**CAS Chairs and Directors Meeting Minutes**
**October 1, 2019**
**4:00-5:00 pm, Murphy Room**

---

*Present: Laura Atkins, Medora Barnes, Matt Berg, Brent Brossman,Todd Bruce, Angie Canda, Rich Clark, Barbara D'Ambrosia, Rebecca Drenovsky, Jeffrey Dyck, Gwen Compton-Engle, Brian Ferguson, Nathan Gehlert, Gerald Guest, Ed Hahnenberg, Steven Herbert, Rodney Hessinger, Anne Kugler, Peter Kvidera, Kathy Lee, Kathleen Manning, Al Miciak, Albert Nagy, Patrick Mooney, Anne Moses, Albert Nagy, Mike Nichols, Paul Nietupski, Kyle O'Dell, Mindy Peden, Dani Robbins, Jackie Schmidt, Chris Sheil, Walter Simmons, Mark Storz, Andrew Welki, John Yost*

---

P. Kvidera welcomed the CAS and Boler chairs to the meeting. S. Herbert distributed the Academic Program Evaluation document, pillar 2 of the strategic planning process. The document is available electronically on the *JCU Faculty and Staff* Google shared drive in the folder *Academic Evaluation Process 2019*.

S. Herbert said the program evaluation is a community conversation about what JCU's strengths and weaknesses are and how we get stronger and decide what directions to take. The academic evaluation process is not about cutting majors, but about getting the right mix of disciplines. Even strong programs have weak spots, whether resource-based or curricular. The Office of Institutional Effectiveness (OIE) has compiled quantitative data for all programs. Qualitative data will come from departments.

- Each department and program will submit a five-page narrative.
- The descriptor list on page 2 is a guide, not an exhaustive list - feel free to add to it.
- Part I, quantitative data, will help departments do an examen: where are we now, what our strengths and weaknesses are, and where we want to go. The process is meant to be concise, quick and allow us to gather a lot of information in a short period of time. Dimensions and examples will be provided by OIE
- T. Bruce added that OIE will provide explanatory documents and directions on how to access everything. Each department has documents with combined data going back to 2004.
- Part II, qualitative data, should include a brief description for each metric. Feel free to include data and rank importance of qualitative metric. This section should be no more than 4 pages.
- Part III is program rating/ranking and narrative using descriptions on page 2. Acknowledge outside factors such as low enrollment. It was asked if departments with multiple majors do one report? S. Herbert said each department can submit one evaluation for all majors, if want to do it differently, consult with your dean. If

departments have undergraduate and graduate programs, one report can be done for each. Interdisciplinary programs should do a report if they have a major.

S. Herbert asked that this turned into Dean's offices by December 4. Reports will then be put on the shared drive and be available to the evaluation team.

Questions/Comments
- P. Kvidera reiterated that chairs can come to him with questions.
- R. Hessinger thanked Todd Bruce and Maria O'Connor from OIE for all the work they did to put so much helpful information at chairs' fingertips
- A. Welki asked if this information can be shared will colleagues. S. Herbert replied yes, the expectations are that chairs and program directors share, delegate, and ask for input.
- S. Herbert said that the members of the evaluation team are still being decided, but so far it includes the associate academic vice president, two associate deans, one academic staff, five at-large faculty members, two at-large members from each college chosen by the provost, and the faculty council chair. The evaluation team responses will go to the departments first and they will have a chance to respond.  Then data, narrative, evaluation team response, and department response will be posted on the shared drive. There will be open forums and curated discussions on campus to decide what to do next. Being open to input is the best process going forward. The interest is in outcomes and future direction. Departments can look at program efficiencies, limited resource pool, money, personnel, time, market viability and program attractiveness. JCU is in a challenging market and has good programs that aren't always on display. Service-learning is especially good here.
- C. Sheil asked if there is any flexibility with the timeline since departments are dealing with evaluations, hiring, tenure, etc. S. Herbert replied that the strategic plan must go to the board by May. There is a little flexibility, but not much.
- M. Peden asked where the draft vision statement came from. S. Herbert replied that the president drafted the vision statement.
- M. Barnes asked about the four areas listed in the vision statement: health sciences, analytics, business, and service learning. What is meant by by analytics? Does JCU have a curriculum for analytics?
- M. Berg said that the vision statement identifies distinct areas that can be taken as pre-selecting winners and losers in the strategic planning process.  If a department or program is not in the areas identified, or does not play a discernible role in support of one of them, there would be grounds for concern that essential areas - liberal arts, interdisciplinary programs, programs of study related to global foci - will be deemphasized or written out entirely.  What do we want internal or external readers to come away with having read the vision statement that will guide JCU's strategic planning and build on the university's foundational values?
- S. Herbert noted that this year's enrollment numbers point to challenge we are under to improve the value proposition. The "buckets" of distinction are areas that are attractive to new students out there. Once students arrive, they often change path and are open

