

**Faculty Council Meeting**  
**March 16, 2016**  
**Mackin Room, Grasselli Library**

The following members were present: Barbara D'Ambrosia (chair), Mindy Peden (vice chair), Gerry Guest (secretary), Scott Allen, Medora Barnes, Mary Beadle, Emily Butler, Larry Cima, Gwen Compton-Engle, Roy Day, Jeff Dyck, Tina Facca-Miess, Jean Feerick, Brendan Foreman, Nathan Gehlert, Dwight Hahn, Sharon Kaye, Dan Kilbride, Tamba Nlandu, Peifang Tian, Elizabeth Stiles, Mariah Webinger, and Tom Zlatoper.

The following members were absent: Annie Moses, Nancy Taylor.

The agenda for the meeting was distributed in advance via email. The meeting started at 2:03 pm.

**Minutes**

1. Chair's announcements

- Minutes from February 10 Faculty Council meeting. With no changes being offered, the minutes were taken as approved.
  
- Community Forum on the Notice Report for HLC: Wednesday, April 6. A draft will be released by April 1. Feedback is important!
  
- D'Ambrosia thanked the Council for meeting with the University Committee on Collaborative Governance. The UCCG also held meetings yesterday with the university leadership, deans, associate deans, and staff council. One more day of listening sessions is left (with President Niehoff). After the listening sessions, the committee will consider where to go next.
  
- Provost Council – Peden reported that at the meeting held this morning the Provost announced what she described as an “epistemological shift.” She now understands better that critique is part of the process. This would suggest that work by the faculty is starting to pay off.
  
- Strategic Plan – Goal groups are meeting to draft objectives. Work needs to begin on this for the HLC report.

2. Items for Business

- Proposal on changes to transfer credit procedures (see Appendix for documentation) CAP has been involved with the process from its inception. The changes outlined in the Appendix document would go into effect with the next Bulletin – so it doesn't necessarily have to be fully dealt with this semester. Compton-Engle noted that among the goals here are consistency and a reduction in the number of students being granted exceptions to the rules.

**Peden moved that the proposal be sent to CAP (seconded Day). Without further discussion, the motion passed unanimously (18 yes votes).** It was agreed that Maryclaire Moroney was the appropriate administrator to act as liaison for this task.

- Proposal on changes to “Examining the Human Experience” integrated courses in the core curriculum (see Appendix for documentation).

Background: In the original Core document it states that for every EHE linked pair of courses at least one of the courses must come from AH, CMLC/CL/IC, CO, EN, or HS. The proposed change would add EC, PO, SC, PL, or TRS to that group. It is important to note that the other course in the linked pair may come from any department (whether or not this proposed change goes through). It is hoped that this proposed change will encourage broader participation and more creative collaboration in EHE courses.

Among points discussed:

Kilbride asked why TRS and Philosophy are being added when they already have their own place in the core. In response, it was noted that no “double dipping” by students would be allowed (EHE pairs would not satisfy other core requirements). Feerick noted that this proposed change might reduce the number of Humanities credits taken by students. Barnes noted that the fixed timeslots for linked courses are a problem here, discouraging faculty participation.

**Stiles moved to send the proposal to CAP (Kilbride seconded).** In the discussion, Webinger pointed out that much of the Boler School is excluded from the Core. Peden suggested that there are lots of Boler possibilities for the core. **The motion passed unanimously (22 yes votes).** It was agreed that Anne Kugler would serve as administrative liaison.

- Faculty Council contributions to the Notice Report for HLC – examples of improved communication and collaboration.

A draft of the HLC report exists and is being worked on. The Board of Directors discussed it last week. D’Ambrosia reported that some challenges are being felt. A consultant was in last week. Some JCU readers have read the current draft report as well. Among the concerns voiced:

- The maturity of our assessment processes
- The linking of budget to strategic planning (the administration is working on this)
- Communication, collaboration, morale.

D’Ambrosia asked the Council to make a list of ways that faculty or Faculty Council have acted to help improve communication and collaboration. The list:

- Council committees working with designed administrator-liaisons on specific tasks
- The rethinking of the Strategic Plan (and the process) after faculty expressed concern
- The handling of Direct Admit
- The Salary proposal and its ongoing evolution
- Council’s meeting with the University Committee on Collaborative Governance
- The abolishment of the Faculty Council Committee on Revenue and Spending
- Faculty liaisons to Board committees (annual orientation meeting and reporting back)
- Provost Council reports at Faculty Council meetings. The council is evolving and reporting back here is significant.

