

JOHN CARROLL UNIVERSITY
PROVOST'S COUNCIL

John Day, Kathleen Dean, Lauren Bowen, Jeanne Colleran, Sherri Crahen, Barbara D'Ambrosia,
Dwight Hahn, Jim Krukones, Mark McCarthy, Sheila McGinn, Paul V. Murphy, Karen Schuele,
Brian Williams, David Wong, Sheri Young.

November 29, 2012
Minutes

Present: J. Day, K. Schuele, D. Kean, D. Wong, E. Patterson, B. D'Ambrosia, P. Murphy,
J. Krukones, M. McCarthy, M. Moroney, L. Bowen, J. Colleran, S. Young.

The meeting was called to order at 9:00 a.m.

The Minutes of the Wednesday, November 7 meeting were approved.

J. Day noted that the Committee would return to the discussion of direct admit, expanding the conversation on the subject. He said that there were pockets of discussion on Direct Admit in other areas, including Vice Presidents' meetings, where there was interest shown in pursuing the issue. B. Williams noted that, if we were to do something systematic in this area, we would need to focus on the next enrollment cycle, i.e., students entering in fall 2014.

B. Williams spoke from the perspective of the admission process, and the idea of students applying directly to the areas or divisions they are interested in. This would mean marketing to, and tracking, students in a different way. It was noted that there are things we could do to move in the direction of direct admit regarding student identification and advising issues.

M. Moroney spoke on cohort advising and clustering of courses in divisional areas. It was noted that this was a way to move students into place. There was discussion of the perception of the Core as a time for self-reflection and exploration. M. Moroney noted that cohort advising was not meant to force students onto a path, but rather to encourage conversation and discernment. There was discussion regarding the difficulty students run into when changing majors. It was noted that Cohort advising would help in this area as a guided support system. It would make available in a more systematic and programmatic way what is already available here, and increase participation in what we recognize as a good thing. It was noted that cohort advising was something John Carroll can do well, and goes to the heart of our mission.

It was pointed out that direct admit will not necessarily change what courses students take in their freshman and sophomore years. It was noted that the key was advising, so that it would be important to get all advisors on board. Rather than advising students to spend the first two years exploring, advisors need to get students engaged in the disciplinary area they are interested in. The Core could be talked about less as a time for discovering, and more as a tool for enriching learning in that it can be individualized. We need to meet students where they are and think about differential advising. This is where direct admit can help students take a deliberate look at classes.

It was pointed out that "direct admit" may have different meanings depending on one's point of view. It was suggested that different wording be used that encapsulates the direct admit idea, e.g., "Direct Advising", "Focused Admit", or "Direct Pathway."

J. Day noted that, while the issue of direct admit was not settled, the conversation had advanced to the point where it can include others. He suggested inviting Dwight Hahn and the Faculty Council Committee on Enrollment to the next meeting.

It was suggested that, with the possible change in the Core, this would be a good time to talk to our colleagues about the issue of direct admit. This could help inform discussions about the curriculum as well as advising. A request was made for a conceptual framework - diagram or schematics - to help talk to others about the subject.

The conversation moved to retention issues, and the part that is active right now – fall into spring retention.

B. Williams distributed a handout detailing the fall 12 into spring 13 student retention. He explained the efforts involved in working with students who are not registered due to a financial hold.

M. Moroney spoke on the advising needs of transfer students as they relate to retention. She noted the deans were proactive in reaching out to students. She also explained the work of the deans in reaching out to freshman who are struggling, and the role played by Bernie McAniff, S.J. She is planning a student support services workshop as a large-scale collaborative retention effort.

M. Moroney reported that D. Campbell and T. Short are working on freshman retention data. B. Williams met with them to refine predictive factors beyond showing high school gpa and gender as predictors of success. The information would be used in defining students at risk and assisting in the assignment of advisors. Suggestions were made to consider athletics, faith, and the residential experience as additional predictive factors.

There was discussion about this semester's "Early Alert" process. In light of fewer responses from faculty to the early alert memo, perhaps we should be doing something differently, for example the language of the memo could more clearly explain that information can be submitted into the 5th week. It was noted that a non-response from a faculty member does not necessarily mean there are no student problems. The process cannot be open-ended; 100% participation is needed. A suggestion was made to add tracking of student attendance as part of the early alert system.

The next piece would be to invite faculty to be a more integral part of the student retention process. Faculty need to know the impact of the process, not just the data. Currently faculty can see only that a student has a hold – not that it is financial. B. Williams will check into this.

J. Day noted that the committee will meet again on December 12 at 9:00 am. The conversation will return to the issue of "focused admit." He will invite the Faculty Council Committee on Enrollment and also reach out to the APTF group on advising.

J. Day adjourned the meeting at 10:40 a.m.

Respectfully submitted,
Barbara Lovequist