

**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.

October 26, 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, J. Krukones, M. McCarthy, A. Miciak, M. Millet, T. Mills, M. Moroney, E. Peck, J. Sully, P. Tian, B. Williams, D. Wong

The minutes of the meeting of October 12 were approved.

J. Colleran provided an update on continuing discussions of the administration with the African American Alliance, which began last December. A recent discussion included J. Colleran, S. Crahen, and T. Mills. J. Colleran explained to the students the many things the administration already has done in response to their demands. She said that the conversation with the AAA needs to be institutionally embedded. As it is, the concept of diversity has been incorporated into the staff evaluation. The AAA also seeks student involvement in faculty searches. J. Colleran said that that could be done, for instance, by means of written feedback. During the conversation she mentioned the recruitment of the new postdoctoral fellows to the students. In response to the AAA demand that the curriculum be diversified, J. Colleran said that we can ask the Core Committee to audit the curriculum in order to find out what percentage of courses deal with race. Regarding another demand—mandatory diversity training for faculty—J. Colleran said that she cannot simply mandate such a requirement for faculty. T. Mills commented that instituting such training would be putting the cart before the horse; instead the first step should be a diversity self-assessment by individual departments using an appropriate scale. M. Farrar noted a similarity with the discussion she recently hosted about working with students who have disabilities, which spilled over into the general subject of advising issues. A specific question that emerged from the discussion focused how we could develop the training that faculty could use at the time they needed it. A. Miciak wondered whether the groups who advocate this training could be the ones to provide it. T. Mills asked how we could heal wounds left over from up to twenty years ago and derive lessons from these episodes that would allow us to move forward. J. Feerick suggested that there might be ways to have conversations with groups such as the AAA and FOCO, which would provide people with a forum and thus a means of building bridges. E. Butler noted that faculty sense frustration over not knowing how to help students or how to secure the guidance that would enable them to lend such help. J. Colleran said that the Provost's Council needs to sponsor a shared response; we also have to memorialize these activities so that they don't simply fade away and to figure out where gaps might exist. T. Mills added that we need to articulate this work so that people are made aware of it. J. Colleran urged that we continue the conversation in our respective areas. D. Kilbride asked whether the recently appointed working group created by Fr. Niehoff to explore the slaveholding activities of

Archbishop John Carroll includes any students. In response, it was noted that Dwight Venson, president of the AAA, is a member. The AAA also wants to be involved in the search for a successor to Danielle Carter as director of the Center for Student Diversity and Inclusion and to learn more about the circumstances of her departure from the University. J. Colleran said that S. Crahen had replied as openly as possible to the AAA and noted that the story making the rounds about D. Carter had a false causality in that she, in fact, had resigned.

Another AAA demand deals with the wearing of kente cloths at commencement. J. Colleran provided a brief history of the issue, noting that there has never been a policy that permitted their use. She said that we should create a rubric for what's worn at the commencement ceremony or simply decree that nothing is permitted beyond traditional caps and gowns. M. Farrar cautioned against permitting a "free for all," which some academic departments would take advantage of while others would do nothing. T. Mills asked whether we have the wherewithal to start a new tradition, for example, having students adorn each other with their "achieved" apparel. A. Miciak noted that students who graduate with honors are identified as such both in the program and by the dean as they cross the stage. J. Colleran suggested that any additional apparel should be related to the University learning goals in some way and that there might be an application process for permission to wear such apparel. In the end, the general consensus was that special apparel should be approved by the University, even though, as J. Colleran pointed out, there are no special funds earmarked for it. J. Colleran appointed a subcommittee to consider the issue and report back to the PC; in addition to her, it consists of M. Farrar, S. Crahen, and J. Krukones.

The meeting next turned to updates from the subcommittees that had been organized a few weeks earlier. Reporting on behalf of the subcommittee charged with reviewing surveys on the student experience, M. McCarthy noted that there are many different assessment surveys; they deal with, among other things, basic demographic information, use of the Learning Commons and other University facilities, satisfaction data (e.g., EBI), longitudinal data (e.g., HERI), learning goals and outcomes data, alumni data, and information about personal health and emotional well-being. He added that N. Santilli would suggest that Institutional Effectiveness be the keeper of these data. He also posed the question as to which of these data we might use. M. Farrar asked whether we know what we want to find out, and what will get us there. B. Williams said that we have to be able to get people what they want, at the same time avoiding the trap of "survey fatigue." J. Colleran proposed that we keep things simple. A. Miciak urged that we articulate the questions we want to answer rather waiting on the data to inform us. M. Moroney then delivered an update from her group, which focuses on the first-year experience. She said that we need the voices of the Core and the faculty in developing benchmarks. Do the faculty have strong feelings as to what students should accomplish in their first year? What should students complete from the new Core by the end of their first year? Collaboration with the deans will be necessary, as will the development of metrics. M. McCarthy suggested the subcommittee invite Eddie Carreon to participate, given his experience with student engagement. M. Hendren proposed that we try to embed the various "checks" on our first-year students into the University calendar. Regarding the subcommittee on diversity and inclusion, T. Mills referred PC members to the documents he had emailed them earlier and requested that they provide feedback. Due to time limitations, E. Peck said that he would provide a report from the reflection subcommittee at the next PC meeting.

J. Colleran noted that we need to develop a list of the kinds of information that need to be shared as well as the timing of dissemination. She expressed the concern that, if the University fails to make the necessary changes soon, it would be facing a serious deficit; she also wondered whether the financial state of the institution needs to be more strenuously articulated. The consensus was that it should be. M. Millet said that not doing so would make it appear as though the problem belonged to the senior administration—in particular, the provost—when, in fact, it needs to be owned by the entire University. J. Colleran observed that the better the institution is run, the better the faculty should be able to focus on what they've been hired to do. This prompted a brief exchange about the perceptions of administrators and faculty as to what the “other” group does. M. Farrar said that any gaps in understanding make it clear why administrators ought to be ex-officio members of faculty committees. J. Colleran expressed concern that a culture of distrust leads to wastefulness and ineffectiveness on the part of the administration, which tries to overcome the distrust by creating unnecessarily large committees that duplicate efforts. D. Kilbride suggested that the University community might be suffering from “crisis fatigue.” J. Colleran wondered whether our institutional procedures had actually worked against a positive response to our challenges. In response to J. Feerick's suggestion that we needed a plan, J. Colleran said that we have the plan but so far are lacking the execution. Finally, she asked that we refrain from dwelling on the so-called lack of communication and collaboration when, in fact, both were consciously underway.

The meeting concluded at 10:05 a.m.

Minutes submitted by J. Krukones