- The evolution of the new cohort advising system.
- The use of Canvas for faculty discussions (an improvement on open hearings; perhaps six discussions so far)
- Community Forums are now more interactive. People are engaged in conversations.

Foreman asked how morale is being measured. D'Ambrosia replied that it's not being measured at the moment; we can't re-do the Great Colleges survey because it's too soon.

Stiles suggested that JCU needs an internal communications plan. D'Ambrosia noted that this was mentioned at the UCCG listening sessions yesterday. Kaye asked if there could be a shared JCU calendar; D'Ambrosia asked at what level. Some discussion of the JCU website followed. Peden suggested that a change in governance structure might make us more collaborative – putting faculty into conversations across campus.

Stiles suggested that an additional item for the “collaboration list” might be the letter that circulated among some faculty about the open forum on race at JCU. It critiqued the Catholic nature of the presentation and a meeting resulted.

- Status of the salary proposal

Kilbride reported that of late work on the Salary Proposal has been a good example of collaborative governance. At a recent meeting with Jeanne Colleran and Rich Mausser, they accepted the peer group. Continued discussion of the salary proposal also took place. It was agreed that the proposal is ambitious at present but the possibility of a staggered implementation is being discussed. For the next three years, there will be at least a 2% raise pool for faculty and staff each year (these are merit increases). Beyond that, we would work toward a 110% average compensation rate at JCU compared to our peer group average salary. The provost is currently drawing up a written response to these ideas; the committee is hoping for a formal endorsement.

D'Ambrosia asked if we might be able to vote on the proposal this year. Kilbride responded that it depends on the provost's response.

Day asked if Rich Mausser is building this 2% raise into the budget. If so, this seems like an improvement over recent practices.

- Request to develop university-wide expectations for academic advisors

The advising office recently sent out a request to advisors of graduating seniors asking for their help in making sure students are meeting requirements for graduation. This opens a discussion about the fact that we don't really have expectations for major advisors. The registrar suggested that developing guidelines would be a good idea – it would give the registrar and the assistant deans some expectations about what they should be doing.

Beadle noted that we used to do graduation paperwork by hand in the fall.

Peden noted that work on these issues has been done before and that there's been a lack of clarity for a long time. D'Ambrosia noted that departments have differing procedures. Stiles noted that faculty could be included in the computerized part of the process as a way of making things flow more smoothly. D'Ambrosia asked the Council whether we want to assign a

committee or a task force to collaborate on this problem. Allen argued that it would create more work for us. Facca noted that some type of intranet would be useful here. D'Ambrosia added that this has been a common request this year. Barnes suggested that these issues could be covered during advising workshops.

### 3. Faculty Council Committee Reports

D'Ambrosia asked each Faculty Council committee chair to report on current work to make sure that an administrator-liaison has been assigned to each task.

- Student Life is working with Claudia Wenzel and with Brian Williams on different issues.
- RTP is working with Jim Krukones on a potential Faculty Handbook amendment.
- RSFD just completed its evaluation of summer course development grants. D'Ambrosia asked if an administrative collaborator is appropriate here. The committee worked with Rodney Hessinger and has collaborated with Jim Krukones on research grants.
- Gender & Diversity is working on transgender pronouns with the registrar and Title IX coordinator; they are working with the HR Director on the possibility of exit interviews with departing faculty.
- Elections – no collaborator needed
- Compensation is working with the Provost and Rich Mausser, also with the HR director on benefits; Deans have contributed to the discussion on the self-evaluation. Kilbride reported that HealthSpan is being phased out among our healthcare insurers. This was previously the Kaiser plan; fewer than 20 employees now use it and are being transitioned to new plans. The committee envisions a larger conversation to be held about benefits.
- CAP is working with Jim Krukones and the registrar's office on a better communication mechanism for departmental level curricular changes.

### 4. Agenda for the March 30 General Faculty Meeting.

D'Ambrosia asked for agenda items. Possibilities discussed:

A report from the Core director on the state of the new core curriculum.

We could ask the Provost to do a Q&A.

We could have a UCCG update.

We could have a report on the current status of cohort advising.

