

**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.

October 23, 2013
Minutes

Present: John Day, Lauren Bowen, J. Colleran, Sherri Crahen, Barbara D'Ambrosia, Kathleen Dean, Dwight Hahn, Jim Krukones, M. McCarthy, Karen Schuele, Brian Williams, David Wong.

J. Day convened the meeting at 9:10 a.m. He noted that the meeting's discussion would center on the draft Higher Learning Commission Self-Study Report, Criteria 1, 3 and 4. He thanked M. Berg for coming to the meeting and thanked both M. Berg and K. Dean for their leadership of the self-study.

The self-study report's primary purpose is to address how John Carroll meets the criteria at this point in time. The report also provides an overview of our campus context, notably recent financial challenges, significant changes in administration, and the academic planning process. Additionally, the self-study provides a required response to the areas of concern noted by HLC visiting team in 2004. Two major areas of concern were morale and communication, and assessment. Minor areas of concern were diversity, enrollment and marketing, and governance. While we have made progress in all areas, there has not been sufficient progress in some.

The Self-Study Report contains chapters relevant to each criterion. The focus at today's meeting will be on Criterion One (Mission), Criterion Three (Teaching & Learning: Quality & Resources), and Criterion Four (Teaching & learning: Evaluation & Improvement.) The report is written to answer the prompt given for each criterion.

Criterion 1 – Mission.

Prompt – The institution's mission is clear and articulated publicly; it guides the institution's operations.

K. Dean reported that there is good evidence to show our mission is clear and articulated in key institutional documents; e.g., in the Bulletins, on our web site, and in our Catholicity Statement.

K. Dean noted that within our academic planning, we can see that mission has guided the process; e.g., the new core curriculum, global learning, and the religious dimension of our programs. New programs, student support, diversity and vocation at orientation are all consistent with mission. As examples of how planning and budgeting connects with our mission, the UPG strategic initiatives came from our mission statement and the Capital Campaign's primary focus is on students.

In response to M. McCarthy question of whether the report would show what we have accomplished, K. Dean stated that the report will show accomplishments, such as the developments in academic advising. She also pointed out that the report will be clear that, while we have not accomplished all, there is evidence of progress. M. Berg noted that in 2004 we were lauded for attention to mission; this report will show that we have not sat pat.

K. Dean noted that the HLC visiting team will have access to evidence between the time we submit the self-study report and their visit in February, and that we are comprehensive in what we are providing (800+ pieces.)

K. Dean reported that the question of how we attend to diversity is addressed in several ways: 1. L. Bowen meeting with departments regarding diversity in faculty searches; 2. the establishment of the Diversity Task Force and Steering Committee; and 3. the development of the Center for Student Diversity and Inclusion.

M. Berg mentioned that an area of where we have the most meaningful work to do would be an increase in the diversity of our population, both student and FSA. As a way to understand success though, he noted that we have made strides in an increased attention to diversity through respect and understanding, laying a foundation to make the campus more welcoming and inclusive. K. Dean noted that writing the self-study report is a useful document for us to see where we are, and to see far have we have come and where we want/need to go.

K. Dean further reported that our Mission reflects a commitment to the public good through focus on justice and engagement in the community. An example would be our involvement with the Cleveland Metro School District.

Criterion 3 – Teaching & Learning: Quality & Resources.

Prompt: The institution provides high quality education, wherever and however its offerings are delivered.

M. Berg reported that evidence shows we have a rigorous curriculum that has currency. The self-study report discusses the current Core and the move to new Core Curriculum. Our learning goals are appropriate to collegiate level. While we still need more work on assessment, assessment is embedded in the new Core and there is expectation of assessment in departments. Regardless of whether we are teaching on campus, in programs abroad, through hybrid or on-line courses, the same rigor applies.

M. Berg reported that we have a relatively stable student to faculty ratio – 14/1 – with the majority of courses taught by full-time faculty. In response to a question by D. Hahn, J. Day stated that, according to IPEDS figures, we are on the low end in utilizing part-time faculty for instruction as compared to our peer group. In discussion, J. Day noted that it was the faculty's decision in recent budgetary savings to cut the number of part-time faculty. He also noted the full-time student numbers to full-time faculty numbers have been fairly consistent: the size of faculty has decreased, but so has the size of the full-time student population.

J. Colleran noted faculty concerns regarding the total size of faculty, and wondered if this would be commented on in the self-study report. D. Hahn brought up faculty's concern that the number of faculty is going down as the number of administrators goes up. In discussion, it was noted that the HLC is concerned if the institution has sufficient numbers – classroom and non-classroom. M. McCarthy stated that we need to be careful to not think of either/or – faculty or administrator. The question is do we have what we need to support students in such a way as to accomplish what we need to do. J. Colleran noted that there is a mixed understanding of what administrative structure currently is like in higher education. It is important to note that the broader climate has changed and that we can't be business as usual as it was in the 80's and 90's. Her concern is that there is a strong reaction to this issue and that the subject will come up, whether or not the issue belongs in the report.

K. Dean suggested that this issue fits in Criterion 5 which relates to resources going forward, and whether we are supporting our mission, both inside and outside the classroom, and using our resources wisely. M. Berg made note of this point as a recommendation for section 5.

Criterion 4 – Teaching and Learning: Evaluation & Improvement

Prompt: The institution demonstrates responsibility for the quality of its educational programs, learning environments, and support services, and it evaluates their effectiveness for student learning through processes designed to promote continuous improvement.

Our report will show we take responsibility for the quality of our curriculum. The creation of new programs has been intentional. We have specialized accreditation through AACSB, NCATE, CACREP, and the American Chemical Society.

The Center for Career Services has a 6 month survey that gives some understanding to our graduate outcomes, but it was noted that follow-up was not a coordinated effort. It was pointed out that this methodology is highly selective. Discussion ensued on how to get information on those students we don't know about. A suggestion was made for utilizing social media, but that is still self-reporting. It was noted that every institution is struggling with this issue. K. Dean suggested that, for us, we need to look at ways we can improve and do a better job to work together on gathering this information. J. Day noted that it is important to ask the question of whether we have the capacity to do what people are saying we should do, and if we are utilizing some antiquated process.

K. Dean noted that in the areas of assessment and evaluation improvements, the HLC team likely will find we are coming up short. We have made some progress, especially in our articulated learning goals, but there is a need for an institutional systematic process. We are moving in the right direction, as we now have strong pockets of assessment. We are being more attentive and thoughtful.

Criterion 5 – Resources, Planning and Institutional Effectiveness

Prompt: The institution's resources, structures, and processes are sufficient to fulfill its mission, improve the quality of its educational offerings, and respond to future challenges and opportunities. The institution plans for the future.

M. Berg gave a short report on criterion 5. We are financially stable with no deficits that are insurmountable. The net tuition is declining, but the discount rate is stable. The endowment is rising and we are in the midst of a capital campaign. Our campus footprint is a challenge but infrastructure improvements and maintenance continue with existing buildings and space. We are invested in systematic renovation. Even in difficult financial times there has been consistent investment in IT, showing an ongoing commitment.

J. Day noted that we are in the process of sharing this report with all campus groups. He suggested everyone read, participate in discussions, and provide feedback on the website

K. Dean reported that there will be upcoming open hearings for faculty, staff and administrators.

The meeting adjourned at 10:05.

Respectfully submitted,
Barbara Lovequist