

**JOHN CARROLL UNIVERSITY
PROVOST'S COUNCIL**

Jeanne Colleran, Medora Barnes, Gwen Compton-Engle, Sherri Crahen, Margaret Farrar,
Jim Krukones, Mark McCarthy, Al Miciak, Michelle Millet, Terry Mills,
Martha Mondello Hendren, Maryclaire Moroney, Ed Peck, Mindy Peden, Nick Santilli,
Elizabeth Stiles, Brian Williams, David Wong.

October 28, 2015
8:00 a.m.; CAS Dean's Conference Room
Minutes

Present: J. Colleran, M. Barnes, G. Compton-Engle, S. Crahen, M. Farrar, J. Krukones, M. McCarthy, A. Miciak, T. Mills, M. Mondello-Hendren, M. Moroney, E. Peck, M. Peden, E. Stiles, B. Williams, D. Wong

The minutes of the meeting of October 14, 2014, were approved.

The principal business of this meeting was a discussion of direct admit, whereby student applicants to the University could be accepted directly into the Boler School of Business.

After some brief introductory remarks by J. Colleran, T. Mills asked why we would not adopt this approach. B. Williams pointed out that direct admit complements the restructuring of the College of Arts and Sciences, brings academics and enrollment into alignment, and enhances the perception of the University by students. M. Barnes wondered what the impact on students would be as a result of direct admit, especially following their first semester; after all, students often change their mind regarding a major only after they've arrived. M. Moroney suggested that, with direct admit, a student belongs to the Boler cohort in a different way; direct admit makes it easier to support to retain superior students in particular. G. Compton-Engle asked where undecided students would be in all of this, wondering whether they might be left feeling more alienated. M. Farrar replied that that ought to be the subject of a separate conversation, at least where the College of Arts and Sciences is concerned. At the outset of the meeting, J. Colleran said that direct admit could serve as an opportunity for shared governance: the administration could consult Faculty Council about its intention to enact the change. M. Peden said she had been hearing from faculty that the decision to move to direct admit is an administrative one that doesn't require faculty approval, a sentiment seconded by E. Stiles. T. Mills asked how direct admit would affect the faculty. J. Colleran said that her hope was that it would give us a competitive edge. She also expressed concern about the possible loss of better students due to our lack of direct admit. Losing better students causes the institution to "sink" a little. By contrast, direct admit offers better support for both very directed and very undirected students. How it might impact faculty work load is hard to gauge. M. Peden suggested a link between high-performing faculty and high-performing students. M. Barnes asked how faculty resources and enrollment planning are supposed to be understood in connection with direct admit. What happens to departments whose majors don't declare until later? M. Peden asked about the fate of a more traditional Arts & Sciences major such as Classics, saying that she wouldn't want to see it overwhelmed by the Boler School. B. Williams replied the direct admit

would enable us to better understand how students arrive at different majors. J. Colleran suggested that our students don't seem to identify themselves exclusively with their major. D. Wong asked whether direct admit would entail an additional cost, to which B. Williams said no. A. Miciak said that all that remained to be done was to formalize the change; currently, Boler faculty already are advising large numbers of students.

G. Compton-Engle emphasized that she doesn't oppose the proposal but needed to understand where the students are developmentally; she was concerned that many of them are still working under parental expectations. B. Williams pointed out that direct admit does not mean that a student is stuck with her or his "first" major. S. Crahen said that we might want to think how we communicate with parents. M. McCarthy referred to the importance of "self-authorship" for students. A. Miciak added that we ought to be more explicit about self-authorship, if that is indeed what we wish to emphasize.

The discussion moved temporarily to relations between faculty and the administration. M. Peden suggested that a driving element in that relationship is salary. J. Colleran suggested that direct admit is one of those levers that would help us improve salaries; at the same time, she pointed to a lack of evidence that salaries have been responsible for diminishing or dampening the quantity or quality of faculty work. She also hoped for a mutual ownership of the salary issue. M. Peden said that an issue such as salaries needs to be raised and advanced; otherwise it would not even rise to the surface. The debt crisis of recent years, she added, has affected younger faculty in a way that it has not affected older faculty. J. Colleran commented that all of us have to embrace a shared reality. A. Miciak said that we need to explore where we can grow; J. Colleran replied that anything we can do we will. T. Mills expressed appreciation for the passion with which individuals had addressed the subject, suggesting that this had been a chance to air some of the stale narratives so that we might move beyond them.

E. Peck said that we needed a practical document about direct admit clarifying what must come next. J. Colleran responded that direct admit could lead to multiple student pathways, which raised the issue of admission standards. M. Peden and M. Barnes pointed out that, if direct admit were seen to have any effect on admission standards, faculty input and approval would be absolutely necessary.

B. Williams noted that direct admit could not become operative until fall 2017. M. Farrar suggested that it might be helpful to have a couple of models of direct admit to present to the faculty. B. Williams replied that there can be a danger in getting too granular about the process. M. Moroney commented that faculty are concerned with the declaration of major, not the admission process. J. Colleran concluded the discussion by noting that all of these matters deal with the realization of student goals and aspirations.

The meeting concluded at 9:40 a.m.

Minutes recorded by J. Krukones