

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, Al Miciak, Rick Greci, Andy Welki, Walter Simmons, Al Nagy, Jennifer Dillon.

1. **M. Farrar** – Welcome to the last official CAS Chairs' meeting of the year. Discussion will begin with Distinctive Programs. The type of education we provide is extremely valuable. Growth and deficiency is a context for discussion. Regarding the Distinctive programs template, what are thoughts, comments, and concerns?

Handout circulated: *Academic Program Model to Achieve Distinction*.

**A. Miciak** – The template will come out as part of the USPG growth efficiency. Growth meaning how to build distinctive programs plus efficiency. In the Boler School, Liberal Arts and business education are the spirit of the notion of distinctive programs. The goal of distinctive programs is to set a good path for growth.

**M. Setter** – Part of the USPG document? What is the purpose behind Distinctive Programs?

**A. Miciak** – Academic excellence and student learning. The objective is to drive growth in programs of study. Applicants are looking for this and we must respond.

**J. McBratney** – There is nothing in the document about the mission. There should at least be a gesture of the mission within the document.

**P. Shick** – “Distinctive research programs are defining a measure of faculty expertise.” A community of faculty is necessary but difficult to obtain. The language needs to be addressed.

**M. Farrar** – I read it as people who talk about their scholarly lives together, they do not necessarily need to share scholarly interests.

**D. Rosenthal** – The document seems biased against the Humanities. It is difficult to have Humanities gestures. Is this harder for the Humanities faculty to achieve?

**M. Farrar** – Yes and no. Every institution is forced to think about this.

**T. Nlandu** – There has been confusion in the last few years where JCU is a teaching university and it is turning into a research institution. The emphasis on research is well meaning but why do we have to do both?

**M. Farrar** – Most faculty in most departments are already following the teacher-scholar model.

**A. Miciak** – Faculty expertise is driven by the research that they do. We are not suggesting that we are becoming a research institution. What do we need to do to attract students to these fields? (HU?) We must amass a portfolio of distinctive programs.

**S. McGinn** – I do not understand the title of the document. Why are research and outreach part of an academic program? Graduate programs are marginalized. If we are going to talk about programs of distinction, we need to talk about graduate programs.

**A. Kugler** – We have an international reputation in Biology and Counseling, demonstrated by their scholarship and outreach. I agree that this doesn't extend into the graduate level.

**S. McGinn** – If programs achieve in different ways I do not understand the list.

**A. Miciak** – The programs are not going to be labeled “distinctive”. Where would we be in the Pre-Health program without CCF internships? There are more applicants in the BL program than

any other. If you dissect the program you will see that they meet the criteria for distinctive programs. We are just encouraging others to follow suit.

**J. McBratney** – A dept. of fine teachers does outreach enrichment, but we are struggling against a climate that is biased against the Humanities. Should we suffer for this?

**A. Miciak** – We need to build programs that are attractive to students. We are willing to work with all departments.

**J. McBratney** – Achieving distinction implies hierarchy.

**M. Farrar** – The idea of distinctive programs is to encourage programs that draw students. We have further to go if we look at the national trends. Additional dimensions need to be added if necessary.

**P. Shick** – We are treating programs in a monolithic way. We need to come up with language that does not label distinctive vs. non- distinctive.

**M. Farrar** – Not sure that this is true. We welcome suggestions but at the same time how would it be different?

**P. Shick** – For example BL students enter for different reasons e.g. pre-med, Environmental Science, language must allow for that.

**G. Lacueva** – The language does allow for that.

**M. Farrar** – There are different strands in each department. I don't use that approach & assume the same of this document.

**D. Rosenthal** – Who decides which program receives distinction?

**A. Miciak** – An ideal point. Not everything will be measured by it. If we don't focus on developing academic programs of study, what is the alternative? It's not about measuring distinction but to inspire people in developing programs that are stellar.

**M. Farrar** – If we can find a way of telling our department's stories in a way that fit into these categories, we can go toward increased enrollment. If you have things to add, please send them to myself or Al Miciak.

2. **Introduction of Jennifer Dillon, Director of Budget and Financial Analysis.** Handout circulated: *Academic Analytics: Chairs and Directors Dashboard.*

**Jennifer Dillon** – In summary, Institutional Effectiveness, working with Brian Williams, is looking at ways to increase efficiency of existing resources through a series of academic dashboard pages.

- Advising Load (visual) – comprises
- Advising Load ( table)
- Advising Load Over Time
- Teaching Load
- Average Class Size

Questions to Jennifer Dillon Include:

**J. McBratney** - What do we do about double majors? Are students counted 2x?

Answer: yes

**S. McGinn:** Is the website still being built? What effort is being made to clean up the Banner records?

Answer: Please send problems and concerns to [data@jcu.edu](mailto:data@jcu.edu)

**T. Nlandu** - There are a high number of part-timers. What are our expectations for part time? How can they commit to help in this goal?

**A. Miciak** – We need to address the issue of part-time faculty. Workload policy, course assignments. We need to determine the best path for success. It will be on the agenda for 2016.

**M. Farrar** – The project is ongoing in phases. What is useful for your department? What information do you need but are not getting? The dashboard will make our work visible.

**A. Miciak** – What we are looking for is for people to consider the institutional perspective. We are looking at the data and tracking how we are using our resources. How can we do better with what we have? What are our own individual needs vs. a healthy institution? Facing this view helps us develop a global perspective.

**M. Farrar** – Please send suggestions for changes as soon as possible.

Meeting Adjourned: 5:00 pm