Humanities and Natural Sciences Council of Chairs Meeting
Dean's Conference Room, Bobet 202J
May 5, 2014 - 3:30 p.m. – 5:00 p.m.

MINUTES

Call to Order
Dean Maria Calzada called the meeting to order at 3:30 p.m.

Attended: Blanca Anderson, John Biguenet, Mary Brazier, Maria Calzada, Frank Jordan, Michael Kelly, Kenneth Keulman, Lynn Koplitz, Martin McHugh, David Moore and Connie Mui,

Also attended: Laurie Leiva, Chris Wiseman, Karen Anklam

I.   Approval of Minutes
Minutes of April 7, 2014 were approved.

II.   Institutional Advancement/Alumni Relations
The following Office of Institutional Advancement staff attended the meeting to discuss development goals: Chris Wiseman, Associate VP for Development, Laurie Leiva, Director of Alumni Relations and Karen Anklam, Development Officer for the College of HNS.

Chris Wiseman reported that there are high goals for development, and that the development office staff is getting out and meeting with alumni and being more engaged. He said the research endowments are a priority for HNS, showed the Harold Baquet video, and reminded everyone that there will be a campaign launch luncheon in October. He also reported that the 2008-2009 gifts totaled $15,972,684, and the total from 2001-2013 was $24,491,847.

When asked who handles pre-med and is communicating with the medical community, Karen Anklam answered that she does along with the Marketing Department.   Karen stated that she is working on capital projects, which is mainly Monroe Hall. Sixteen million dollars is needed for that project.

Laurie Leiva gave a handout from Alumni Relations with information on how their department is communicating with alumni. The handout also provides information on how the chairs can promote their department and events through mass emails and mailings (Attachment #1).

III.   Program Review Revisions Based on SCAP Requirements
Dean Calzada handed out the schedule for in-depth program reviews, along with the HNS policy and procedures revisions according to SCAP requirements (Attachment #2). Dean Calzada said it could cause confusion and lower scores if the reviews are not prepared using the SCAP criteria. There was a motion to approve the revised document, a move to approve, and all approved the document.

IV.   Honors Convocation and Commencement
Dean Calzada reminded the chairs of the HNS honors convocation on Friday, May 9th at 11:00 a.m., and commencement on Saturday. Chairs will give out department awards and retiring faculty and staff will be honored.

V.   Open Purchase Orders

Finance is doing away with open purchase orders that carry over into the next fiscal year. This may be tedious for the sciences, but plan to spend your money before the fiscal year ends. If you receive goods or services on/before July 31, 2014, your account will be charged in fiscal year 14. If you receive goods or services on/after August 1, 2014, your account will be charged in fiscal year 2015. If you have any extra funds at the end of the year, please purchase computers or return it to the dean's office.

Also, service contracts that start in January and end in December must be renegotiated to end July 31st.

VI.   Update on Recruitment, Budgeting and Planning
Dean Calzada reported that there are no new updates at this time.

There was a brief discussion on addressing ill prepared students and, also, English as a second language. Some chairs expressed that students cannot even understand questions on tests, and also commented on student technical writing skills. It was suggested that there needs to be a university-wide response to the problem.

VII.   College Restructuring
There was a discussion about the concern of the college restructuring process, and when faculty would get to see what is proposed. Some chairs expressed concern about needing a better sense of when their feedback will be solicited. Other concerns about what will be best for the College of HNS were discussed, and whether there should be some sort of recommendation on what is best for the college in the form of a motion from the Council of Chairs.

Dean Calzada said that the Senate Ad Hoc Committee is getting feedback on the restructuring. The recommendation will be brought to the Board of Trustees in October, and the final recommendation will go to the Provost in September.

VIII.   Other Matters
- Staff performance evaluations are due to Human Resources by May 30th. Please send a copy to the dean's office.
- Course evaluations will be online next year. Suggestions by the chairs included that it may be a good time to work on new questions, that labs may need to be evaluated differently, and if students want to view their grades on Blackboard, they would have to do the evaluations.

