

**JOHN CARROLL UNIVERSITY**  
**UNIVERSITY COMMITTEE ON THE STUDENT LEARNING EXPERIENCE**

Mark McCarthy, Jim Krukones, Todd Bruce, Sherri Crahen, Carlo DeMarchi, Margaret Farrar,  
Sr. Katherine Feely, Rodney Hessinger, Devvin La Barge '19,  
Stephanie Levenson, Stacey Love, Brandi Mandzak, Al Miciak, Michelle Millet,  
Maryclaire Moroney, Patrick Mullane, Ed Peck, Karen Schuele, Amy Wainwright

October 3, 2018  
8:30 a.m.; CAS Conference Room

**NOTES**

Present: M. McCarthy, J. Krukones, T. Bruce, S. Crahen, C. DeMarchi, M. Farrar, K. Feely, R. Hessinger, S. Levenson, S. Love, B. Mandzak, A. Miciak, M. Moroney, P. Mullane, E. Peck, K. Schuele, A. Wainwright

The notes from the meeting of September 19 were approved.

The committee resumed discussion of the national student surveys that occupied the last part of the September 19 meeting. There was general agreement we should continue administering NSSE. M. Farrar suggested that we also need to conduct our own survey, pointing out that some departments already do their own surveys, e.g., exit interviews and alumni surveys. She thought that everything might be collapsed into a single survey. S. Crahen said that Student Affairs uses different surveys to gauge and plan for the student experience. P. Mullane added that the Career Services "At Graduation" survey included items related to our learning goals. A. Miciak warned against adopting a global approach to surveys, asking whether it would meet the needs of stakeholders for usable information. A. Wainwright said that the information gleaned from surveys has been very useful to the retention subcommittee. T. Bruce noted that deciding which surveys to use was a challenge everywhere. He said that JCU was, in general, doing a satisfactory job, for example, with respect to measuring learning outcomes of the Core. Some aspects of the student experience, however, are less tangible. A better instrument would gauge the affective aspects of that experience. M. Farrar suggested that surveys should be a guidance to departments, a mechanism helping to advance continuous improvement, not just a matter of checking a box. Responding to E. Peck, T. Bruce said that surveys could be related to the work of the Assessment Academy. P. Mullane expressed the concern that relying on our own survey would not provide comparative data, but M. Farrar said that departments do not see themselves in NSSE data anyway. In the end, T. Bruce suggested that he go back to the Assessment Academy group and come back with a draft of an internal survey as well as a suggestion as to which national survey we should continue to administer. M. McCarthy wondered whether we might benefit from a non-NSSE survey such as HERI, which speaks to student characteristics. R. Hessinger said that we need to be more deliberate about collecting data. T. Bruce noted that it would be helpful to incorporate First in the World data, too. E. Peck added that this project might be an opportunity for Maria O'Connor to take the lead and for everyone to learn more about the Assessment Academy.

The committee then turned to reporting on tactics for 2018-19 in the University Strategic Plan, specifically, those dealing with Experiential Education (Objective 4). The first item was the CAS Professional Development Program (PDP). P. Mullane noted that this program and a similar PDP in the Boler College are now competency-based. M. Farrar praised P. Mullane for bringing together department chairs and making the CAS program a success. A tactic for the strategic plan in 2019-20, she added, could be 100% participation by the academic departments. M.

McCarthy suggested that the program deserves major marketing, which was endorsed by M. Farrar. S. Love noted that the PDPs feed right into attempts to instill value from the outset. It might be worthwhile creating a video about them for parents and prospective students in which students discuss their experiences, such as networking and job shadowing. She also wondered whether coaches were aware of the PDPs. S. Crahen asked whether the PDP already required students to create a video, especially since videos had become a common interviewing component. M. McCarthy thought that such a requirement could be a good addition to the PDP experience.

The next tactic was a report on existing experiential learning (EL) opportunities across the University. P. Mullane said the report is in preparation. A particular need is the selection or development of tools to track EL. More investigation has to be done on this question; Canvas might prove to be a useful tool. K. Feely said that the issue of data integrity had to be resolved first; specifically, can Banner 9 and its successors get us to where we want to go? In response to M. McCarthy's question, she replied that additional costs might well be involved. M. McCarthy concluded that this tactic might need to be carried over to 2019-20.

The committee then turned to the tactic that called for determining which students are participating in experiential opportunities and for developing initiatives to improve inclusivity and access. P. Mullane said that some work had been done in this area but more was needed. We need to find out what department chairs want and what is available; the tracking tools are just evolving. M. Farrar said that we needed to secure the support of Advancement to help cover internship costs and that an institutional survey could help reveal what chairs are seeking.

As for other Experiential Education tactics, K. Feely said that we can move some forward in limited ways. In Global Education Melanie Hahn is working as best she can without the benefit of support staff. A director is needed; that initiative must be led by the Provost's Office. R. Hessinger asked whether it was worth approaching faculty to determine possible interest in running the office. M. Farrar said that faculty would be reluctant to do so without coverage of their specialty teaching areas. The program review outlined a way ahead, but we need the will to move there. Thus, for the time being, it seemed that only tactical improvements would be possible.

Finally, on the subject of the Magis Learning Commons, it has been reported that the President and M. Millet will be meeting regarding this project as part of a larger Library renovation. A. Miciak pointed out that two elements are involved here; one focuses on the Learning Commons, while the other deals with a complete renovation of the Library. He asked whether we might be able to accomplish something without having to embrace everything. It was noted that Student Accessibility Services was recently allotted some additional testing space on the Garden Level of the Administration Building. E. Peck asked whether an APR for that office could help to determine its space needs. Regarding the Office of Academic Advising, M. Moroney said that the report of the external reviewers was expected to arrive soon. Also, faculty are expected to vote on cohort advising by the end of the semester.

The next meeting (October 17) will focus on Experiential Learning.

The meeting ended at 10:00 a.m.

Notes recorded by J. Krukones

