

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.

November 6, 2013
Minutes

Present: John Day, Lauren Bowen, J. Colleran, Sherri Crahen, Barbara D'Ambrosia, Kathleen Dean, Dwight Hahn, Jim Krukones, A. Kugler, S. McGinn, Paul Murphy, Karen Schuele, Brian Williams, David Wong.

J. Day convened the meeting at 9:10 a.m.

The Minutes of the October 26, 2013 meeting were approved.

John Day welcomed the visitors, and asked that all introduce themselves. Visitors to the meeting were Eddie Carreon, Student Life; Martha Mondello-Hendren, Enrollment; Claudia Wenzel, Financial Aid; and Maryclaire Moroney, Academic Advising. J. Day noted that it was timely to hear about the first agenda topic -- the CARE Team -- since we have discussed related issues of efforts around retention and student success.

L. Bowen and S. Crahen then reported on the CARE Team. Its members represent the divisions of Academic Affairs, Enrollment, Mission and Identity, and Student Affairs. Conversations began last spring on ways to improve outreach to students identified as being in some distress, whether academic, financial or social. An updated list of students is distributed before each meeting. Discussions at recent weekly meetings have centered on the best way to intervene with students who have four or more deficiencies (C- or lower among their midterm grades.) The team identifies the best person to follow up with a student. An updated list of students is distributed before each meeting. The team will meet weekly for the foreseeable future.

Students are identified by means of mid-term grades and the early alert system. Discussion ensued on whether a better mechanism was needed since there wasn't 100% participation in mid-term grades and the early alert, and since midterm grades are required only for freshman students. There was also a question as to how the faculty advisor would get involved.

L. Bowen noted that this brought up larger questions of how public the team should be and also issues of privacy. S. Crahen thought it appropriate to alert someone about their concern for a student, with no need to report every detail.

M. Moroney said that faculty should know that any office they call will be able to direct them to the right person/place to assist the student. The various offices are partnering with each other and will talk to each other to make sure the student gets the necessary help. The CARE Team can be thought of as a clearing house for student resources. E. Carreon noted that the idea behind the CARE Team was to create a network of support for students so that we can make sure they don't fall through the cracks, and intervene early enough so that they don't struggle for four semesters.

L. Bowen suggested eventually creating a CAREteam@jcu.edu email to contact the team more easily. S. McGinn asked that part-time faculty also be requested to inform their department chair of any student issues. After discussion it was decided that the Provost's Office would send a preliminary email to faculty, staff and administrators with a short list of contacts for student concerns. A subsequent email will be sent with more specific information regarding the CARE Team.

S. Crahen mentioned that Cornell University has an impressive handbook for faculty dealing with student issues that can be adapted for other institutions. Revising it for use at John Carroll could become a goal of the CARE Team.

J. Day thanked the visitors for coming, and moved to the topic of the Communication Survey.

K. Dean reported on the Communication Survey developed and administered last spring, along with its relation to the HLC Criterion 5. Since the 2004 Self-Study cited morale and communication as areas of concern, the HLC Self-Study team developed a survey about modes of communication put in place since the arrival of Fr. Niehoff.

According to the results of the survey, one-half of the respondents indicated that the communication mechanisms at JCU adequately satisfied their needs, with InsideJCU singled out as very informative. Administrators and staff indicated a need for more horizontal communication (that is, across divisions), while faculty indicated a need for more vertical communication (between higher administration and the other personnel of the University).

Less than one-half of the respondents felt adequately represented in decision making. K. Dean wondered if this was an accurate representation, or if it was a matter of people not knowing who their representatives were on various committees. Discussion ensued on a variety of issues, including the importance of involvement, University citizenship, and professional vs. contractual obligations. A. Kugler wondered if communication was the issue or if there was another issue for which communication is a partial proxy.

K. Dean noted that while these matters are useful for in-house discussion, the HLC is more interested in the bigger picture, that is, how we think about them and develop improved means of communication.

B. Williams asked whether the report would identify recommendations. K. Dean replied that she and Matt Berg will be writing recommendations after the last HLC community meeting. The recommendations need to flow from the argument, while reflecting discussions with the community and the gathered evidence. After all, the HLC Self-Study is intended for our benefit, showing how we see ourselves, where we would like to go, and where we should devote our energy. The final draft needs to be delivered to the Board by end of next week.

The meeting adjourned at 10:55.

Respectfully submitted,
Barbara Lovequist