Move to Adjourn
The meeting was adjourned at 5:00 p.m.

ATTACHMENTS:

Attachment #1: Alumni Communications

Alumni Communications

- *Pack Press* Monthly E-Newsletter sent to ALL Alumni
- LOYNO Magazine
- Email for events
  - ○ 4-6 Weeks Notice
  - ○ Promote via Social Media
  - ○ Assistance with Event Logistics—give-a-ways, nametags, sign-in sheet, gift with registration
- Email through MyEmma
  - ○ 2-3 weeks notice
  - ○ Complete online request to schedule: http://www.loyno.edu/advancement/request/webteam/
- Mailings
  - ○ Include a solicitation and the Office of Annual Giving will provide technical support and funding for the mailing
  - ○ Must go out in February/March
  - ○ Must notify us in August if you are planning to do this

Upcoming Projects

- Senior Crawfish Boil on May 9th; 11:30 a.m. to 2 p.m.
- Alumni Weekend June 20-22nd
- Online contact info updates

ALUMNI ASSOCIATION

EVENTS | CHAPTERS – GROUPS | UPDATE YOUR INFORMATION | VOLUNTEER | DONATE | ABOUT THE ASSOCIATION

Privacy Policy

Loyola University New Orleans collects and retains information and data about its students, employees, alumni, and friends in support of the teaching, learning, research and service mission of the university. The university is committed to protecting and maintaining the privacy of this information. Access to University information is restricted to faculty, administrators, and staff who need that information in order to perform the duties of their position. Employees with access to this information may use it only for the purposes of fulfilling the duties and responsibilities of their positions and in accordance with applicable privacy laws.

Login
Update Your Information
My Email Preferences
Privacy Policy

Attachment #2: In-Depth Program Reviews

SCHEDULE FOR IN-DEPTH PROGRAM REVIEWS[1]

AY	DEPARTMENT	Final Reports are due in May

2013-2014 Psychology (this review has been postponed until 2015-2016 because of the Monroe Hall renovation)

2014-2015 Chemistry, History, American Studies minor, Math, Math Lab, Computational Science minor, Middle East Peace Studies minor (all internal reviews)

2015-2016 Psychology, English, African and African-American Studies, Religious Studies, Walker Percy Center, Film Studies minor, Catholic Studies minor (all internal reviews except Psychology whose external review was postponed in 2013-2014 because of the Monroe Hall renovation)

2016-2017 WAC, Philosophy, L&C, Language Lab, Film Buffs, Asian Studies minor (all internal reviews)

2017-2018 Biology, Physics, Medieval Studies minor, Program in the Environment (all internal reviews)

2018-2019 Center for Latin American and Caribbean Studies, Latin American Studies, Women's Studies, Legal Studies minor (all internal reviews)

2019-2020 Chemistry, History, Math, Math Lab, Computational Science minor, Middle East Peace Studies minor (the minors will have internal reviews)

2020-2021 English, Religious Studies, Psychology (Psychology's review will be internal)

2021-2022 WAC, Philosophy, L&C, Language Lab, Film Buffs, Asian Studies minor (minors and Film Buffs will have internal reviews)

2022-2023 Biology, Physics, Medieval Studies minor, Program in the Environment (the minors will have internal reviews)

There will be internal department reviews five years after an external review, to evaluate the progress in responding to the external review. Programs with only a minor will not normally have external reviews.

---

[1] All are external reviews unless otherwise noted.

HNS POLICY AND PROCEDURES FOR PROGRAM REVIEW
  November 2008 (revised according to SCAP requirements in May of 2014)

The primary purpose of the Program Review process is to provide a comprehensive assessment of the current status of a program based on its activities and achievements since its last program review. Reviews of programs provide an opportunity to identify strengths and weaknesses in the provision of quality services; support of the educational (learning) outcomes of the university; contributions in accomplishing the Jesuit mission of the university; and special features or services provided by the unit.