### 5. New Business – none

### 6. Adjourn – the meeting was adjourned at 3:11 pm.

Respectfully submitted,  
Gerry Guest  
Faculty Council Secretary

**PROPOSED CHANGES TO THE UNIVERSITY'S TRANSFER  
CREDIT POLICIES, FOR THE 2017-2019 UNDERGRADUATE  
BULLETIN**

**EXECUTIVE SUMMARY**

**FEBRUARY 2016**

Submitted to Faculty Council by a cross-divisional group of faculty and administrators charged by the Provost's Council with reviewing current academic policies and making recommendations for improvement: M. Moroney (chair), L. Atkins, L. Calkins, G. Compton-Engle, C. DeMarchi, R. Drenovsky, M. Finucane, M. Hendren, P. Kvidera, A. Kugler, G. Lacueva, P. Mason, C. Sherman

**RATIONALE FOR REVIEW AND RECOMMENDATIONS:**

The current higher education landscape is one of heightened student mobility. Given national concerns about college completion rates, it is in everyone's interest to make transferring credits as efficient and transparent a process as possible without compromising degree integrity. To this end, members of CAP, the University Registrar, the Assistant and Associate Deans of Boler and CAS, and the Assistant Provost for Advising and Student Support, met to review our current policies and procedures. What follows distills our discussion of institutional needs and national best practices into a short list of recommended changes. In particular, we hope to build shared expectations concerning best practices in evaluating transfer coursework.

1. Replace current language concerning learning goals and the Integrative Core (p. 21) with an initial, more broadly applicable definition of what will be considered for transfer credit. The language of this recommendation is consistent with the HLC's description of best practices in assessing transfer coursework.

**Coursework taken at another regionally accredited academic institution or foreign equivalent may be awarded credit towards a John Carroll degree. Courses are reviewed by department chairs, program directors, and academic deans for acceptability, comparability, and applicability to programs offered at John Carroll.**

2. **Replace the C- standard for transfer coursework with the C for all students.**

Our current policy differentiates between new transfer students and current John Carroll students. Incoming freshmen and new transfer students may bring in coursework for which they earned a C- or higher (p. 25); current John Carroll students must earn a C or higher to bring in credits from another institution (pp. 118-119). According to Admissions, the change to the C standard would have a negligible effect on the credits brought in by new transfer students. The University defines academic good standing as a C or higher. It makes sense to communicate this consistently through our transfer credit policy. Thus, we recommend replacing the C- language with the C wherever needed in both the bulletin and on the admissions website.

### **3. Replace the 64 credit rule and the last 30 credits in residence rule.**

The Boler School has clearly stated rules concerning how much coursework can be transferred in for either Boler core courses or for a major in Boler. The College of Arts and Sciences uses several policies—one limiting transfer course work to 64 credits brought in from two-year schools and another requirement that the last 30 credits of a student’s degree must be earned in residence at John Carroll. All of these policies are also applicable to Boler students, but CAS students do not, currently, have one consistent policy concerning what they may take away from the University and what must be earned here. Our proposal, which does not replace Boler’s requirements but which offers clarity for CAS, is to replace the current policies with:

- At least 50% of the credits for the degree must be earned at John Carroll or through an approved study abroad or dual-degree program.**
- At least 50% of the credits for the major must be earned at John Carroll or through an approved study abroad or dual-degree program.**

**Students in the Boler School of Business should consult Boler stipulations about transfer coursework for their majors.**

### **4. Eliminate the age stipulation for the CLEP exams, and be more explicit about our willingness to review scores from international exams for the award of credit.**

## **ADDENDUM TO EXECUTIVE SUMMARY**

**This includes the passages from the current bulletin we propose for modification. Passages concerning transfer credits which are not affected by our recommendations are not included here. Recommended changes will include all instances of a particular policy (e.g., moving from C- to C as the standard for transfer credits).**

### **I. GENERAL STATEMENTS ABOUT CREDIT TRANSFERABILITY**

#### **a. Current language in bulletin (p. 21):**

Determination of credit transferability occurs at the time of admission evaluation and decision. A listing of the applicant’s courses and credits which are transferable to John Carroll University will be sent to the admitted student shortly after the admission decision has been made, provided we have an official copy of the transcript. For all students new to the University, all requests of transfer courses for the Integrative Core Curriculum must be submitted by the end of the second semester after matriculation.

