

**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, Pat Mullane, Ed Peck, Nick Santilli, John Sully, Peifang Tian, Steven Vitatoe, David Wong.

March 1, 2017

8:30 a.m.; CAS Dean's Conference Room

Minutes

Present: J. Colleran, E. Butler, L. Calkins, S. Crahen, M. Farrar, K. Feely, M. Hendren, J. Krukones, P. Kvidera, M. McCarthy, M. Millet, T. Mills, P. Mullane, E. Peck, N. Santilli, J. Sully, D. Wong

J. Colleran announced that Dean Miciak came through his recent surgery successfully.

The major item on the agenda featured T. Mills addressing the subject of diversity. He pointed out that diversity often gets put on the back burner. Asking whether JCU is ready to undertake a diversity readiness assessment, he suggested that we probably will need to go forward with it. With the help of a PowerPoint presentation, he then introduced the concept of Multicultural Organizational Development (MCOOD), a process of "best practices" to create socially just, inclusive campus communities. T. Mills explained that MCOOD would enable us to gather the perceptions and perspectives of the different stakeholders on campus and answer the question as to what the perception of diversity is at JCU. The last such assessment, conducted by FOCO, took place about ten years ago. T. Mills noted that any future assessment needed to be data-informed as well as mission-centered. He cited the institutional diversity rubric developed by the New England Resource Center for Higher Education (NERCHE) as a self-assessment instrument that supports the development of a culture of evidence and inquiry and that could be tailored to JCU needs. It involves six dimensions of institutional change (philosophy and mission of diversity, equity, and inclusion; faculty support; curriculum, pedagogy, and research; staff engagement; student support; and administrative leadership and institutional support); also, the process is marked by three stages of development—emerging, developing, and transforming. The results of the assessment would help inform subsequent efforts at diversifying the faculty and student body.

T. Mills explained that the committee on Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion has been studying and discussing how JCU might go forward, specifically, by starting with the institution as a whole and then asking community members to reflect on the state of affairs in their own departments. J. Colleran suggested that the Provost's Council could give the signal to go forward, adding that the president and the Senior Leadership Team think the initiative important and linked to the University Strategic Plan. M. Farrar asked whether the assessment would be linked to the Office of Institutional Effectiveness and its own cycle of data collection and surveys. N. Santilli wondered when the survey would be undertaken, noting that the IE website includes a cycle of surveys. T. Mills replied that DEI has not yet discussed the issue of timing, as its focus has been making the survey strong. M. Farrar asked about the survey process, cautioning that we not go

overboard with surveys and wondering whether we might already be asking these questions. She added that she could see this project going two ways: 1) a University-wide conversation about our diversity needs; 2) building these impulses into what we're already doing. J. Colleran said that we are definitely ready for (i.e., in need of) the assessment, but perhaps not ready in terms of the skill needed to carry it out. She asked whether we first should settle the issue as to the institution going forward with the assessment at this point. E. Peck agreed that we are ready and that any inability to carry it out simply indicates our need of it. J. Colleran suggested that the survey(s) could take place next year, by the end of which a report with suggestions would be issued; the following year would include specific activities by individual departments. In other words, this would be a multi-year, systematic effort. T. Mills expressed appreciation for the substantive nature of the discussion and said that DEI still has work to do. S. Crahen said that the survey will raise awareness, which by itself would make it worthwhile. J. Colleran said that perhaps DEI should consult with N. Santilli about the project. We need a mechanism to bring together the multiple sources of information about diversity on campus, as well as someone in particular to gather all of this information. L. Calkins asked whether the survey would be administered to everyone; T. Mills replied that that remains to be decided, perhaps with guidance from the PC. To bring closure to this part of the meeting, J. Colleran asked whether the PC would support an institutional initiative on diversity. Everyone present backed the motion. She said that the DEI would work on the survey and that T. Mills would help prepare an announcement about it.

In conclusion, J. Colleran reminded everyone that a community conversation would take place that afternoon dealing with the University's fiscal situation and that follow-up meetings would be held on the University and divisional levels within the next few days and weeks. Another community conversation is scheduled for April 5.

Finally, the March 22 meeting of the PC will focus on justice.

The meeting concluded at 9:50 a.m.

Minutes recorded by J. Krukones