

**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 7, 2012  
Minutes

Present: J. Day, K. Schuele, D. Hahn, D. Kean, D. Wong, E. Patterson, B. D'Ambrosia, P. Murphy, S. Crahen, J. Krukones, K. O'Dell, M. McCarthy, L. Bowen, S. McGinn, J. Colleran

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

J. Day reported on the Council of Independent Colleges Chief Academic Officers meeting that he attended along with M. McCarthy, L. Bowen and J. Krukones. He noted that John Carroll is a member of the CIC and that he is on their Board. The focus of this year's CIC CAO meeting was core responsibilities in a changing environment, and other academic officers were invited to attend. John Day and Mark McCarthy gave a panel presentation on interfaith issues. J. Krukones noted that the concurrent sessions he attended were useful and intersected directly with his current work on faculty workload, compensation and retirement issues. L. Bowen attended sessions focused on student learning, noting that what she took away from the conference is that, while John Carroll has much to celebrate, we can be more intentional in developing retention plans beyond the first and second years. She also noted the good work currently being done by M. Moroney with regard to advising, and our need to strengthen what we do based on best practices of other schools. J. Day noted that this was a valuable conference also touching on issues of leadership, the rising cost of education, and accreditation issues, and that the CIC is very good at posting material from its conferences on-line.

John Day then noted that it would be useful to continue the conversation regarding orientation and related issues and identify follow-up procedures. J. Day asked K. O'Dell if, after the previous conversations, there was anything regarding those issues that stood out as needing to be changed, or kept as they are.

K. O'Dell noted that we need to determine what outcomes we want from the 1<sup>st</sup> year experience, what message should come from Admissions, and the need for a consistent communication plan. He suggested the compilation of a list of desired outcomes and where each should be addressed – e.g. pre-admission materials, website. It was felt that there is a missing link between June and the fall experience.

It was suggested that outcomes and measures could include FYS, AR 101, CO 101, and EN 101, as common classes taken by many students. For students in the sciences, the only common class would be FYS. It was suggested that, instead of measuring student experience through common courses as “touch points”, we need a more formalized advising process with regimented expectations, which would require students to meet with their advisor.

It was suggested that the Residence Life experience could also be used as another touch point for student connection, while also including students who don't live on campus.

It was noted that, while there may be different entryways and pathways for orienting students, we need to be aware of overlaps. The goal is to combine channels in the most effective way possible. Current retention rates are good but can be improved. We shouldn't limit discussion to the first year, but look at what is delivered into sophomore year as well.

The importance of all students meeting with advisors was emphasized. J. Day noted that students currently have one advisor in summer and possibly a different advisor in fall. If this advising structure is to continue, might this be a place to focus?

K. Schuele noted that, if students were on track in their freshman year, they would be in a better place in their junior and senior years with regard to internships, and would be able to communicate with the outside business world in a more professional way. She noted that data pulled together by B. Williams show that most students come to John Carroll pretty sure of their major, and that we should use that information to get students to where they need to be.

J. Colleran noted agreement at recent chairs' meetings on the need for earlier support for students on a direct, individual level. Students need to use the Core wisely for their personal developmental goals and career goals. The resources are available for their needs, but currently the information is not relayed well.

The discussion then focused on the topic of "direct admit." It was noted that many other universities use direct admit successfully, and John Carroll may be losing students by not doing so. It was pointed out that this was a critical decision to make – even before working groups dive in, since this could change up-front messaging. There was further discussion on how to handle undecided students.

It was noted that direct admit would need to be part of a larger faculty discussion. It was pointed out that the Core curriculum would remain the heart of the John Carroll University education. This would not be a curricular change; but instead a structural change to provide more advising and mentoring support to students who come to John Carroll University with specific academic goals.

J. Day adjourned the meeting at 10:30 a.m., noting that we need to strategize on how to get to the next steps.

Respectfully submitted,  
Barbara Lovequist