

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

1. **New Business**, M. Farrar – Raise pool will be 2%. HLC update, IMC (?) in the final stretch. What can we do to help?
 - A. Make sure that syllabi are in compliance.
 - a. Learning goals
 - b. Department goals
 - c. University goals

Keep to assessment and keep on schedule. Document changes of assessment data. If you have had an APR in the last 2 years, finalize action plan. Be open to information and be willing to share with department. There will be meetings and communication from Todd Bruce and Nick Santilli in terms of where we are. The New Core Committee is spending time devoted to assessment work. Be an enthusiastic supporter.
 - B. Chairs are urged to attend the Diversity Workshop on 2/3. It is also very important to encourage students and colleagues. What do we need to talk about? How can faculty and staff contribute? S. McGinn announced that Theology and Religious studies and the Center for Diversity and Inclusion will present the Valentino Lassiter workshop award. Information will be in Inside JCU.
2. D. Kilbride – CORE Committee will ask to collect student work to load into Canvas. Rubrics are in the tentative stage. M. Setter said that he received a request from the sub-committee. G. Lacueva responded that those who are receiving request information may be assessed first. *Student involvement in hiring will systematize student involvement in hiring faculty. Having things in writing is the best approach. Students are not asking for decision making rights, just want a voice to be heard.*
3. M. Farrar -This spring there will be an evaluation of the CAS Dean's Office. We are interested in knowing how we are doing. In the past, administrative reviews have been formal. The best approach may be toward focus groups for faculty. Look for an upcoming invitation to participate. Very important for Chairs.
4. M. Farrar - There will be a cutback in GA positions in the coming year. We do not have a good sense on how much revenue is coming in and if it covers expenses. Questions include: How much does it contribute to research? Are we getting our money's worth? We need a better developed sense of what a viable grad program is. We need a better systematic approach. How do we best apply the resources we have? What would a rubric from a thriving program be like? Thriving does not necessarily mean financial. The idea is to identify where there is the most potential to thrive.

Comments:

- Need Alumni interest
- Student outcomes. Need a systematic approach.

- Part of the goal should be to assist programs that we have now.

S. McGinn – Who decides which programs are on the chopping block?

M. Farrar – Deciding to end a program is a group effort. It will be a reluctant decision to confront reality as it is.

5. Interdisciplinary Programs –

Question: When developing an interdisciplinary program, at what point do you collaborate with others that you are working with?

M. Farrar – Consultation should be at the beginning when an idea is developed and departments are approached. Catholic studies was not approached this way as it used an advisory committee and faculty that were already in place.

Question from S. Young: what happens when collaboration increases course overload? Where does compensation come from?

S. McGinn – TRS has managed to do it without course overloads.

R. Clark – PJHR has not had that experience.

M. Beadle – CO has had to hire adjuncts to replace interdisciplinary ½ time. Capstone classes require other major classes to be taught by part-timers.

M. Farrar – Cognizant that it is all very stressful but how can we make it better?

P. Shick – Assoc. Deans could keep a running tab of actual teaching time that faculty members are doing. This could influence decision making.

S. Young – Need earlier communication to organize classes. Mechanism for the allocation of resources should be reviewed periodically. Dean & Assoc. Deans need to keep accurate scores that are reviewed on a regular basis.

G. Lacueva – People applying for grants need information to cross into related dept. More communication is needed. Accounting should include linked courses.

6. Tenure and Promotion – M. Farrar stated that she was impressed with time and care taken in promoting colleagues. Question for Chairs. While reading different cases of promotion how do we see promotion to professor? Is there a clear path? Do they get adequate mentoring?

S. McGinn – The Provost understands the full Professorship as being a prestigious honor, while the department's view it as research and straight forward scholarship.

P. Harris – we were asked to write promotion statements and those statements have now disappeared. Service to the University was emphasized rather than service to the profession.

J. McBratney – Candidates are judged on three levels. Teaching, scholarship, and service, with weight on the first two. Does the candidate need to be hitting on all levels or can they be exemplary in one area? The qualification for promotion to full professor is too narrow.

M. Farrar – The challenge of evaluating for full professor is accommodating variety. Is there good mentoring?

- A. Kilbride – Mentoring is very specific to departments.
- B. P. Shick – We are mandated every year to meet and identify potential candidates.
- C. M. Farrar – the problem is that there is no place for them to go except the department committee. Do people share information?
- D. S. McGinn – Candidates should get feedback from other disciplines. Some collaboration but decision is ultimately made by the department. Candidates should talk with committee and mentor.
- E. J. Dyck – Degree of interaction depends on what the candidate seeks out.

M. Farrar - We do not want to inhibit people for pursuing a career goal. What can we do to help them on the path?

- F. M. Martin – Associate Professors should meet every 3-4 years to touch base.
- G. D. Taylor – We want to make sure they have all the opportunities for the support that they need. We need conversations about parameters on what is needed in a faculty member to qualify for promotion.
- H. S. McGinn – What should we be doing to encourage faculty to apply for promotion? Should this be the job of the (promotion committee) Chairs?
- I. D. Hahn – It may be implied in the handbook to make that part of the Chairs' responsibilities.
- J. B. Wirkus – The handbook tends to not be read or useful.

M. Farrar – It makes sense that the promotion committee chair should reach out. The bottom line is that I am a firm and passionate believer in mentoring. It is an equal opportunity for both the Department Chair and the Promotion Committee Chair. We need to make it better and more transparent for people.

Meeting Adjourned: 4:50 pm.