

**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 12, 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, J. Krukones, M. McCarthy, A. Miciak, M. Millet, T. Mills, M. Moroney, E. Peck, N. Santilli, J. Sully, B. Williams, D. Wong

The minutes of the meeting of September 28 were approved.

M. Moroney and M. Hendren delivered a report on the changes to the registration of first-year students that were introduced in summer 2016. M. Moroney explained that planning for the changes began in fall 2015, when the Provost's Council charged a working group with reviewing the freshman registration process and making recommendations for improvements. During the planning stage, a conscious attempt was made to align changes with the needs of the "First in the World" grant; G. Lacueva, co-project director for the grant, was a crucial element in that process. M. Moroney also explained the criteria used for student course assignments (intended major; English placement; anticipated transfer credits; Gold/intervention or Blue path; co-curricular schedules, especially sports and work; medical or other needed accommodations; commuter status; gender; or special attributes [Arrupe, Honors, Borromeo, leadership]). In the end, 272 students were assigned to Blue sections; 360 to Gold sections; and 83 students were not assigned. In addition, M. Moroney showed how many students were placed in each of 5 courses (CO 125, EN 120/125, TRS 101, EC 201, BL 155). She noted that it became a real struggle to achieve a balance in seats across these courses from one registration session to the next. Several issues figured in her analysis of the changes: institutional efficiency (seat loss and instructional costs); administrative costs and implementation (including the lack of sufficient technology solutions, the problems caused by incomplete and belated information about incoming students, and the work load); scheduling conflicts and the use of facilities (involving athletic practice times and course meeting times). Regarding feedback, students submitted 93 requests for schedule changes (44 of them related to sports), while 35 of the 60 faculty who participated in the registration sessions responded to the survey. Most of the faculty commented positively about the changes, citing as a plus the additional time they had to discuss substantive matters with students and their parents instead of having to focus almost entirely on registration. M. Moroney recommended that pre-registration for first-year students should be continued; that the Blue sections should be eliminated, leaving only the Gold intervention group and all others; that, for each of the Gold course pairings, the FITW team determines the roster of students; that more conversation take place regarding the course selection for the Gold course pairings; that it be more clearly determined which students should participate in the study (Borromeo, Arrupe, Honors); that

further conversation take place about the learning environment in the Gold sections as well as about the appropriate curriculum, pedagogy, and support for first-year students.

In the ensuing discussion of the registration changes, J. Colleran asked whether there are special scheduling software programs that might facilitate the process; M. Moroney said that there were. J. Colleran also asked what role coaches could play in course registration for student athletes. M. Moroney responded that she hoped to have accurate and comprehensive practice schedules from all coaches and all sports in the spring, i.e., in advance of summer orientation. T. Mills said that there would be follow-up testing of the first-year students in the spring. A. Miciak asked whether there was a way of modeling student demand earlier so as to better control supply. K. Feely wondered what might happen when the FITW grant comes to an end; is it possible that this could prove to have been an exercise in futility? M. Hendren said no, that first-year pre-registration will not go away. J. Colleran concluded the discussion by applauding all of the work the changes in the orientation/registration program entailed.

Next, N. Santilli familiarized PC members with the results of a survey administered to our students by HLC. He explained that this survey has become an institutional requirement, perhaps because HLC is not necessarily satisfied with the students chosen by the school to meet with the visiting team. The survey was sent to every student registered for classes in spring 2016. HLC prepares the questions (15 of them, scored on a Likert-type scale), does an analysis of the results, and has control of the data. The HLC team that was here for the focused visit last month did not mention the survey. In general, the results indicate strong student satisfaction with their JCU experience, although it's not possible to say who agreed or disagreed. One possible takeaway is to try making our students more financially literate so that, e.g., they would be more acutely aware of the consequences of taking out loans. In addition, some students expressed dissatisfaction with academic advising and communication issues. M. Farrar asked what we might do about these matters. N. Santilli suggested that we deal with them within the PC as a whole and also within our subcommittees. He noted that this is a NSSE year and, as part of the survey, we could opt to incorporate the advising module free of charge, while considering the addition of others as well, especially diversity and civic engagement, which would cost \$150 each. J. Feerick suggested that we consider creating a hospitality budget for faculty advisors that they could use for their advisees in order to create a sense of community and in this way support retention efforts. N. Santilli said that some students had complained about condescending treatment by faculty or staff; this might require collaboration with Human Resources. M. Hendren observed that the *Carroll News* had just interviewed her about the way in which the academic schedule is created. N. Santilli added that some students had also criticized the inconsistency in class evaluations. This comment gave rise to discussion about class evaluations at JCU and, more specifically, the lack of a University-wide evaluation. J. Colleran said that she would inform HLC that we have discussed the student survey; also, that we will add the advising module to NSSE this year. To B. Williams's suggestion that we avoid "survey fatigue," J. Colleran said that we would develop a calendar for the administration of surveys.

The next item on the agenda involved a template that J. Sully had been asked to develop for the recently created PC subcommittees. He has created a Google website for the PC that is accessible only by members; the website has sections for each of the subcommittees, including their KPIs. It was suggested that the website be made accessible to other faculty and staff who

will be working with the subcommittees. In response to a question from J. Colleran, J. Sully said that the PC meeting minutes could be posted to the website as well. In addition, he welcomes suggestions from all PC members. J. Colleran asked that all of the subcommittees meet within the next two weeks and report their progress at the next (October 26) PC meeting; also, they should upload their reports to the new website in advance of the meeting. B. Lovequist has access to that website.

Finally, J. Colleran noted that as part of our response to an OCR complaint, we will develop a unified University policy on sexual harassment, the draft of which will be made available for comment. The PC should review this draft, too. For that reason, J. Colleran will invite Mr. David Sipusic, our new Title IX coordinator, to the PC meeting on October 26.

The meeting concluded at 9:55 a.m.

Minutes submitted by J. Krukones