

Present:

Medora Barnes	Gerry Guest	Mike Nichols
Matt Berg	Matt Johnson	Debby Rosenthal
Cecile Brennan	Anne Kugler	Keiko Nakano
Rich Clark	Graciela Lacueva	Mindy Peden
Gwen Compton-Engle	Kathy Lee	Cathy Rosemary
Rebecca Drenovsky	Kathleen Manning	Paul Shick
Jeff Dyck	Maria Marsilli	Earl Spurgin
Tina Facca-Meiss	Pam Mason	Andy Welki
Margaret Farrar	Sheila McGinn	Sheri Young
Margaret Finucane	Michelle Millet	

Announcements (M. Farrar):

1. Faculty development day will be January 12. CAS is collaborating with Boler, CSSA, the Library, and Student Affairs. The day will be in a conference format with participants sharing expertise and coming together around strategic plan initiatives. More information to come.
2. Thanks to those who participated in the tenure and promotion workshop. Several attendees asked for a special workshop on promotion, which will be scheduled later this fall.
3. Stacey Love, Assistant Vice President for Enrollment Outreach and Student Success, will join the next chairs' meeting to talk about transfer partnerships, events, and faculty involvement.
4. P. Mason announced that Global Education is going through its APR right now. The team visit is scheduled for September 26-27. The internal reviewer is Feng Zhan from Economics. The review will provide direction for Center for Global Education, including mission, staffing, and reporting structure. The hope is to reimagine the possibilities for global learning. There are also many constituencies to consider. P. Mason added that Megan McBride from enrollment is now in the Global Ed office. Global Ed staff member Melanie Hahn is developing as study abroad advisor. They have support services for undergrads in place and are working on services for graduate students.

Career Services Survey

M. Farrar reported that the results from The Center for Career Services survey about graduates (Outcomes Survey) is now available. There is broad institutional information given the high rate of undergraduate participation (77%), including valuable data on internships, jobs, and graduate schools. The data can be broken down by department, so departments do not need to get information on their own. M. Farrar said she would find out when it will be distributed this year and will share with department chairs. M. Nichols added that Pat Mullane (Director of Career Services) mentioned doing the survey at graduation, but Career Services might add a six-month or year-out survey. M. Farrar agreed that would be helpful. J. Dyck agreed that it would be good to have long-term data to better understand what the placement numbers mean. M. Farrar remarked that in the future, this information should be available from the institutional research office. The university needs to be able to respond to the data, to use it in academic planning.

Strategic Planning in CAS

M. Farrar reported that fourteen faculty members participated in the evaluation and there was good feedback. A few things stood out as important for positioning JCU for the future and setting us apart:

1. embedding professional development
2. partnerships with local organizations
3. cross-departmental and cross-college program development
4. graduate school and continuing education
5. project-based learning in curriculum and classes
6. focusing on undergraduate research

The strategic plans of CAS and the University must proceed together. As the college generates ideas, the Institutional Research office can help with information from market studies. S. McGinn asked how departments could get data to make decisions. There is a need to bring people in and talk to them about what they want that is not offered. Who is the demographic? The college needs to think both departmentally and in interdisciplinary terms. M. Farrar said she would like a template / structure for doing continuing education offerings. If there is interest, perhaps we can develop a degree program around it. C. Brennan suggested a meeting to discuss CEUs - appropriate cost, etc. M. Farrar said the pricing structure should be based on competitors; there should be an institutional conversation within the context of the university's strategic plan.

M. Farrar said the college needs to articulate what we are working towards and put it down in writing. Global Education is a good example of this: they are gathering good data to make goals and decisions. We need to tell a good story, push marketing forward to say what we want, what we know about our students, research, etc. The plan will need to be cohesive, silos are not where the future is going to be. CAS priorities can align and drive university priorities. Global education and research, can be university priorities driven by CAS. Associate Deans will talk with chairs to start conversations. Think about pushing past boundaries of departments, making partnerships, sharing resources. A formal strategic planning session will take place later this fall.

Comments:

R. Drenovsky noted that this is long overdue. CAS does not really have an identity. We need to get out in front and take control of the message. M. Farrar agreed that we should drive the agenda. M. Berg added that departments that do not have professional development training can show value-added relevance.

S. McGinn mentioned the need for resources, endowed positions, course release time, and other compensation to do this work. Faculty are asked to do more with less, but that is not always possible. M. Farrar agreed that the institution must have a better understanding of strategic budgeting and investment. Dennis Hareza (Vice President for Finance) understands the need to align the budget to meet university priorities. Current incentive structures do not always line up with priorities, not just course load reductions, but also tenure and promotion guidelines. There is a need to align the incentive structure with creative work to introduce revenue-growing programs.

M. Peden suggested the college should think about how we approach experimental and co-curricular activities. There should be an accounting of the importance of these activities on enrollment. There should be equal support for co-curricular activities on level with sports programs. How can these revenue-generating programs be supported without creating silos of funding?

E. Spurgin mentioned the ethics competition that philosophy students attend. Some schools have students enroll in a course to be on the team. M. Farrar asked how we can value programs that are good co-curricular activities. R. Drenovsky noted the importance of looking at the broader implications of expanding programs and mentioned the difficulty of handling the growth of the honors program and supporting the need for faculty to review the increased number of honors theses. We must think about all aspects of increasing programs. G. Lacueva mentioned we should have money available for students to go to conferences. R. Drenovsky agreed. M. Farrar said we must measure, incentivize, support.

M. Berg commented that when strategic planning began, the suggestion was made that funds be allotted for travel, conferences, Model UN, etc. What did USPG come up with? M. Farrar suggested thinking about what we want to accomplish, what are our goals, is this the best use of resources? What do we want the outcome to be? Can goals be accomplished another way? Yes, no, why? Think about allocating resources broadly, if goal is globalized curriculum, how allocate resources to best impact that aspiration.

R. Drenovsky pointed out that funding co-curricular activities is a social justice issue. Wealthy students can afford to go to conferences and travel. We need to find ways to make it achievable for all students - those who cannot afford to go would benefit the most. M. Farrar suggested establishing a fund for students for experiential learning. Her previous institution increased tuition to have funds to apply to experiential learning. There were stipulations about how the money could be used, but students had choices. M. Peden agreed that we should fund other activities and allow students to have experiences outside of established programs.

M. Nichols noted that this would take a lot of communication between associate deans, deans, and departments. M. Farrar agreed and added that department chairs need to take responsibility for passing news on to department faculty. Chairs can also contact her or the associate deans about topics for chairs meetings. Contact Margaret if you have a topic to include in the "Weekly Messages from CAS" emails.

S. McGinn brought up the issue of submission of syllabi. Chairs need more time to review - one week is not enough time to manage it. M. Peden said she viewed syllabus review as more of a long-term process. Her feedback to instructors is communicated as something to change for next semester; part of a process of continual improvement. M. Farrar commented that it is the obligation of department chairs to send in syllabi in the best shape possible. Syllabi must have learning goals, a reasonable schedule, and compliance policies. She noted that part-time faculty teach in different systems and know that these things need to happen. A. Kugler added that syllabi must also include how grading happens. M. Peden noted that she understands why policies exist, but they can be hard to enforce. M. Farrar said we should move toward pedagogy for retention and push for the success of transfer students. The syllabi checklist is full of things that will come back to cause problems if not addressed. The group discussed whether submission of syllabi should be changed to the end of the second week of the semester. A. Kugler noted that addressing issues the first week implies correction needed for week 2. Syllabus has already been handed out to students. G. Lacueva added that it is helpful to make sure students have full information at the end of first week.

Meeting adjourned 5:00 p.m.