to a different calling, but we need to get them here. These areas don't exclude anything and rely on a liberal arts foundation.

- A. Kugler commented that writing a program evaluation for the humanities program framed within the draft vision statement will be problematic in the absence of the words "liberal arts" in that vision. The liberal arts are foundational to John Carroll. "Jesuit Catholic" tends to bring to mind philosophy and theology, not the broader humanities. How can a program such as the humanities masters program write an academic program evaluation aligned to the vision statement in terms of health sciences, business, analytics, or service learning when the program's contributions are to the liberal arts?
- S. Herbert replied that part of the draft vision statement is how to get 17-18 years olds to see themselves at JCU. It is about inviting them in.
- R. Hessinger commented that there is a good amount of data that liberal arts majors do better in the long run. We are not a pre-professional or technical school. Students will learn skills that will serve them for a lifetime and allow them to be nimble. S. Herbert noted that we need to have an answer on how we do that, rich anecdotal evidence.


Meeting adjourned at 5:00 pm.

# Strategic Planning Process
Pillar 2:  Academic Program Evaluation
October 2, 2019

**Draft Vision Statement**

*Grounded in its Jesuit Catholic tradition, John Carroll University will build upon its strengths and innovate to educate a diverse population of undergraduate, graduate and non-traditional students to become inspired and discerning learners and leaders in service to others through their areas of study, with particular distinction in areas that include health sciences, analytics, business and service learning. In doing this, JCU will be a top-ranked regional, private university delivering excellent academic programs by an excellent faculty in an environment where students feel at home.*

## Academic Program Evaluation metric areas

| Academic | Contribution | Market/Appeal | Personnel | Operational Efficiency/ Financial |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Quantitative Measures | | | | |
| Graduation rate by exit major | Contribution to the Core (UG only) | Student enrollment | Student/Faculty ratio by major | Avg. section size |
| Major GPA by exit major | # of faculty per student major ratio | Student major mobility | Faculty rank distribution | Seats filled per section |
| Time to degree by exit major | | Degrees awarded – historically at JCU | Student credit hour production by rank | Course capacity utilization |
| Student diversity | | Degrees awarded nationwide | # SCH taught by adjunct faculty  - By intro level  - By upper level | SCH Generated |
| | | Persistence by entry major | Faculty diversity | SCH Taught |
| | | | | Program Costs/SCH Taught |
| | | | | Grad – Revenue/SCH |
| Qualitative Measures | | | | |
| Academic quality | Student Engagement | Future career demand | Faculty Reputation | Use of allocated resources |
| Achievement of program SLOs | High Impact Practices | Preparation for associated fields/outcomes | | |
| Post-degree outcomes | Contribution to Core | | | |
| Faculty scholarship and grants | Contribution to Mission | | | |
| Faculty service | | | | |
| Faculty external contribution | | | | |

<u>Major/Program Rating Descriptors</u>:
1. Strong = Program is strong academically, meeting and exceeding all national or accreditation norms and may have distinctive aspects that distinguish it nationally; routinely meets assessment learning outcomes; strong student experience and after-graduation outcomes; enrollment numbers meet or exceed resource capacity; net tuition revenue it positive to strong.
2. Solid = Program is aligned with national programmatic curricula; usually meets assessment learning outcomes and/or routinely addresses shortcomings; positive student experience prepares students for post-graduate outcomes; enrollments are good with capacity to grow; acknowledged to have room for curricular improvement and enrollment growth; net tuition revenue is marginal or net positive.
3. Needs attention = Program is aligned with general national norms but is in need of refreshing or re-imagining; often misses one or more assessment learning outcomes; enrollments are steady or declining with no clear plan to re-invigorate appeal; marginal or declining net tuition revenue.
4. Weak = Program lacks curricular identity and/or distinction; is challenged to meet assessment learning outcomes in multiple areas; low enrollments over time represents little appeal to student recruitment; low net tuition revenue.

