

**JOHN CARROLL UNIVERSITY  
PROVOST'S COUNCIL**

Jeanne Colleran, Medora Barnes, 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.

March 30, 2016  
8:00 a.m.; CAS Dean's Conference Room  
Minutes

Present: J. Colleran, M. Barnes, G. Compton-Engle, S. Crahen, K. Feely, M. Hendren, J. Krukones, M. McCarthy, T. Mills, M. Moroney, M. Peden, N. Santilli, E. Stiles, B. Williams, D. Wong,

The meeting began with a review of the webinar on diversity training held the previous day. T. Mills said that it had provided useful materials that could be used to determine where John Carroll stands with respect to diversity and inclusion. The Diversity, Equity and Inclusion Committee will provide follow-up to the webinar. That committee conducted a survey on the February 3 community forum dealing with on-campus racism. The response rate to the survey was respectable, and most of those filling it out thought the forum worthwhile. More detailed analysis of the survey will be forthcoming. J. Colleran asked whether the DEI would take the lead in subsequent diversity initiatives. She thought that the webinar had demonstrated that diversity is essential to student success. B. Williams appreciated the variety of tools that the webinar laid out for different groups so as to advance diversity efforts in different areas. T. Mills added that we now have a model for going forward. M. McCarthy asked whether copies of the webinar presentation would be made available; T. Mills said they would be. E. Stiles raised the question of the number of students of color on campus in terms of their constituting a critical mass. B. Williams observed that the number of deposits from first-year students of color has been increasing over the last several years; he also pointed out that diversity involves everyone on campus and their readiness to host these students. J. Colleran said that it was a question of structures and asked who the "engine" was regarding diversity—DEI or the Provost's Council? T. Mills suggested that it was the latter, with DEI support. M. Hendren asked whether DEI has been properly introduced to the campus, and T. Mills urged that it receive a charge or mandate from the Provost's Council or the Provost herself. N. Santilli noted that, in the Strategic Plan, various tactics will be taken up by different groups, enabling us to determine our assets and targets regarding diversity over time. J. Colleran said that the survey on the community forum suggests that support exists for various measures. She also said that she would write the charge for DEI and ensure that Goal 2 of the Strategic Plan includes this tactic. T. Mills added that the previous day's webinar was symbolic in bringing together leadership from around campus so that they could commit to the effort. T. Mills added that the concept of "privilege" should not be the starting point but could be addressed along the way; instead it would be better to begin with structures. M. Peden expressed the need for rules because the emphasis on person-to-person relationships at John Carroll too often gave rise to exclusivity. M. Hendren suggested that every office could come up with a list of "barriers" that they could resolve to fix. M. Barnes added that

diversity training needs to become routinized and institutionalized. D. Wong noted that, for such training, small groups tend to be more effective than large ones, permitting people to get to know and feel comfortable with one another. N. Santilli said that the process is developmental, moving through stages. J. Colleran expressed appreciation to T. Mills for his work and the change in the community his very presence has brought about. She also voiced gratitude for the discussion, taking note of its importance. A common purpose benefits morale and communication. The PC had arrived at a point where action will take place and change will come about. J. Colleran thanked the members for that development and urged the group to continue down that path, at the same time keeping the JCU community apprised of our progress.

Next, N. Santilli led a discussion of the “Great Colleges to Work For” survey administered on campus in spring 2015. (His analysis of the survey results was distributed prior to the meeting.) He noted that many of the problems identified by the survey are “relational”; also, that some areas of concern already have been attended to. A natural question would be to ask what ought to be fixed first. M. Peden said that, at the most recent Faculty Council meeting, several positive instances of faculty-administration collaboration were cited, for which reason the survey results look different nowadays than when first promulgated several months ago. E. Stiles observed that “local” leadership on campus receives high marks, leading her to conclude that the problem is structural. M. Hendren said that most people don’t see the work of senior leadership, making it easier to criticize. T. Mills suggested that we “at the table” are not communicating as broadly and as deeply as we should. M. Barnes added that there is no intentional reporting out of the work of the Provost’s Council. M. McCarthy said that the communication issue is a big one and not just a matter of posting minutes. S. Crahen agreed, noting that it became apparent in Student Affairs that information is not shared going down to all levels. G. Compton-Engle said that communication is not just reporting down. M. Barnes commented that the Faculty Council had discussed the possibility of committees sharing minutes, perhaps using a special website, but that this was not likely to happen for the time being. E. Stiles suggested that a professional be engaged to lead the effort. J. Colleran said that we could suggest the hiring of an external expert in the strategic plan; right now IMC is so burdened they don’t have the capacity to develop a communication plan. B. Williams thought that an organizational chart, including the tasks of committees, would be helpful. J. Colleran said that she had developed one along those lines and that the committees driving the vision of the institution need to be connected. K. Feely noted that a wider net of inclusion is successfully bringing people to the table. T. Mills questioned the extent to which this has been articulated; it seems as though the context has not been fully understood by other parts of the campus. The members of the Provost’s Council do not have individual charges related to the overall work of the PC. J. Colleran asked whether the communication system in academic affairs needed to be different, positing the vision of a rich learning community that goes above and beyond functionality. M. Hendren emphasized the need of recognition and appreciation on top of other needs, along the lines of recent HR initiatives geared toward professional development. J. Colleran thanked everyone for contributing to the discussion and said that she would bring these matters back for the next discussion. consideration.

Minutes recorded by J. Krukones