

**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, Nick Santilli, John Sully, Peifang Tian, Brian Williams, David Wong.

September 28, 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, M. Millet, T. Mills, M. Moroney, E. Peck, N. Santilli, J. Sully, P. Tian, B. Williams, D. Wong

On behalf of the Provost's Council, S. Crahen thanked J. Colleran for her effective leadership of the University during the period leading up to the HLC focused visit on September 26-27.

N. Santilli provided a wrap-up of that visit, describing it as very positive and an institutional milestone. T. Mills asked whether the visiting team had given any indication of their evaluation; N. Santilli replied that they are very careful not to do so. They requested a few additional pieces of promotional material, which N. Santilli provided. J. Colleran reported that the HLC team said that people at the University feel as though they are being heard and that assessment has become an embedded process. They did not ask anything outside of the "focus" areas identified in the Notice Letter. J. Colleran said that she had two insights related to the HLC experience: first, we need to do more to engage people at the mid-level leadership level, for example, sending them to conferences and making available to them other kinds of leadership development; second, the personal anxiety that the experience caused was alleviated and, in the end, overcome by the efforts of many individuals, including (but not limited to) the deans, T. Mills, K. Feely, and the enrollment division.

Next, B. Williams reported on the new recruitment initiative, showing (on the computer screen) the microsites that had been developed in recent weeks. The microsites, or tiles, are emailed to students, and the numbers indicated that the response has been enthusiastic. E. Peck observed that clever phrasing helps draw in students, causing them to "uncover" the tiles and find out more about the JCU programs. J. Colleran noted that this initiative will continue with new tiles focusing on the humanities and social sciences. M. Farrar said that she has been receiving—and passing along to IMC—stories about student success; these stories are beginning to appear on our website as well as social media. (Stories should be sent to stories@jcu.edu.) J. Colleran noted that our colleagues are being responsive, as evidence, e.g., in IT's timely reaction to requests from BSOB faculty. M. McCarthy suggested that the new recruitment initiative warrants an announcement to the JCU community; J. Colleran thought a community conversation might be appropriate.

The PC then turned its attention to its goals for 2016-17, which J. Colleran had identified prior to the meeting and which are aligned with the University Strategic Plan. The goals were assigned

to subcommittees, each subcommittee to consist of several PC members. A schedule was also worked out so that each subcommittee would know at which upcoming PC meeting it would report to the entire group. (The list of subcommittees, their members, and the reporting schedule is attached to these minutes as an appendix.) M. Millet suggested that the discussion on data and student surveys ought to take place first, as that material informs everything else. It was also pointed out that, when each of the subcommittees reports back to the PC, the “holes” in coverage of student needs would become apparent. For the next PC meeting on October 12, all of the subcommittees are to have identified the following: 1) their goals for 2016-17 and beyond in light of the Strategic Plan; 2) key performance indicators; 3) budget requirements; 4) other community members with whom they need to consult; 5) an assessment plan; and 6) other needs. In addition, on October 12 N. Santilli will report on student comments about the HLC process so that the PC might determine whether follow-up actions are necessary. The subcommittees will submit their goals to Barbara Lovequist by Friday, October 21, so that they might be distributed to the entire PC in time for discussion at the October 26 meeting.

Next, M. Moroney delivered a brief summary of a written “Report on Changes to Freshman Registration – Summer 2016” that had been distributed prior to the meeting. She noted that the Academic Advising Office had just received reports from faculty participants in the summer orientations; the reports were generally favorable, as faculty appreciated the additional time they had had to discuss more substantive matters with students and their parents, including the new Integrative Core Curriculum. Eleven of the new sections of the Cohort Advising course (AR 101) for 2016-17 have benefited from the participation of Student Affairs liaisons. In addition, AR 101 classes have started making use of videos and special exercises, some focused on the importance of reflection and values; moreover, the topics for AR 101 have been reorganized on the basis of faculty input. Meanwhile, a new academic coaching program has been productive, and the Academic Advising Office has a graduate assistant who works exclusively with transfer students.

Bringing the meeting to a conclusion, J. Colleran said that she is considering the possibility of augmenting or replacing the Provost’s Report with a single page of links to the subcommittees created at today’s meeting. For that reason, the subcommittees might want to develop communication plans.

The meeting concluded at 9:50 a.m.

Minutes submitted by J. Krukones