

JOHN CARROLL UNIVERSITY
PROVOST'S COUNCIL

Jeanne Colleran, Medora Barnes, Sherri Crahen, Barbara D'Ambrosia, Margaret Farrar,
Margaret Feely, SND, 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.

November 11, 2015

8:00 a.m.; CAS Dean's Conference Room

Minutes

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

The minutes of the meeting of October 28, 2015, were approved.

At the outset J. Colleran said that every PC meeting would include updates from each of the subcommittees. M. Moroney reported that the Retention Council had met the previous week and discussed its charge. It has been working with T. Mills on implementing the "First in the World" grant. In addition, the RC wants to coordinate its work with all relevant entities on campus. S. Crahen reported that the group working on the withdrawal policy was scheduled to have a training session with the Registrar's Office and the enrollment counselors the following Wednesday. It was still anticipated that the implementation of the policy would begin with the spring 2016 semester. E. Peck reported that, at its recent meeting, the Reflection Group had decided that it wants to develop a framework for reflection rather than a uniform definition and to seek out different models for this purpose. It also discussed the undergraduate capstone experience as a possible tie-in with its work. E. Stiles suggested the idea of reflection as a framing device for the report to the Higher Learning Commission now in preparation.

Concerning direct admit (discussed at the October 28 PC meeting), L. Stiles said that the Faculty Council would like a more detailed proposal about its implementation, a page or two focusing on the "how" rather than the "why." In her view, FC members did not want to put the proposal to a general faculty vote. A. Miciak commented that, practically speaking, the Boler School already has direct admit; M. Farrar added that we should point that out as a selling point to the faculty.

The principal business of the meeting was a discussion of e-portfolios. J. Colleran noted that we have been discussing the subject for about five years already and that earlier concerns focused on cost. It was observed that a few programs have used them before, e.g., Arrupe Scholars (with the help of Blackboard). M. Farrar commented that Augustana took more of a repository approach to e-portfolios and also used them to document learning that occurred outside of the classroom. J. Colleran cited LaGuardia Community College, the University of South Carolina, and Georgetown University as institutions that were in the forefront of the e-portfolio movement. She pulled up their websites so that PC members could view examples of student portfolios. M. Barnes said that e-portfolios offered additional possibilities with respect to uploading videos and assessment. G. Compton-Engle asked what purposes or uses we wanted e-portfolios to serve. M. Farrar said that the answer to that question could determine who oversees e-portfolios, adding that we would not want to engage in backloading. M. McCarthy suggested that, for example, the Center for Service and Social Action could insert relevant material in student files. J. Colleran said that we might need another discussion about e-portfolios so that everyone had the time to read articles she had recently circulated as well as to examine more closely the websites of

schools that made effective use of e-portfolios. It might be desirable to assign a smaller group to consider the issue, too. M. Farrar observed that such a group would seem to have much in common with the Reflection group. E. Peck suggested adding a few individuals to the Reflection group, which is already pursuing various projects through subcommittees.

Laying out some of the basic guidelines for e-portfolios, J. Colleran proposed that they would be required of all students, would be introduced and initiated at orientation, would be carried forward via cohort advising, and would be archived. M. Moroney noted that the development of individual portfolios could be thought of in terms of “points” in the career of an undergraduate, e.g., the declaration of major. G. Compton-Engle recalled that Dr. Julia Karolle-Berg had been considering the introduction of e-portfolios for Honors students on a trial basis. A. Miciak said that John Carroll does not have the administrative structure for e-portfolios right now but that we could make students more responsible for them along with the faculty. J. Colleran thought that we might be able to use e-portfolios as a repository of documents that would provide evidence of fulfilling the University learning goals. M. Peden expressed concern that these documents would be accessible to the public, mistakes and all. She also wondered whether the term “e-portfolio” sounded dated and suggested that it might be preferable to think in terms of “portfolio” instead. In addition, she thought that a one-credit course might help introduce students to the concept. E. Stiles proposed that e-portfolios be introduced to students through academic advising.

J. Colleran pointed out that the discussion about e-portfolios intersects with our conversation about student self-authorship. M. McCarthy added that, at orientation, new students write a reflection that subsequently goes to their academic advisor. J. Colleran suggested that a consensus seemed to be emerging regarding the value of e-portfolios. In reply to G. Compton-Engle’s question, D. Wong said that it would not be possible to know the cost of e-portfolios without an established framework. M. Peden said that it was necessary to take into account as well the human cost, e.g., faculty time. She also suggested that external consultants might not be necessary, that it would be possible to rely on in-house expertise, represented, for example, by Kyle O’Dell, Rodney Hessinger, and Brian Williams. M. Farrar said that we needed to determine the purpose behind portfolios first. M. McCarthy suggested that we find out more about the actual uses to which schools with e-portfolios put them. S. Crahen proposed polling our alumni as well. M. Peden suggested that an intern could be assigned to research the matter, and J. Colleran proposed attaching the individual to the Office of Institutional Effectiveness.

Bringing the discussion to a conclusion, J. Colleran reiterated the idea of assigning further consideration of e-portfolios to the Reflection group. Specific individuals were proposed as additions to the group who would take charge of the matter, including Jim Burke, Angie Jones, Malia McAndrew, Michelle Millet, and Kyle O’Dell. This subcommittee would articulate a purpose for e-portfolios at John Carroll and review appropriate models. For the time being, the project would be exploratory. J. Colleran said that eventually any proposal about e-portfolios would need to be shared with the Faculty Council, and deans would need to communicate with department chairs about it.

Finally, A. Miciak suggested that the new Integrative Core Curriculum be given a more compact and dynamic name. J. Colleran proposed that the PC discuss the matter at its last meeting of the semester on Wednesday, December 2, which would also include reports from the subcommittees. M. Hendren asked that Core director Peter Kvidera be informed about the renaming project.

The meeting concluded at 9:55 a.m.

Minutes recorded by J. Krukones