

**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 14, 2016  
8:00 a.m.; CAS Dean's Conference Room  
Minutes

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

The minutes of the meeting of August 31, 2016, were approved.

The meeting was devoted to preparing for the visit to the PC of the HLC team on Monday, September 26, at 10 a.m. J. Colleran and N. Santilli left the room so that the other members could discuss the answers they could provide to likely questions from the team. This discussion was led by M. Moroney. An initial discussion topic was the history and charge of the PC. The PC was founded in 2013 to focus on the student experience; for that reason, it is made up of representatives from those divisions and offices that are what T. Mills described as the "touchpoints" of the student experience across campus. B. Williams added that, in the last couple of years, the PC has become a place to effect structural change; since its membership is drawn from various parts of campus, the PC opposes the "silo-ism" that has often characterized administrative structures at JCU. Regarding the PC's accomplishments, a number of things were mentioned, including the University learning goals; the campus-wide discussion of racism; a focus on student retention and thriving; a reworking of summer orientation and registration; and direct admit to the Boler School of Business. D. Wong asked what the PC had learned from these experiences. E. Peck suggested, for one thing, the boundaries between committees and, for another, the need to take things back into the wider campus community. M. Farrar said that we still needed to learn what different parts of the campus do. T. Mills added that the PC engages in a good deal of reflection as well.

Returning to the room, J. Colleran and N. Santilli began playing the roles of HLC team members and posed questions to the group. B. Williams provided some history of the PC, including the provost's assumption of responsibility for University planning in the fall of 2014. E. Peck added that, compared with its largely consultative function at the time of its creation, the PC more recently had moved to being action-oriented. M. McCarthy noted that it brought into the group the required expertise from other parts of the university, as needed. It was observed that members had begun taking more seriously the obligation of reporting back to their respective areas; for example, faculty members to Faculty Council. As another reporting mechanism, E. Peck took note of the provost's report that appears every semester. To J. Colleran's question about the PC's accomplishments, members reiterated several of the items that had been mentioned in the "pre-discussion," e.g., the University learning goals; the response to racial

incidents on campus; the creation of the PC subcommittee on Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion; direct admit to the Boler School; the focus on student thriving and the development of means intended to advance it, e.g., the student leave-of-absence policy, which also represented a PC recommendation that was subsequently approved by the faculty. D. Kilbride asked whether everything the PC does had to fit into the category of student thriving; in response, it was suggested that this was simply a way to consider various issues and where to deal with them. N. Santilli asked how members saw the PC evolving, especially in connection with shared governance; A. Miciak said that PC was becoming more effective at deciding how to proceed when an issue comes to the fore.

T. Mills asked how the new members of the PC felt about its work. J. Sully thought that its strength lay in its cross-functional approach. J. Feerick spoke about a greater awareness of its accomplishments. J. Colleran lauded the important role played by faculty representatives to the body, saying that they added dynamism to the faculty voice. She also asked whether the PC had tightened the relationship between the student and academic affairs divisions. S. Crahen replied with a resounding yes. B. Williams said that greater involvement in the body had snowballed, which in turn helped to build relationships with other parts of campus; an example he cited was the visit made to a PC meeting by Claudia Wenzel. D. Wong said that we had moved from a siloed situation to one of sharing. For M. McCarthy, the PC had created the opportunity to bring our own experiences with students to the table, which gave those experiences a broader context.

N. Santilli asked whether the PC had encountered any challenges. T. Mills said that we needed to communicate more effectively with appropriate groups. M. Farrar raised the issue of representation on the PC; also, the fact that members, especially faculty members, rotated in and out of the group yearly. D. Kilbride wondered whether mission creep might pose a problem. M. Moroney suggested that that danger would be countered by the work of the University Committee on Collaborative Governance. E. Butler asked whether, in the wake of the UCCG's work, the PC would remain a hub; J. Colleran thought that it would.

J. Colleran asked what the PC planned to do this year. A. Miciak said that one focus would be data-driven decision-making. M. McCarthy added that, in the process, we would be rounding up the data and studying their intersections as well as the meaning of the data for our students. M. Moroney asked about the connection between the PC and Institutional Effectiveness. N. Santilli answered that the PC does periodic presentations on data that help IE. He also said that data are being collected in many different places, raising the question as to whether we have a surfeit, overlap, or duplication. In other words, is it possible that we could eliminate some of the data?

J. Colleran noted that K. Feely had been invited to become a member of the PC in view of the crucial role of service at the University. She also asked about the link between the PC and the University Strategic Planning Group. M. Farrar suggested that the USPG establishes the measures or metrics, which are then farmed out to different groups in order to move things forward; in other words, the USPG is not the executor of tasks. Instead, the PC takes its cues from the USPG and its emphasis on the University Strategic Plan, deciding which "pieces" of the Plan belong to the PC. N. Santilli saw this relationship as an example of integrated planning, that is, how the PC aligns itself to the Strategic Plan. M. Moroney added that the USPG also is responsible for establishing timelines and deadlines. K. Feely offered that the PC is the center of

strategic communication, collaboration, and integration. D. Wong suggested that a logical follow-up question would focus on the alignment of the PC's work to the budget.

D. Wong also asked whether, after all of this work, morale had improved. E. Peck thought that improvement was evident in the relationships that had developed as a result of different people and offices working together. M. Farrar said that she would not venture to speculate about morale but suggested that greater collaboration was underway. T. Mills suggested that we ought to be bold enough to make the claim about improved collaboration. J. Feerick said that change, including change in morale, is gradual. B. Williams believed that the question needs to be answered on a personal or office level. In addition, the HLC experience forced us to stop being insular. J. Sully said that faculty and staff are not as separated from one another as they used to be. T. Mills noted that the transition from "town halls" to "campus conversations" was indicative of a closer and more equitable working relationship between the University administration and the other parts of the community. Looking forward, D. Wong said that the Staff Council would like to engage the Faculty Council this year. D. Kilbride asked about student responses to the HLC process, which had been referenced in the minutes of the August 31 PC meeting. J. Collieran replied that we are going to review those this year.

Bringing the meeting to a close, J. Collieran asked that PC members attend the community conversation on Wednesday afternoon, which is the last preparatory session prior to the HLC focused visit. Referring to the focused visit itself, N. Santilli suggested that, if an individual is asked a question that s/he is unable to answer, the proper response would be not to make something up but rather to refer them to an appropriate party. He also said that the full schedule of the visiting HLC team would soon appear on John Carroll's HLC website. E. Peck asked everyone to encourage their colleagues to attend the open sessions held during the HLC visit so that the community would be well represented.

The meeting concluded at 10:00 a.m.

Minutes recorded by J. Krukones