

**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.

November 9, 2016
8:00 a.m.; CAS Dean's Conference Room
Minutes

Present: J. Colleran, E. Butler, M. Farrar, K. Feely, J. Feerick, M. Hendren, D. Kilbride, J. Krukones, A. Miciak, M. Millet, T. Mills, M. Moroney, E. Peck, N. Santilli, J. Sully, P. Tian, D. Wong; guest: D. Sipusic

The minutes of the meeting of October 26 were approved.

David Sipusic, John Carroll's new Title IX Coordinator, had been invited to the meeting to talk about a complaint that a former student has filed with the Office for Civil Rights against the University. As background, D. Sipusic said that he has worked with the OCR for the last seven years and enjoys a good relationship with the office; also, these matters take a long time to resolve, partly because the OCR is understaffed. He noted the University's need to work towards a unified sexual harassment policy. The creation of such a policy will involve a period of review and comment. Meanwhile, notice of the student's complaint has been made public; for example, it has been reported in the *Chronicle of Higher Education's* Title IX database tracker. In response to T. Mills's question as to needed areas for improvement, D. Sipusic said that John Carroll has multiple policies on sexual harassment that exist in a variety of places. M. Farrar asked whether we needed a unified process as well, to which D. Sipusic responded yes. As an example of an anticipated change, the current Sexual Harassment Board will be rolled into a Community Review Board, although the situation will remain much the same procedurally. This change will allow the board to consider claims of sexual harassment as well as interpersonal violence. T. Mills wondered what role the University community will play in the process. D. Sipusic said that they would be asked to take part in climate surveys, whose results will better enable us to move forward. J. Feerick asked how many cases OCR is dealing with right now; the answer is almost 300. When J. Colleran asked about our reporting obligations, D. Sipusic pointed out that the new mandatory reporting policy is available for review on the HR website now and that every incident of sexual harassment or interpersonal violence needs to be reported. J. Colleran urged everyone to have a look at the website; the period for commenting on the policy ends on November 18. J. Colleran concluded this part of the meeting by praising the hard work D. Sipusic has done since his arrival a few months ago, which includes providing material related to the specific incident for OCR and raising the profile of Title IX on campus, in part by appointing several deputy Title IX coordinators.

J. Colleran informed the PC that she would report further on the issue of commencement apparel—which she had raised at the October 26 meeting—at the next meeting on November 30. Meanwhile, she asked that the subcommittees deliver progress reports. On behalf of the group

working on diversity, T. Mills expressed thanks for the feedback he had received regarding the documents generated by that subcommittee. The Faculty of Color Organization (FOCO), for example, had questioned the diversity-themed images on the University's website, asking whether they reflected or falsified campus reality. Another key performance indicator is the diversification of the student body and, as a related question, what our specific goal for student diversity is. Regarding faculty diversity, T. Mills noted the progress we had made, for example, with the recent arrival of the three postdoctoral fellows, all of whom are pleased to be here. What, however, will happen when their official stay comes to an end? T. Mills also said that the most important issue was the need of buy-in from the entire JCU community as to accountability. On the issue of mandatory training for the community, T. Mills does not favor it, noting that certain affinity groups might try excusing themselves from any training that was mandated.

At this point J. Colleran posed the question, "What do we want from the subcommittee reports?" She suggested that the PC would like to find out what each subcommittee is thinking about, as well as the information it would like to convey so that action might be taken and then reported to the larger community. It's likely that any one subcommittee will be able to report no more than three times during the year, which means that we need to develop a plan of implementation. For that reason, she asked whether the PC ought to consider weekly meetings. Another question that came up had to do with the external groups and individuals that the subcommittees will have to draw into their work and the questions that the subcommittees will need to ask.

Next, speaking for the subcommittee on student thriving, M. Millet said that the main question before her group as it discussed the learning commons was what would have the biggest impact on student learning. She said it would be necessary to consult, among others, Carol Dietz, Allison West Kaskey, and the associate deans, and then return to the PC with a plan. Another issue concerned the students that we are trying to serve.

M. Farrar asked about the connection between the work of the PC and the USPG Steering Committee; in other words, what are the most important things that the PC should be doing? D. Kilbride urged that, if we know certain things would strengthen retention, we simply do them; also, that the PC needs to focus on major matters.

Next, reporting for the subcommittee on reflection, E. Peck said that the group had met twice and outlined the work before it. Catherine Sherman has completed an inventory about reflection activities taking place throughout campus. A definition of, and framework for, reflection have been drafted and need to be reviewed and refined by the appropriate groups on campus. Next steps include developing 1) metrics to track the growth in reflection and 2) some means of enabling students to store and integrate significant reflections throughout their undergraduate experience. The project will need to be piloted, and the PC may want to recommend how the resulting data might be used.

The meeting ended at 10:05 a.m.

Minutes recorded by J. Krukones