

**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.

April 13, 2016
8:00 a.m.; CAS Dean's Conference Room
Minutes

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

The minutes of the meeting of March 30 were approved.

The meeting then turned to the charge to be given by the Provost's Council to the Diversity, Equity and Inclusion Committee. For this purpose, J. Colleran had distributed in advance of the meeting a draft statement for the PC to consider. In the ensuing discussion several changes or friendly amendments were suggested and incorporated into the draft. For example, the DEI's representation on the Provost's Council—originally limited in the draft statement to the Assistant Provost for Diversity and Inclusion—was expanded to include “other faculty and staff representatives.” Likewise, it was stipulated that, in the absence from PC meetings of the Assistant Provost for Diversity and Inclusion, any other DEI member in attendance would be responsible for reporting out to the PC. Furthermore, the DEI would be responsible for disseminating periodic reports to the campus community. Several other matters arose during the discussion. D. Wong asked whether the DEI would be assigned a budget. J. Colleran replied that it would come from the PC. S. Crahen suggested that an internal scan or audit would help decide where money should be spent. It was agreed that the membership of the DEI should be determined, and could be adjusted, by the PC.

Next, the committees that report to the PC provided updates. M. Moroney said that the Committee on Student Thriving and Success had met to review the graduation rates of students of color. It will meet again in a week to focus on graduation. E. Peck then reviewed the work of the Committee on Reflection. It had sketched out a framework for reflection and decided what constitutes good, transformative reflection, resulting in the development of a rubric. It also discussed the kind of tool we could use to further reflection, for example, student e-portfolios, in which case Todd Bruce could be asked to bring his expertise in assessment to bear on the matter. As another possibility, J. Colleran mentioned the experiential transcript, which is a catalog of college-approved extracurricular experiences (e.g., internships, immersions). M. McCarthy suggested checking out the version developed by Elon University. J. Colleran pointed out the need—by April 25—of a paragraph of text about our plans for reflection and experiential education. She also provided an update on Career Services. The search for a new, permanent director will soon begin. The new director may be brought into the University at a higher

administrative level than is presently the case. The search committee will be chaired by M. McCarthy and will have the help of a search firm. The need to form a search committee raised the issue of faculty representation and the possibility of faculty working over the summer. M. Peden said that she would bring up this matter at the Faculty Council meeting that afternoon. In the ensuing discussion, it was suggested that a distinction be made between regular committee work and the extraordinary kind of work represented by a personnel search. In addition, it was proposed that a committee's charge could include a provision about summer work. J. Colleran concluded that we ought to be able to resolve the issue as far as the Career Services search is concerned.

During the last part of the meeting, members present divided themselves into three smaller groups in order to discuss the significance and the accomplishments of the PC in anticipation of a visit to the April 27 PC meeting by the University Committee on Collaborative Governance. The smaller groups were asked to respond to several questions, including the following: What would you describe as the significant accomplishments of the PC? Do you think that the representation on the PC is sufficient? Do you think the work of the PC is sufficiently understood in the University community? When the general meeting resumed, the groups reported out the results of their discussions. Several accomplishments were cited on behalf of the PC's usefulness, e.g., cross-divisional collaboration, the overcoming of traditional "silos" at the University, timely response to emerging issues, iterative drafts of important statements, a focus on student thriving, the active participation of PC members, civil discussion and disagreement about major issues, and the shift from discussion to action. J. Colleran asked that those who had served as scribes in the smaller groups forward to her their notes for integrating into a single document.

The meeting concluded at 10:00 a.m.

Minutes recorded by J. Krukones