

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

1. **Housekeeping, M. Farrar** – Began with an expression of thanks for the conversation on distinctive programming, and for participation and work at the Celebration Day for the class of 2020. Deposits are doing well with 261 received as of today. Request for a show of hands in regard to specifying names within the Chairs' meeting minutes. The majority were in agreement to keep the names. R. Clark suggested an "off the record" option. John McCluskey weighed in in favor of transparency.

The spring faculty meeting will be held on **Wed. April 27, at 3:30 p.m.** in the **LSC Conference room**. CAS will be honoring retirees during the meeting. Request for chairs to send the Dean's office the names of retirees in their department.

The **HLC meeting** will be held on **Wed., April 6, 2:00-3:00 pm** in **Dolan Aud.**

Jeanne Colleran will attend the next **CAS chairs' meeting on May 3rd in Dolan 202-203** to discuss the HLC. Recent summary is showing terrific progress. There will be an invitation for all students across the university to participate in a survey.

There will be another joint CAS/BSOB meeting, date and time to follow. Possible items for discussion – operations management, working with Institutional Effectiveness.

Several chairs have expressed concern for training. More to come.

S. McGinn – Do we have a standard job description?

M. Farrar – I will be working on this over the summer.

S. McGinn – After having observed the chair position, the job has changed significantly. Should we consider a co-chair position?

M. Farrar – good idea, there is not a lot of clarity on what the chairs do. Co-chair can bring support to the department list of responsibilities.

J. McBratney – Should we invite incoming chairs to the next meeting?

M. Farrar – yes

2. **CAP – Gwen Compton-Engle - handout distributed: CAP Proposal: Approval and Notification Process for Curricular Changes**

Update on what CAP is working on. **Problems to solve:**

- CAP has been charged by Faculty Council to make changes within programs. Departments that make curricular changes without consulting other departments contribute to communication problems.
- The Registrar does not know what has been approved or from where and is left in the dark about the effective date of these approvals.
- Publication of the Bulletin in late summer or early fall means that students and key offices (Registrar and Advising) do not have the official version or curricular requirements until well after registration.

Proposals:

- New academic programs retain current approval through faculty governance, but establish earlier deadlines which would enable approved changes to be distributed by March 1 (yearly) and a pdf of the Bulletin for availability by June 1 (in Bulletin years).
- For existing programs: establish a system of consultation among chairs, approval by Associate Deans, and notification of all faculty and academic offices on a timetable that allows approved changes to be distributed by March 1 (yearly) and a pdf of the Bulletin for availability by June 1 (in Bulletin years).
- Each year, by March 1, the Provost's office compiles a document that includes a summary of curricular changes that have been created by departments and reviewed and approved by the Assoc. Deans. The Provost's office will distribute the approved document as the official record of changes, effective the following year.

M. Martin voiced concern that 3+3 programs need to be implemented quickly. M. Farrar responded that not all programs/partnerships are the same. We must figure out how to categorize and provide meaning. If we have one 3+3 agreement will others basically be the same? M. Martin suggested adopting model from CWRU in order to have something to go on.

J. McCluskey suggested developing a cover sheet with department and chair information that can be circulated for signatures which may provide speed and agility. M. Martin suggested that students be coded upon admission in order to be advised properly.

D. Taylor indicated that creation of programs without faculty knowledge is potentially a handbook issue so therefore it is very important to clarify the process. Also expressed concern that compressing 3+3 programs with a portion of credit hours being taken elsewhere may weaken the program overall. M. Farrar responded that this is not a problem as we can get students through partnerships and faculty need to be instrumental in these partnerships.

3. **Protocol for Recruitment of Jesuit Faculty – Sheila McGinn – Handout distributed: *Protocol for Recruitment of Potential Jesuit Faculty***

S. McGinn put together a process for recruitment based on other searches. The difference between a regular and Jesuit hire is that the Jesuit hire is initiated from the provost with an invitation to interview and the respective departments arrange to bring the candidate to campus. This is an anomalous situation. The visit is not clear. Cover sheet with work history and CV replaces dossier. How should we go forward? What are our expectations? Minimal requirements create a bad dynamic within the department. Consulted with Fr. Martin Connell who reviewed requirements and agreed with the requirements in principle. Requested chairs to review document.

Todd Bruce and Nick Santilli arrived to talk exclusively with chairs about upcoming CAS Dean Survey. Meeting adjourned at 4:30 p.m.