

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

1. **Announcements, M. Farrar** – The CAS/BSOB Chairs' meeting will take place on Thursday, May 12, from 3:30 – 5:00 in the Mackin Rm. of Grasselli Library. Agenda to follow. Please send agenda items to M. Farrar, your Assoc. Dean, or Ellen Valentine. Main topic will center on information on how to make your job easier and more productive.

As of the May 1st deadline, deposits were at 722. 800 is the ideal. Hard to tell where we will be by June 1. What it means? Adjuncts may teach fewer sections to save money. We'll know more over the summer. No information on tuition revenue.

Attended several admission events and was very impressed by the hard work that faculty is doing.

2. **Introduction of Dr. Jeanne Colleran and Dr. Nick Santilli** – Handout distributed: *The JCU Accreditation Timeline and Key Milestones*.

J. Colleran began by stating that they will have a much improved draft of the HLC document for the JCU community. The notice itself is 60 pages, our efforts are meeting the subcomponents, Drs. Rosemary and Santilli are editing the entire document and it is in much better shape. There are 164 pieces of evidence included as a PDF and we are submitting a long list of documents. The Town Hall meeting will cover in shorthand the large amount of work that has been done. We will need a well-informed group when the well-experienced team arrives. The team includes:

- An Institutional Researcher from Creighton University.
- A President of a small Catholic college.
- A Benedictine assessment professional.

Dr. Colleran requested that Chairs, through their leadership, ask faculty to read the report so that we all can be as knowledgeable about the visit as possible. Please ask questions. There are three components including subcomponents that focus on articulating student learning outcomes. We have identified places where it was critical to respond in an action letter. The action letter is the template for the report and it is critical to organize the argument around it. Cathy Rosemary suggested that the faculty allow a couple of weeks to read it through.

Nick Santilli, Expectations – Referring to the handout Dr. Santilli called attention to 3A Learning Goals. Goals are aligned. What have we done to answer sufficiently? Every academic program has learning goals. Differentiation between degree levels have been cleared up.

What have we done to produce a "mature system"? Categories have been reviewed by internal and external reviewers and all have concluded that the learning goals have been met. Please double check your websites to confirm that the information is up to standards and correct.

J. Dyck – Physics does not have a graduate program but has done work to flesh out problems. Additional suggestions?

N. Santilli – Update website and Bulletin to include the most recent version of outcomes.

J. Colleran – Confer with Todd Bruce for advice and assistance.

N. Santilli - Criterion 4. Sense of importance and emphasis is on teaching and learning. Program review and assessment demonstrate that we are providing quality programs. The cycle of program review proves a mature process of ongoing assessment of student learning. Thank you for the tremendous effort. We will have completed 23 program reviews that will be operational in the University Strategic Plan.

The ongoing student assessment is not consistent. Standardization is important for accreditation. The annual assessment reports will be reviewed by the committee. Assessment data and program review data need to have a relationship. If the committee meets faculty that are not educated and knowledgeable about assessment, it will be a negative. If you have colleagues that say it makes no difference, chairs need to investigate the tools that they are using.

N. Santilli - Criterion 5. How the university demonstrates how the work gets done. How does the institution make decisions? By taking information from assessment and program review. The focus is on identifying and improving ways of engaging in the customary effect of student learning. This will guide resources and drive the work done by the institution, e.g. strategic planning.

J. Colleran – In the March 9, 2015 action letter, 5b, 5c, 5d were listed as “not met”. A single “not met” results in failure of the entire criterion. Work that we have done and will do makes us better as an institution. 5b| Effective Leadership and Collaborative Processes has resulted in the following:

- Structural reorganization resulting in Divisional Deans.
- Productive interaction between CAS and BSOB.
- Focus groups
- Professional development e.g. Academic Dashboard and seminars for chairs.
- Report from the university committee on collaborative government by Dr. Barbara D’Ambrosia and David Short (board member).
- Governance Audit led by Dr. Thomas Longin.

We need to encourage the work of the staff through professional development and advocacy. Evidence in Faculty Council to enhance communication and collaboration between Administration and Faculty. The USPG meeting is held every Thursday from 8:00-10:00.

N. Santilli – Prominent in assessment is work that focuses on institutional performance, benchmarking, and work with compensation committee. We need an external perspective and an environmental scanning to look inward. It is important to recognize nationally the Great Lakes region. Benchmarking is critically important. Also, new programs. Where do we see ourselves in the adult market? How can we grow competency based education? We need to talk about developing a plan.

J. Colleran – A disheartening statistic is that Higher Ed is sought by only 15% of the pop. Going forward we need to balance our budget and be mindful of how we use the

endowment. Enrollment is at 722, 1% ahead of last year. We need 760 for a balanced budget. The Data analytics site shows a 9% increase in retention and persistence.

Questions:

Will they quiz the part time folks?

J. Colleran - They will question whoever they cross paths with. Please have a conversation with your adjuncts and share information. Make sure that their syllabi are in line with the University Learning Goals.

M. Setter – Can we send the letter out early?

P. Shick – There are classes that require funding for part time and full time faculty to set up CORE courses.

M. Setter – There are several areas in Criterion 5 that we have not met because they are not fully functioning.

J. Colleran - The HLC team will get the report after July. We can contact them to see if they can add the part-timers to the agenda. If you have faculty members with deep concerns please encourage them to bring it to the table now. Dr. Sweeny is very responsive and supportive but how much can we do in 18 mos.? In the main statement we understand that we have made course corrections. Integrity rests on teaching and learning. Both direct and indirect evidence are acceptable. An example of direct evidence is that the Provost Council is doing a better job in student learning, indirect evidence is our desire to promote better conversations on diversity, retention council, and leave of absence. The self-study must be framed as an argument for accreditation.

N. Santilli – We are now on a standard pathway. The assurance report meets the 5 criteria with evidence in 40,000 words. Please share this information with your colleagues. I will be happy to come to any meeting to address questions.

3. **Margaret Farrar introduced Sheila McGinn, handout distributed: *Protocol for Recruitment of Potential Jesuit Faculty***

S. McGinn – We received a list of Jesuit Faculty to be considered as faculty hires. This process does not work in the same way as regular hiring. Where are the parameters? The general drift is not the same. These are more informal visits that only require a short 4 page C.V. and no writing samples. AJCU schools met and gathered information which accounts for most of the range of answers, 50% of AJCU schools follow similar guidelines as the handout.

Closing comments: Margaret Farrar thanked the Chairs and the Associate Deans for the phenomenal job that they have done.

Meeting adjourned: 5:00