Program reviews should allow the unit to plan to build on existing strengths, maximize opportunities for growth, and solve current problems. The reviews should lead to more effective planning which should be linked to the budgeting process.

Support program reviews allow the unit to thoroughly and candidly evaluate:

- the mission and goals of the program and its relation to those of the college and university.

- support of the educational objectives, curriculum, and student learning outcomes of college.

- resources (e.g., library, physical facilities, and technology in support of teaching and research).

- readiness for accreditation, if appropriate.

The guiding principles for program reviews include:

- Program review should provide a candid assessment of program strengths and weaknesses and should result in program improvement. To this end, the self-study report should move beyond a program description toward a systematic program evaluation.

- The process should be broadly participatory involving faculty, students, staff administrators, alumni, and other relevant stakeholders.

- The program review should provide a framework for excellence; an opportunity to explore, enhance, and integrate student learning and faculty teaching, service, and scholarly/creative efforts into the mission and goals of the program.

- The process should facilitate short-term and long-term strategic planning in areas such as curricular development, resource allocation (e.g., financial, physical), as well as faculty/staff hiring and workload.

- The program review process allows the college to account for its use of university resources and develop support among its various constituencies.

Results of program reviews along with other assessment results will be utilized by the HNS College Planning Team in the development of Five-Year Plans and financial planning for the College.

Program Review Procedures And Self-Study Document

The academic program reviews consist of four phases including the preparatory phase, the development of the self-evaluation and development of revised action plans based on reviewers' recommendations.

Phase I.   Preparatory Phase
Phase II.   Self-Study Report: Development and Preparation

Phase III   The Site-Visit and Site Visit Report (not required; recommended)
Phase IV.   Program Report

Phase I. Preparatory Phase

A. **Notification**
In May of the academic year prior to the review year, the dean will notify, the chair/director/coordinator of the program to be reviewed that a review has been scheduled.

B. **Self-Evaluation Committee**
The program to be reviewed, according to its own protocols, will select a self-study committee of the whole. The self-study committee will be responsible for organizing and conducting the review process and for preparing the self-evaluation report.

C. **Meet with Dean**
Once a committee is appointed, the chair/director/coordinator and self-evaluation committee will meet with the dean to discuss any requests for specific information/issues that the dean would like included in the self-study.

D. **Library Contact**
For academic program reviews the library should be contacted at least three months prior to the development of the self-study to provide sufficient time to generate data about the program's library resources.

E. **Nomination of Site Visitors**
Whether or not there is a site visit depends on departmental needs, recommendations from the dean, and available funding. It is recommended that an external site visit occur once every ten years. The chairperson of the program to be reviewed, in consultation with the self-evaluation committee and the departmental/program faculty, should submit a list of names and qualifications of potential external academic reviewers with relevant expertise. The dean, in consultation with the department or program, will select the external academic reviewers from the list of names provided. Each department is expected to follow the external review with an internal review after five years.

Phase II. Self-Study Report: Development and Preparation

A. **Document Preparation**
The Self-Evaluation Report is an interpretive document that uses data to assess current program status and future directions (see Appendix for a detailed description of the Self- Study Document). Data should be analyzed and discussed in relation to the program's mission and goals. Although the report is compiled and written by the self-study committee, the chair/director/coordinator of the program is responsible for the content, accuracy, and completeness of the work and should actively oversee the report preparation.

B. **Document Distribution**
The Self-Evaluation Report, together with an executive summary, should be forwarded to the dean, who will review it for content, completeness, and accuracy. When necessary, suggested changes/improvements will be returned to the self-study committee for revision. The document will only be distributed to the provost after the dean and the program agree that the document is satisfactory.

Phase III: The Site Visit and Site Visit Report

A. **Academic External Reviewer's Site Visit**

Site visits will be conducted during the spring term of the review year. During a one to two day site visit, normally in April, the external academic reviewers will analyze the program review document, collect additional relevant information, meet with appropriate faculty, administrators, students, and alumni and prepare a report identifying program strengths, concerns and recommendations.

