

**JOHN CARROLL UNIVERSITY  
PROVOST'S COUNCIL**

Jeanne Colleran, Emily Butler, Sherri Crahen, Margaret Farrar, Sr. Katherine Feely, SND, Jean Feerick, Martha Mondello Hendren, Jim Krukones, Peter Kvidera, Mark McCarthy, Al Miciak, Michelle Millet, Terry Mills, Maryclaire Moroney, Ed Peck, D. Riley, Nick Santilli, John Sully, Peifang Tian, Brian Williams, David Wong.

August 31, 2016

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

Minutes

Present: J. Colleran, E. Butler, S. Crahen, M. Farrar, K. Feely, J. Feerick, M. Hendren, D. Kilbride (for P. Kvidera), J. Krukones, M. McCarthy, A. Miciak, M. Millet, T. Mills, M. Moroney, E. Peck, D. Riley, N. Santilli, J. Sully, P. Tian, B. Williams, D. Wong

J. Colleran began the meeting by welcoming the new members of the PC and by asking all of those present to introduce themselves.

The first item of business concerned the "focused visit" to campus by a team from the Higher Learning Commission on September 26-27. The team will meet with the PC on the 26<sup>th</sup> at 10 a.m. For that reason, all PC members should familiarize themselves with the section of the report submitted to the HLC that deals with the PC (Section 5B). The PC will review that section of the report at its next meeting on September 14.

The next item had to do with the preparation of an agenda for the PC for the 2016-17 academic year. The PC had devoted its last meeting of the previous academic year to this topic, and those suggestions appeared on the agenda for this meeting; they included goals such as continuing to improve the student experience (the core purpose of the PC) and aligning the PC's work with the University Strategic Plan. J. Colleran also suggested that we take note of the student comments from the HLC process. Moreover, she made reference to the PC's ongoing work, examples of which also appeared on the agenda, including revamping the summer orientation/registration sessions for new students and the initiation of a campus-wide conversation on racism.

J. Colleran then called on members to suggest other projects that the PC might take up. M. McCarthy thought that it would be desirable to bring together and analyze the results of the various surveys and other assessment data that have been collected in different parts of campus, for example, by CSSA, Student Affairs, the Boler School of Business, and the alumni office. N. Santilli observed that such a project would also show which data we still need. J. Colleran proposed that we begin with a review of these data; T. Mills added that we should find out as well where the data reside. It was decided, then, that, following the HLC focused visit, the third PC meeting would deal with freshman retention, and the fourth with data review. Regarding this last subject, J. Colleran summarized what the goals of reviewing all of these data collectively would be; they included determining key performance indicators, reviewing the implementation of the First-in-the-World Grant, augmenting student profiles (to benefit cohort advising), and determining whether our programs and services are adequate. She also suggested that this review might give rise to a white paper intended for the Board of Directors.

Turning to another issue, J. Collieran noted that we have 8 to 12 University committees and should try reducing that number. At the same time, we have need of a University-level academic policies committee that would serve as one of the “Big 4” committees to which all other University committees should be connected. Such a committee might make it unnecessary for the PC to deal with certain issues, e.g., the student leave policy. J. Collieran’s reference to the work of the CSSA in poverty-stricken areas and its proposal about working with refugees elicited a suggestion that the PC should try “knitting together” the efforts of other groups. M. Farrar supported the idea because too many smaller activities remain isolated in pockets around campus. T. Mills added that we don’t even know about these efforts. Knowing about them, suggested E. Peck, would enable us to support them. N. Santilli asked how we might continue to build on existing connections. A. Miciak suggested thinking about this goal in terms of consolidation and pooling resources. M. Hendren wondered whether the missing link might be the proposed University committee on academic policies. J. Collieran saw it as a matter of value proposition as well: What precisely does the University stand for? How do we create men and women who are equipped to respond to social crises? K. Feely suggested that we need to put a vision in the center of the table.

The discussion of noteworthy activities occurring across campus led to mention of the student panel on diversity that was held for our new first-year students the Friday before the start of fall classes. Panel members took risks in articulating their own, often non-mainstream identities. M. McCarthy said that we would not have been able to hold such an event as recently as two years ago, in part because of the way in which the world has changed. E. Peck thought that the event had been made possible as well by the smaller-scale conversations that have been undertaken on campus recently, e.g., by the African American Alliance. Sherri Crahen noted that the Center for Student Diversity and Inclusion is now processing an evaluation that it administered after the event. A. Miciak asked how we might use such an event to recruit students.

Returning to the topic of the “Big 4” committees, J. Collieran said that three of them need to be cross-divisional and include both faculty and staff. N. Santilli added that all of these committees should be required to review their charge in order to understand their roles and responsibilities. D. Wong asked whether the University Committee on Collaborative Governance has identified a new committee structure. J. Collieran replied that the UCCG had identified the problem, which led to pinpointing what the strategic University committees are.

J. Collieran said she would put all of the suggestions made at the meeting into narrative form and then, following the HLC visit, send that narrative to PC members for further consideration.

The meeting ended at 9:30 a.m.

Minutes recorded by J. Krukones