<u>Strategic Fit</u>:
A. Vision Specific = Explicitly included in draft vision statement as an area of growth or explicitly necessary for continued growth in one of these areas
B. Vision Connected = Provides necessary foundation or extension to areas included in the draft vision statement or closely related areas.
C. Vision Supportive = Does not contribute directly to areas of growth but contributes generally to overall support of a strategic vision area and/or supports general academic experience overall.

<u>Mission Fit</u>:
A. Mission Critical **=** Program area without which it would be impossible to deliver our Jesuit Catholic mission.
B. Mission Central = Program area delivers content directly related to our Jesuit Catholic mission.
C. Mission Related = Program participates in the general mission of educating men and women for and with others.

Outline:

1. Quantitative Data section – ratings:

2. Qualitative Data section – ratings:

3. Program Evaluation – overall rating:

4. Program Evaluation Narrative (5 pages or less):

5. Program Future Visions (1 page or less):

6. Appendix:  Qualitative Data descriptions (4 pages or less):

_____

Description:

# Part I. Quantitative Data

Your Major/Program has been provided quantitative date from John Carroll's data systems for each metric mentioned in the evaluation matrix above. Consult the Google Drive:  *Academic Evaluation Process 2019* folder under the JCU Faculty and Staff shared drive.

Are the data provided consistent with your understanding of your program:  Yes/No?
If no, please describe the ways that you believe the data is incorrect:  _____

For each quantitative metric provided, please rate the programs' performance as Strong (1), Solid (2), Needing Attention (3), or Weak (4).  The comments under each metric refer to the data definition documentation on the shared drive.

## Section A. Academic Metrics

| | |
|---|---|
| Graduation Rate by Exit Major | 1 2 3 4 NA |
| Major GPA by Exit Major | 1 2 3 4 NA |
| Time to Degree | 1 2 3 4 NA |
|     Consider *Time to Undergraduate Degree* and *Time to Graduate Degree* | |
| Student Diversity | 1 2 3 4 NA |
|     Consider *Student Diversity: Race/Ethnicity, Gender, International,* and *First Gen* | |

## Section B. Contribution Metrics

| | |
|---|---|
| Contribution to the Core | 1 2 3 4 NA |
|     Consider *Courses Contributed to the Core* and *Sections Contributed to the Core* | |
| Faculty per Student Major | 1 2 3 4 NA |

## Section C. Market/Appeal Metrics

| | |
|---|---|
| Student Enrollment | 1 2 3 4 NA |
|     Consider *Student Enrollment* and *Graduate Student Enrollment* | |

Major Mobility                                                              1 2 3 4 NA
Degrees Awarded                                                            1 2 3 4 NA
    Consider *Majors Awarded* and *Minors Awarded*
Degrees Awarded Nationally                                                 1 2 3 4 NA
    Consider *Bachelor's Degrees Awarded Nationally* and *Master's Degrees Awarded Nationally*
Persistence by Entry Major                                                 1 2 3 4 NA

## Section D. Personnel Metrics
Student/Faculty Ratio by Major                                             1 2 3 4 NA
Faculty Rank Distribution                                                  1 2 3 4 NA
Credit Hour Production by Rank                                             1 2 3 4 NA
    Consider *Credit Hour Production by Instructors, Assistant, Associate,* and *Full*
Attempted Student Credit Hours Produced by Part-Time Faculty               1 2 3 4 NA
Faculty Diversity                                                         1 2 3 4 NA
    Consider *Full-Time* and *Part-Time Faculty Diversity: Race/Ethnicity, Gender,* and *International*

## Section E. Operational Efficiency Metrics
Class Size                                                                 1 2 3 4 NA
    Consider *Average Section Size, Seats Filled per Section overall and by level*
Course Capacity Utilization                                                1 2 3 4 NA
    Consider *Seat Utilization* and *Classroom Utilization*
Student Credit Hours                                                       1 2 3 4 NA
    Consider *Attempted Student Credit Hours Generated* and *Attempted Student Credit Hours Taught*
Cost per Credit Hour                                                       1 2 3 4 NA
    Consider *Cost per Credit Hour (EAB)* and *Cost per Credit Hour Taught*
Graduate Revenue                                                          1 2 3 4 NA
    Consider *Graduate Revenue Estimate*