B. Site Visit Report
Once site visits are complete, site visitors will be asked to submit a Site Visit Report within three weeks of their visit. This report is sent to the dean.

Phase IV. Unit's Response Report and Wrap-Up Session

A. Unit's Response Report to the Site Visit Report
Once the dean and the program have agreed that the document is satisfactory, it will be shared with the all units affected by that support unit and the Office of the Provost. The program director should review and discuss the report with the faculty and/or staff associated with the program and solicit responses from the directors of those areas affected by the program.

Appendix: The Self-Study Document[2]

The following outline is suggested for the self-study document. The narrative should be written easily within twenty pages. (This does not include the director's explanation of workload distribution and appendices.) Selected college/university data summaries are provided and other key college/university documents (e.g., mission statement, strategic plan) are available from the A&S website. The document report should be organized around the following headings:

I. Brief History of the Program

Provide a brief overview of the history of the program including such things as changes in administrative organization; dates new programs were established; significant additions to the staff and major changes in program directions.

II. Findings and Recommendations of the Previous Program Review

Specify the date and type of previous program review. Briefly outline the major findings and recommendations of the previous review and the unit's, colleges, and/or university's responses to them including actions taken as a result of the recommendations. Briefly outline the impact of changes made as a result of the previous review.

III. Description of the Program

Please organize the report utilizing the headings below. The text within each heading can be modified to better meet unit needs/dimensions.

1. Mission

Describe the mission of the program and how it responds directly or indirectly to the mission of the college and the university.

---

[2] Revised 5/5/2014 to align with requirements of SCAP

2. Alignment with the College and University Strategic Plan

  a. Describe the goals of the program and the role of faculty and staff in setting these goals.

  b. Describe the process for assessing the extent to which goals are met.[3]

  c. Describe ways in which program goals align with the College and University's strategic plan. Evaluate the contribution of the program in advancing the state of the college's or the university's overarching objectives and strategies.

3. Demand for Department/Program

Describe demand for the program including the following data:
  a. Recruitment/admissions information;
  b. Actual enrollment statistics including numbers of majors and minors and full time equivalent (FTE) student enrollment in all course offered;
  c. Trend data for degrees awarded over last five years;
  d. Qualitative data based on internal information or comparisons with peer programs.

4. Relationship to Other Existing Programs

  a. Describe service to majors, minors, other programs and/or the common curriculum;
  b. Describe ways in which program enhances/complements existing programs and curricula;
  c. Describe ways in which program overlaps and collaborates with other existing programs.

5. Adequacy and Appropriateness of Resource Utilization

Evaluate the availability of resources to meet the program's priorities and build strengths.

  a. Current faculty resources, including those available through consortial agreements;
  b. Library (information resources and staffing);
  c. Information Technology
  d. Other academic support services
  e. Administrative support staff resources
  f. Space requirements and classroom technology
  g. External grants received;
  h. Contributions and impact on fundraising;
  i. Annual operating budgets since the last review (provide analysis);
  j. Accreditation expenses.

6. Assessment

  a. Provide the program's assessment plan that includes student learning objectives, processes, implementation, and projected results;
  b. Provide assessment results addressing student satisfaction, such as senior exit interviews, FYE surveys or other satisfaction inventories;
  c. Provide the results of external reviews;
  d. Describe the structure and process of administrative and academic oversight;

---

[3] See SCAP citeria for Assessment below

    e.   Describe impact on accreditation or certification;
    f.   Discuss ways that the assessment data have been used to enhance the program.

7. **Future Plans**

    a.   Based on the results of the self-study, discuss the program's strategic plans within existing resources?
    b.   Should limited additional resources become available, specify programmatic initiatives the program would like to pursue. Discussion should outline plans in growth areas and resource allocation/reallocation for the next 5 years.