments:

- a. Mike S. - Will meeting take place over the summer? Yes, Look at faculty needs, space, equipment, get back to departments
- b. Jeff D.– what about reviews done recently but not last year? How to discuss needs now?
- c. Mike S. process moving forward. Marg – evolving document, prioritization of department needs, process may change in spring. Closing meeting – initially dept. chairs were supposed to be there, had experiences at past job became awkward. Dept. chairs no longer coming to meeting. Kathy suggested have dept. chair at meeting, briefing, and then leaves.
- d. Paul S. – why not have separate meetings? Penny – want chair there so chair and dean hear same message, and reviewers don't need to repeat themselves. Want process to be transparent, information

- e. Penny H. – reviewer used to have separate meeting with department – useful to have entire department present to hear reviewer comments?
 - f. Margaret F. - Departments have separate meeting with untenured faculty and reviewer.
 - g. Mike S – CH reviewers had lunch on second day with most faculty in dept. informal information sharing. Hasn't gotten any feedback from dept. – not sure it was worthwhile.
 - h. Consider doing focus groups with students?
 - i. Sheila M. – What are we hoping to get out of APR? In the past there was no receipt of acknowledgement or written response. Frustrating experience.
6. Graduate studies follow up:
- a. Brenda W. – message heard that directive to save money, only three programs are making money.
 - b. Paul S. – negative meeting. Too focused on bottom line, ignoring mission, outreach to community, and influence on undergraduate education. Two years ago asked urgently for APR of grad programs. But those disappeared
 - c. Sheila M. – follow up admission data – wrong grad programs are important to university.
 - d. Young – has to be better way of funding programs
 - e. John M. – objected that view was short term. Need to move away from narrow minded business model.
 - f. CC no one is looking at future of grad programs. No one directly responsible. Need to have sense of where programs are going
 - g. Brenda W. – agreed, grad studies floundering need to have broader faculty discussion.
 - h. Margaret – agreed that larger conversation is important. Linked to strategic planning, need to be systematic with planning, quantify value of grad programs. Her report will ask questions raised here. Will share at the next chair's meeting.
 - i. Kathy M. -asked that data be reviewed closely, wrong in the past.
 - j. Paul S. – Grad programs should include summer enrollment
 - k. Mike M – budget numbers?? M need proactive discussion about grad studies. How to have programs be attractive, draw in students
 - l. Sheila M. – problems with data. Need someone to look closely at what is driving concern.
 - m. Margaret – graduate school revenue is important. CC – is it a crisis? Still need long term plan.
 - n. Sheri Y. – is there a crisis?
 - o. Anne K. – data on money vs. data on heads. Systems don't talk to each other. Starting to change.
 - p. Margaret F. – regardless of exact data, trend lines are down. Need to have conversation. Can have revenue generating programs and non-revenue. Need a game plan and realistic expectations.

Meeting adjourned 5:15 pm