

**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 27, 2016

8:30 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, M. Millet, T. Mills, M. Moroney, E. Peck, M. Peden, E. Stiles, B. Williams, D. Wong; Guests: B. D'Ambrosia, T. Longin, D. Short

The principal business of this morning's meeting was to discuss with members of the new University Committee on Collaborative Governance (UCCG) how the Provost's Council functions within the governance process.

At the outset, J. Colleran asked that those who acted as scribes for the small group discussions at the April 13 PC meeting send her their notes. She also raised the issue of expanding the membership of the PC, mentioning Rodney Hessinger and Peter Kvidera as possible additions.

J. Colleran then introduced special guests Tom Longin and Dave Short, both of them members of the UCCG. T. Longin posed a couple of questions: Presuming that the Provost's Council might be a model of effective governance, what has made it work? Has it faced any challenges? D. Short agreed with T. Longin about the effectiveness of the PC, offering particular praise for Faculty Council chair B. D'Ambrosia, who received a round of applause. He noted that the UCCG would not be here forever. He also said that the issues with which the UCCG is intended to deal have been building up for a long time, possibly even decades. He also made clear that he and T. Longin had come to the meeting in order to listen. In response to T. Longin's questions, M. Barnes said that it was accurate to presume that the PC represents the hope of collaborative governance, as it operates according to the classic theory of breaking down prejudice by gathering people in a small group to work on a common task and thereby putting them on the same level. T. Mills wondered how the PC is seen by faculty and other administrative bodies. M. Peden said that the PC is the place to work out many institutional issues; its discussions have led to the consideration of those issues by the Faculty Council and to greater clarity as to where decisions are made. E. Stiles observed that things work better when there is time and matters are not rushed. D. Short agreed but noted that John Carroll is not alone in that respect. M. Farrar raised the question of the interaction of the PC with other bodies on campus and what its members take back to their own constituencies from its meetings. She also expressed an interest in seeing the agenda for meetings of the Board of Directors. M. Peden said that the past year had seen more commonality between the Faculty Council and the administration, representing from her perspective a culture shift. T. Longin asked whether there was something that drives everything on campus; there was general agreement that the answer to that question is the strategic plan. E. Peck noted the greater coordination that had begun to occur within the Board,

whereby the Board committees were planning their agendas in conjunction with the Board as a whole. B. Williams said that focusing on the student experience has given the PC a common topic to concentrate on, so that other committees begin revolving their work around that topic as well. M. Barnes added that this commonality enhances communication, too: people will know what's going on because everyone is working on the same thing. T. Longin suggested that the recent HLC experience may actually have helped in this regard, at the same time stressing that the University wouldn't want to deal with that kind of situation as a rule.

J. Colleran suggested that one of our most significant failures has been University governance, referring to collaborative, cross-divisional effort. For that reason, she expressed a commitment to having a few strong committees with close alignment of tasks, rather than a multiplicity of committees, each charged with a different task. T. Longin agreed, offering that only by having a structure that is conducive to change will change occur. A brief discussion ensued regarding the question of faculty turnover on the PC, including the suggestion that the faculty should elect their own representatives to the PC for three-year terms. M. Peden noted that it's desirable to rotate people through positions for the sake of experience, causing T. Longin to raise the same point about the administrative members. T. Mills observed that we're always having to bring new members up to speed; also, that we need a reward structure to facilitate greater engagement. M. Farrar said that it takes a year to learn a job, which makes broad rotating involvement a problem. M. Hendren commented that one body not represented on the PC is the Staff Council, raising again the challenge of communicating the PC's work to everyone on campus. J. Colleran noted that only the USPG has that kind of comprehensive representation. S. Crahen asked about the role of the University Leadership Council. T. Longin suggested that the PC is effective because its members come with an affiliation but represent the entire University as opposed to having a personal agenda. M. McCarthy expressed uncertainty that having a representative from the Staff Council would really help but agreed that the communication issue looms large. M. Hendren said that, because the staff is tasked with implementing policy, there needs to be interchange with the PC. J. Colleran observed that one reason for the "rushed" quality of the PC's work is that it has taken on things that perhaps other groups should be doing. D. Wong urged that we be more mindful about conveying to the Staff Council the things that happen in the PC; also, the importance of personal relationships had diminished in the face of more intentional structure, which has its merits. Nevertheless, there are discrepancies in salary and benefits between faculty and staff that need working out. M. Peden suggested that her experience had been different in that she found the emphasis on personal relationships often off-putting and exclusionary. By contrast, the PC represents the place where she feels comfortable communicating with both faculty and administrators. J. Colleran agreed, noting that Fr. Niehoff had instituted a University budget committee for the first time with the intention of bringing behind-the-doors decisions to an end. M. Peden added that the "personal culture" heretofore prevalent at the University had left it open to lawsuits involving, for example, discrimination. T. Mills asked whether all University decisions are collaborative and transparent or whether certain of them need to be made in isolation. T. Longin replied that decisions of a strategic nature should be made transparently, whereas others need not be. It would be desirable to develop a matrix of decisions that could be communicated to the entire campus.

T. Longin asked whether this past year has been different in terms of transparency, to which G. Compton-Engle replied yes and no: the faculty would insist that curricular matters fall under the

Committee on Academic Policies, a direction in which we're moving. D. Short suggested that perhaps what constitutes a curricular matter has grown more complex in recent years due to the greater competitiveness in higher education. T. Longin said that we need more dialogue between faculty and administrators on a variety of issues, including curriculum. E. Peck commented that administrators sometimes are powerless to resist changes in higher education, which can make matters especially difficult for non-tenured faculty caught in between.

In bringing the discussion to a close, J. Colleran emphasized that there has been an increase in administrative receptivity, including her own. D. Short observed that the PC is clearly a very caring group; his reaction was shaped in part by his surprise at encountering the frustration at the Staff Council. T. Longin said that dissatisfaction among staff has been an ongoing problem in higher education, emphasizing that staff members should not be taken for granted. Finally, T. Longin expressed his thanks and that of D. Short for the discussion.

The meeting ended at 9:55 a.m.

Minutes recorded by J. Krukones