

**JOHN CARROLL UNIVERSITY
PROVOST'S COUNCIL**

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

February 17, 2016
8:00 a.m.; CAS Dean's Conference Room
Minutes

Present: J. Colleran, M. Barnes, G. Compton-Engle, S. Crahen, M. Farrar, K. Feely, M. Hendren, J. Krukones, M. McCarthy, A. Miciak, T. Mills, M. Moroney, M. Peden, N. Santilli, E. Stiles, B. Williams, D. Wong; Guests: L. Atkins, A. Kugler, P. Kvidera, G. Lacueva, P. Mason, K. O'Dell

The minutes of the meeting of February 10, 2016, were approved.

The principal business of the meeting was a continuation from the previous meeting of the discussion of suggested changes in the summer orientation/registration program for first-year students. M. Moroney distributed a diagram intended to capture these changes starting with the end of the spring semester in May and continuing through the start of the next academic year's fall semester. The diagram mapped two versions of these changes side by side. The first version envisioned the pre-registration of first-year students for their foundational courses by means of block or batch schedules prior to orientation and the completion of registration (for courses in their major, for example) at orientation itself. The second version envisioned the working out of fall class schedules in their entirety only after all of the orientation sessions had concluded and transfer credits had been received. M. Moroney emphasized that summer orientations had always been student-driven and would remain so under the new system. The challenge was incorporating the changes into the orientations while also tending to the requirements of the "First in the World" grant. The Integrative Core Curriculum makes matters more challenging as, under it, there is less overlap with electives for a student's major. There is a total of eight foundational classes to work with—a fairly small number. Last summer the orientations began running out of seats for those classes, especially in the later sessions. The goal is guaranteeing seats to all first-year students. Thus, in the first version of the revision, students would have guaranteed seats by the time they arrive for orientation; in other words, they would have been pre-registered for up to three classes. Subsequent class assignments—based on preferences indicated by the student at the orientation—would focus on their major and other electives. Several questions came up in connection with the proposal. One of them dealt with the assignment of language classes. M. Moroney replied that it would be possible to accommodate those classes. M. Barnes noted that the experience of working with faculty on the development of their fall schedules is reassuring and helpful to new students, in part because it prepares them for dealing with class scheduling for subsequent semesters; she wondered whether something would be lost given that students would be pre-registered for approximately one-half of their fall schedule from the outset. M. McCarthy wondered whether, in the case of the second revision,

not having a complete schedule by the time they left orientation might create an unanticipated reaction when students received their tuition bill, ordinarily, by July 1.

K. O'Dell suggested a hybrid version that would combine elements of the two proposed versions: pre-register students for their foundational classes prior to orientation but register them for their electives after all of the orientation sessions. This arrangement would enable them to leave the orientation with the assurance of a partial schedule. M. Barnes wondered whether students might have greater concern regarding their electives as opposed to the foundational classes. When A. Miciak asked whether we had done everything possible to separate the times of the foundational classes and the electives, M. Moroney replied that we are making progress toward that end. M. Peden said that the course preference form that students would be asked to fill out at the orientation should include more than two choices. A. Kugler suggested that the second version might be better as it promised to do away with the "May scramble." At the same time, each plan seemed to have its pluses and minuses. M. Farrar suggested that, in making a final choice, we defer to those who do the work on the ground, that is, the Academic Advising personnel and Registrar's Office. M. McCarthy said that we should maximize the time that faculty advisors and students spend with each other, pointing out that the second version would allow more time. J. Colleran posed two questions: 1) Which plan will make sure that students actually show up in the fall? 2) Which plan can we carry out with the greater confidence, at least eventually if not immediately? When it was asked what our decision date must be—partly in connection with messaging the changes to new students and their parents as well as faculty—B. Williams pointed out that mid-March was the absolute latest.

M. Barnes said that we would need time to present the proposed changes to the faculty; L. Stiles added that faculty would need time to absorb and react to the proposal. M. Peden said that it would be desirable to wait until after the unveiling of the plan—and the receipt of any faculty feedback—before an actual decision was made. M. Moroney said that she would be happy to explain the changes at a general faculty meeting. T. Mills emphasized that the proposed changes should be presented in the context of concerns expressed by the faculty regarding last summer's orientation experience. M. Hendren suggested that a separate discussion be held with department chairs given their role in class scheduling. M. Barnes said that faculty concern about this matter is quite real, given, for example, that academic advising is treated as an aspect of teaching on the faculty self-evaluation. M. Peden observed that we ought to elicit suggestions for assessing the revised model. In the end, it was decided that M. Moroney would present the proposed changes to orientation/registration at the general faculty meeting on Wednesday, February 24, at 2:00 p.m.

J. Colleran said that a debriefing on the February 3 community forum would take place at next week's meeting.

The meeting adjourned at 9:25 a.m.

Minutes recorded by J. Krukones