*Please provide any context or explanations you would like the Academic Program Evaluation team to consider as they review your quantitative metrics.*

## Part II. Qualitative Data   (Limit: No more than 4 single-spaced pages, 12 pt. font)
For each metric below that you believe is relevant to your program, please rate your performance as Strong (1), Solid (2), Needing Attention (3), or Weak (4).  In the appendix, provide for the Academic Evaluation Team a description of the data and evidence that justifies your ranking. Please try to keep your descriptions as concise as possible – one paragraph per metric.  You may supplement your justification with quantitative data, if available.  We would like the quantitative and qualitative data to be somewhat comparable, so please focus your attention on the last three years; however you may include information from the last decade to provide context and a sense of trends over time. Submit these measures as an appendix to your Program Evaluation documentation (limit 4 pages, total).

## Section A. Academic Metrics
Academic Quality                                                       1 2 3 4 NA
    *Your rating should consider curricular structure and content, pedagogy, and program expectations of students and faculty.*
Achievement of Student Learning Goals                                  1 2 3 4 NA

*Your rating should consider the degree to which students are or are not meeting the intended student learning outcomes for your program. Evidence about achievement of student learning goals may be gathered from your Annual Assessment Reports.*

Student Outcomes                                                                    1 2 3 4 NA

*Your rating should consider short-term outcomes like employment after graduation and/or enrollment in subsequent degree programs and longer-term outcomes, such as career achievements and highlights. Evidence may be gathered from the Center for Career Service's at-graduation and one-year-out surveys.*

Faculty Scholarship and Grants                                                      1 2 3 4 NA

*Your rating should consider external grant applications and awards, the quality of scholarship, level of activity, the ways in which scholarship is disseminated, and how it informs University operations, pedagogy, the community, and the profession. Scholarship is construed here in the broadest possible sense and includes both disciplinary, pedagogical, and community-based research. Evidence may be gathered from Academic Program Reviews, Faculty Notes, the Faculty Bibliography, or faculty CVs.*

Faculty Service to the University and College                                       1 2 3 4 NA

*Your rating should consider committee work, appointments or elections to administrative positions, participation in campus-wide events and programs, cross-departmental collaboration, and support for interdisciplinary or other University-wide programs (e.g., honors). Evidence may be gathered from annual evaluations, Academic Program Review, or committee websites.*

Faculty Service to the Profession and Community                                     1 2 3 4 NA

*Your rating should consider recognitions, committee service, appointments, and elections related to professional or community organizations, participation in community events and programs, and cross-institutional collaboration. Evidence may be gathered from annual evaluations, Academic Program Review, or faculty CVs.*

## Section B. Contribution Metrics

Student Engagement                                                                 1 2 3 4 NA

*Your rating should consider the degree to which your students are engaged in campus life; possible examples of engagement include membership or leadership in campus organizations; roles as tour guides, ambassadors, guides, or peer mentors; and campus employment. Evidence may be gathered from Academic Program Reviews or from your students.*

High Impact Learning Opportunities and Outcomes                                     1 2 3 4 NA

*The AAC&U defines high impact educational practices here: https://www.aacu.org/leap/hips. Your rating should consider the opportunities your program provides students to engage in these practices, the extent to which your students participate in them, and the impacts these practices have on your students.*

Contribution to Mission                                                            1 2 3 4 NA

*The University's mission is posted here: https://jcu.edu/about-us/values-and-jesuit-tradition/mission-vision-and-core-values. Your rating should consider the opportunities your program provides students, faculty and staff to participate in the mission, the extent of participation, and the impacts these practices have on you're the University community and the larger world.*

Contribution to Core                                                              1 2 3 4 NA

Your rating should consider the many ways your program's faculty are involved with the core curriculum, including but not limited to what is reflected in the quantitative data section: service on the core committee, participation in faculty learning communities, participation in core assessment. You can also consider the relationships between the curriculum of your program(s) and the core curriculum.

