

JOHN CARROLL UNIVERSITY
PROVOST'S COUNCIL

Jeanne Colleran, Medora Barnes, Sherri Crahen, Barbara D'Ambrosia, Margret Farrar,
Jim Krukones, Mark McCarthy, Al Miciak, Michelle Millet, Terry Mills,
Martha Mondello Hendren, Maryclare Moroney, Ed Peck, Mindy Peden, Nick Santilli,
Elizabeth Stiles, Brian Williams, David Wong.

October 14, 2015
8:00 a.m.; CAS Dean's Conference Room
Minutes

Present: T. Peck, M. Barnes, G. Compton-Engle, S. Crahen, M. Farrar, J. Krukones, M. Mondello-Hendren, M. McCarthy, A. Miciak, M. Millet, T. Mills, M. Moroney, M. Peden, N. Santilli, B. Williams, D. Wong; guests: K. Feely, E. Hahnenberg, K. O'Dell, C. Sherman

The minutes of the meeting of September 30, 2014, were approved.

Acting as co-chairs in J. Colleran's stead, E. Peck and M. McCarthy explained that the meeting would focus on the use of reflection as a tool with which to examine the student experience as well as to help bridge the academic affairs and student affairs divisions. They pointed out that reflection is not the same as prayer and that there are different kinds of reflection occurring across campus in and outside the classroom. He also took note of the three stages of Ignatian pedagogy—experience, leading to reflection, and then on to action—which figures in the University learning goals. E. Peck referenced J. Colleran's question to the Provost Council at the beginning of the year: "How will we enshrine the Ignatian ideal of reflection that precedes action?" M. McCarthy and others noted that we need to link this project to the strategic plan; service-learning, for example, has long had an obvious connection to reflection.

E. Peck then introduced several special guests: Ed Hahnenberg and Catherine Sherman, who have been working on a NetVUE grant to explore how we can develop our capacity for reflection; Kyle O'Dell, who has been involved with reflection in the leadership program; and Katherine Feely, who has been engaged in conversations with E. Peck about deepening the reflection component in service-learning in conjunction with efforts in Campus Ministry, especially with regard to immersion trips.

E. Hahnenberg spoke about joining the Vocation Coordinating Committee and then deciding to apply for a grant to support a learning community. The LC was made up of twenty people who met eight times and read texts from the Ignatian tradition. Eventually it broke up into eight smaller working groups based on interests, each one focused on developing a special project. (The LC and the working-group projects are described in a handout distributed at the meeting.) C. Sherman and her group, for example, did an audit of reflection activities already taking place on campus. They discovered approximately 60 such activities and prepared a survey that includes a narrative, "map," and spreadsheet. The survey could serve as a guide for students trying to decide how they might participate in reflection, as well as a way to leverage reflection and to build bridges across campus. E. Hahnenberg noted that the survey helpfully viewed

reflection from the student's perspective. C. Sherman pointed out that the survey is not a final document and mentioned the possibility of creating a web presence that could be periodically updated. E. Peck said that many things are happening in isolation; we need to synergize them and broaden the effort. K. Feely then spoke about the three distinct focus groups that the Center for Service and Social Action organized last year. The office is also piloting three different models of reflection—affectionate, cognitive, and behavioral—each serving as a basis for the next, and all of them moving toward action. In addition, supported by a Mandel grant, CSSA designed an “immersion” tour of Cleveland, which included meetings with politicians and an overview of the commercial development of the region. The tour was intended to familiarize students with the general context in which they would be performing service. K. Feely noted that reflections offered by the students on the return trip immediately following the tour were extraordinary. E. Peck noted the practice of reflection before, during, and after immersion trips.

M. Peden and M. Barnes applauded all of these efforts while suggesting that they also needed to be more explicitly tied to classroom work. G. Compton-Engle urged that a connection be made with study-abroad experiences, too. N. Santilli observed that making connections with the broader community was a normal step in psychosocial development of young people as they moved through “emerging adulthood.” K. Feely noted that it was classroom learning that enabled students to “connect the dots” with their experiences in the community. Students had expressed interest in a “now what?” workshop to build on those experiences.

K. O’Dell described the reflection activities that take place during new student orientation. One of them is a vocation development exercise, the results of which become a part of each student’s advising folder; the other is a “one campus” exercise that familiarizes students with JCU’s expectations of them and involves small-group discussions focusing on relationships. He also explained the reflection activities in the leadership program. Leadership development is open to all students and occurs at four levels: 1) self-awareness; 2) group dynamics; 3) leveraging leadership opportunities; and 4) ethical decision-making. In the Leadership Scholars program, about 20 students per year examine different kinds of leadership and interview leaders in different fields.

E. Peck called attention to the range of projects undertaken by the small groups within the learning community. He also took note of the detailed statistics maintained by CSSA, which show (among other things) that more than 2,000 of our students are engaged in service of some kind. K. Feely added that it is interesting to observe how students manifest the desire to learn who they are, or who they’re becoming. K. O’Dell said that at times students need explicit direction in making connections. M. McCarthy wondered where the institutional structures are that might assist students in this process. This led to a brief discussion of the possible role to be played by the Center for Career Services and the significance of student internships more generally. A. Miciak suggested that, instead of focusing exclusively on a top-down approach, students be expected to shoulder some of the responsibility, perhaps by creating an e-portfolio and pulling things together by that means. C. Sherman said that that is not always an intuitive process for students. In a similar vein, M. McCarthy said that students don’t always articulate their experiences well. M. Farrar wondered what the status of e-portfolios was at the University. M. Millet recalled that the Arrupe Scholars Program had used an e-portfolio based on Blackboard; when, however, Blackboard was retired, the University did not have another mechanism for it. Jim Burke is now trying to coordinate a campus group with an interest or

experience in e-portfolio software. M. Hendren suggested that it might be worth contacting our alumni to find out more about their experiences in reflection. M. McCarthy replied that we are doing just that and that the project is a big one.

E. Peck thanked everyone for the energetic discussion. Returning to the goal set forth at the beginning of the meeting, he proposed the formation of a core group from the PC. The group would work on cataloging current reflection activities at JCU; developing a rubric to use with our data; creating a paradigm for reflection; and linking reflection to the University learning goals and strategic plan. It was decided that the group should consist of the following individuals: M. McCarthy, E. Peck, M. Farrar, A. Miciak, M. Barnes, E. Hahnenberg, K. Feely, K. O'Dell, and C. Sherman. E. Peck will seek a representative from Campus Ministry and noted that, with this group, we would have an opportunity to help students make connections between classroom learning and experiential learning, forging a dynamic relationship between the two.

The meeting concluded at 9:42 a.m.

Minutes recorded by J. Krukones