

JOHN CARROLL UNIVERSITY
PROVOST'S COUNCIL

Jeanne Colleran, Sherri Crahen, Barbara D'Ambrosia, Roy Day, Kathleen Dean, Linda Koch,
Jim Krukones, Anne Kugler, Graciela Lacueva, Mark McCarthy, Michelle Millet, Terry Mills,
Martha Mondello Hendren, Maryclaire Moroney, Mike Nichols, Alissa Nutting, Ed Peck,
Karen Schuele, Brian Williams, David Wong.

February 27, 2015
Minutes

Present: S. Crahen, B. D'Ambrosia, L. Koch, J. Krukones, A. Kugler, G. Lacueva, M. McCarthy, T. Mills, M. Mondello Hendren, M. Moroney, M. Nichols, E. Peck, K. Schuele, B. Williams, D. Wong..

Minutes of the February 11, 2015, meeting were approved.

A. Kugler announced she would be chairing today's meeting in J. Colleran's absence.

E. Peck reported on the final draft of the University Learning Goals. He thanked the drafting task force for their work on the document. He noted the document was finalized using feedback from the last Provost's Council meeting, meeting with the BSOB faculty, and comments received from the University community. E. Peck reported receiving praise for the clear, succinct nature of the document, and the fact that it is reflective of who we are.

After receiving Father Niehoff's approval of the document, E. Peck noted the next step in the process would be to identify performance indicators, to measure the various ways in which the University is achieving its goals. This work would be centralized in the Institutional Effectiveness Office. It will also be necessary to see where to place the document in the Bulletins. The document will be posted on Provost's web page with links in other areas, and with the Office of institutional Effectiveness. E. Peck noted that this has been a very positive, collaborative experience.

A. Kugler moved the discussion to the work done to catalog efforts on support for student and student persistence. Handouts were distributed of an inventory of student support services, and of available data from those areas.

M. Moroney reported on work done to draft an inventory of resources for student support and persistence. Three groups worked on the areas of current resources, gathering data to identify aspects of current model of persistence (matriculation to graduation), and an environment scan, to see where there are gaps and opportunities. She noted a shifting from a retention model to a thriving model; not to look at why students leave, but what helps them stay.

There was discussion on the direction to go with this information and next steps. M. Moroney pointed out that the end point is to find where we are serving students well and where are the gaps. The goal is not to proliferate, but to consolidate and optimize.

There was a question of whether we should back out and do data collection first. B. Williams noted that it is not an ITS project, but an admission project; keeping track of student as a unit of analysis. It was pointed out that some of this falls out of the realm of trackable data and is confidential. B. Williams suggested using data we have rather than getting more data. We also

need to determine what our goal is in a thriving model. D. Wong noted we need to establish strategic goals for retention, persistence and completion in order to measure how successful we are.

M. Moroney noted that part of the thought behind compiling the list/inventory is to see whether we are collaborating, communicating and integrating our resources effectively. We need to look at which partnerships are most effective.

There was discussion on what can have a positive or negative affect on student success, with on-campus employment singled out as having a positive effect. D. Wong pointed out that the budget for on-campus employment for students is not fully utilized, and suggested this is an area to look into. There was also discussion on the first 6 weeks of class being a critical marker for freshmen student success, and that this is an important area to focus our effort.

There was discussion on the importance of advising, and cohort advising as a touch point, especially since FYS going away. It was noted that the second important touch point is the office of residence life. The importance of understanding check point opportunities was also pointed out - to be able to ask a student how s/he is doing; data informs strategy, but the interaction is important.

M. Moroney noted that we have no feedback mechanism at the moment – except who is not attending class. B. Williams suggested that rather than using an early alert system, we utilize a survey for freshmen students as a student check in point; ask students about their concerns, whether we are we living up to their expectations, if they are ok and what they need, and then funnel the information back to cohort advising.

There was discussion of the cohort advising model, with faculty noting it needs to be better structured. A suggestion was made for collaboration with staff to assist faculty. It was pointed out that it would be a huge missed check point opportunity if we were not using cohort advising.

G. Lacueva asked whether the use of part-time faculty plays a role in student success, as an increased number are teaching first-year classes. There was discussion of the issue of part-time faculty teaching first-year courses in light of the new core and the disbanding of FYS. It was suggested that the number of courses a student has with part-time faculty could be one of the measures.

A. Kugler reiterated the net outcome of today's discussion is a needed focus on cohort advising, the effect of a student's only contact being part-time faculty, and the need for coordination with residence life. M. Moroney felt the focus should be on faculty advising and how to better support faculty while acknowledging large loads. M. Moroney will reconvene the persistence/retention group.

L. Koch brought up the issue of the direct admit model, and asked where the University is on this. It was noted we were in the discovery stage.

A. Kugler noted the discussion of the Leave of Absence Policy would be taken up at the March 11th Provost's Council meeting. S. Crahen explained that the policy is currently in draft form and has been shared with the Care Team and general counsel, and their feedback incorporated. She asked the committee to provide feedback by March 10.

Respectfully submitted,
Barbara Lovequist