## Section C. Market/Appeal Metrics

Future Career Demand                                                               1 2 3 4 NA

*Your rating should consider the extent to which your program prepares students for future careers and possible levels of market demand. Evidence may include information from the Census (example) or from the Bureau of Labor Statistics.*

Preparation for Associated fields/outcomes                                          1 2 3 4 NA

*Your rating should consider how your program prepares students for associated fields, such as law school, medical school, or other professional outcomes, if this is relevant to your program.*

## Section D. Personnel Metrics

Faculty Reputation                                                                 1 2 3 4 NA

*Your rating should consider how the reputation of faculty in your program contributes to the quality and/or attractiveness of the program. Markers of reputation may include regional, state, or national recognitions or professional service and/or citations or other references to faculty research and publications.*

## Section E. Operational Efficiency Metrics
Use of Allocated Resources                                      1 2 3 4 NA
*Your rating should consider how your program has significantly contributed to the operational efficiency and fiscal stability of the university, college, and/or department. Please provide clear and specific evidence.*

## Part III. Program Evaluation Rating
Considering the quantitative and qualitative information above, please rate your program's current overall status, strategic fit, and mission fit. (See rating descriptions on page 2.)

**Overall Status**     1. Strong        2. Solid          3. Needs Attention    4. Weak
**Strategic Fit**       A. Vision Specific      B. Vision Connected   C. Vision Supportive
**Mission Fit**        A. Mission Critical      B. Mission Central      C. Mission Related

## Part IV. Program Evaluation Narrative   (Limit: 5 double-spaced pages, 12 point font)
The quantitative and qualitative data are meant to help you clarify and craft the narrative that you believe your major/program has to share. Use the data that speaks most to you, knowing that no one type of data tells the whole story. Please be aware that program marketability and market appeal will be an important lens – one of many to be sure – to address in your narrative. Also, the Program Evaluation Team will be looking at the same data and coming to their own evaluation of your program.

In 5 pages or less, please help us understand the reasons why you rated the program as you did. Within your response, provide any context that you think helpful in understanding your program's strengths and challenges.
  i.   Please add insight into other dimensions that may impact your rating that are missing from the metrics provided. What have we missed?
 ii.   You may see that certain dimensions of your program are strong while other dimensions are less strong or even weak. Please give us insight on these different dimensions. How do these contribute to your overall rating of the program?
iii.   Not every dimension is under your control or influence. For instance, your program area may have low market appeal (currently) and thus you may rank it as weak. Help us see this dynamic as best you can.

**Major/Program – who needs to submit a report?**
We recognize that there is complexity in how we define majors and/or programs at John Carroll. In order to optimize the Academic Program Evaluation process and minimize the burden on Chairs/Program Directors:
  • We ask that each Academic Department submit **one** Program Evaluation Report for all of the undergraduate majors/programs overseen by the department:

- Departments should ensure that each major, program, or concentration is given adequate representation within the report, as they see best.
- Departments that feel that there is enough diversity and/or distinctiveness between their various major programs that they would not be well-served by combining all programs into one report may consult their dean's office for guidance.
- Departments that have both undergraduate and graduate programs should submit separate Program Evaluation Reports for each.  Should a department feel it is best served by combining these report they may consult their Dean's Office for guidance.
- Interdisciplinary Programs that result in a major degree should submit one Program Evaluation Report for their program.

***The questions below may be helpful to you in framing your program evaluation narrative:***
1. If you believe your program is strong (1):  How do you maintain this strong position? What are the threats to maintaining this strong position? What additional resources might assist in maintaining this strong position?
2. If you believe your program is solid but could be strengthened (2):  What do we need to make the program better and more appealing?
3. If you believe your program is in need of improving, whether in academic quality or in enrollment (3):   What might be done to increase the program's academic quality and appeal? What resources would be required or what barriers may exist?
4. If you believe your program is weak – in academic quality and/or enrollments (4):  How do we strengthen the program's academic quality? What will the impact of those plans be on enrollment? What are the critical resources necessary to assist in improving the program's academic quality? What may be inhibiting your program from increasing in academic quality or enrollment?
5. If you believe your program is weak and may be a candidate for sun-setting (4):  How might we strengthen the program's academic quality and appeal?  Can both aspects be worked on simultaneously?  What critical resources would be required or what barriers may exist to improve academically and/or financially?  How do we decide when a program has run its course?  Are there resources within the program than can be repurposed in new directions and/or contribute to other programs?

## Part V. Program Future Vision
In 1 page or less, please comment on ways in which we may build on current strengths within your program and/or identify new thematic areas or programs arising out of the inherent academic qualities that your program(s) possess.  This is a place for ideas or themes rather than a full new-program proposal.