Credit for advanced standing will be accepted from regionally accredited institutions, subject to the following restrictions: Credit will not be given for courses completed with the lowest passing grade, though these courses need not always be repeated; courses completed with a “Pass” grade will not be accepted unless it can be established that the “Pass” was the equivalent of a “C-“ grade or higher; no credit will be given, even as general electives, for courses in orientation, applied arts, athletics, or technical training which do not contribute to the goals of a liberal arts education.

Transfer guides for Lakeland, Cuyahoga, and Lorain County Community Colleges are available on request and online. The limit of transfer credits from a community college is 64 semester hours (96 quarter hours). In no instance will a degree be awarded to a transfer student unless the last 30 semester hours have been completed at John Carroll University.

Courses completed to satisfy the Integrative Core Curriculum requirements must conform substantially to the requirements, including learning goals, of courses offered at John Carroll University. Quantitatively, credits from other schools must be within one credit hour of the Core requirements in the subject area involved. Quality points and grades are not transferred, only credit hours. Approval of application of transfer credits to a major program is determined by the chair of the department with the approval of the appropriate dean. Most departments require that at least half of the major be completed at John Carroll University. For the specific requirements, transfer students should consult the sections of this *Bulletin* devoted to individual departments and majors.

### **b. Proposed substitution:**

The University offers students two ways to receive transfer credits towards the John Carroll degree. Prior to matriculation, students may earn college credits through exams administered by major testing programs or by coursework taken at accredited institutions of higher education or their foreign equivalents. Initial determination of credit transferability occurs at the time of evaluation for admission. All requests for transfer of credits earned prior to matriculation must be submitted by the end of the second semester after matriculation. To ensure transferability of credits after matriculation, students must have an approved petition in advance of taking courses through University-approved study abroad programs or at other regionally accredited institutions. Transcripts must be sent directly to the University registrar.

Courses proposed for transfer credit must be completed with a C or higher (not Pass/Fail, unless it can be determined that the passing mark is equivalent to a C or higher). Coursework taken at another regionally accredited academic institution or a foreign equivalent may be awarded credit towards a John Carroll degree. Courses are reviewed by department chairs, program directors, and academic deans using the following criteria:

\*Acceptability: course work acknowledged by the university as having met standards for evaluation and award of undergraduate transfer credit

\* Comparability: the coursework is comparable in content, expectations, and credit hours to courses offered at John Carroll

\* Applicability: the coursework is deemed appropriate for use within a degree program to fulfill specific requirements

(These definitions will also appear in the Bulletin's glossary.)

Some restrictions apply. Qualitatively, credits from other schools must be within one credit hour of comparable work at John Carroll. Quality points and grades are not transferred, only credits. At least 50% of the credits for the degree must be earned at John Carroll or through an approved dual-degree or study-abroad program. At least 50% of the credits for the major must be earned at John Carroll or through an approved dual-degree or study-abroad program.

### **RATIONALE FOR CHANGES:**

- **More detailed description of transferable credits, along with definitions used nationally (acceptability, equivalence, and so on) to examine categories of transferable courses. This replaces the language of learning outcomes, and moves beyond the Integrative Core to include a single standard for all credit transfers.**

- **Standardize C/C-. On p. 119 of the bulletin, “A grade of C or better is required for transfer of credits” for currently enrolled John Carroll students, as distinct from the C- currently required of students prior to matriculation.**
- **Remove the language of what will not be considered (courses in orientation, applied arts, and so on), given the lack of consistent definitions of such coursework.**
- **Replace the 64 credits from community college and the last 30 credits in residence with a 50% requirement for the degree and for the major. This is a baseline requirement; individual programs (e.g., Bolser majors) may have a higher requirement.**

## **II. CLEP and Other Credit options**

### **A. Current Language in Bulletin (pp. 31-32)**

Adults, 21 or older, who through personal study and effort may have developed the knowledge, understanding, and skills normally associated with certain college-level courses, may be permitted to earn up to 30 semester hours of credits on the basis of high achievement on the General and/or Subject tests administered by the College Entrance Examination Board in its College Level Examination Program (CLEP). The amount of credit granted will depend on the tests taken the scores achieved, the degree program to be pursued, and the major field. Earned CLEP credit does not convert to letter grades and does not apply toward graduation honors. CLEP exams may not be used to fulfill the last 30 semester hours of credit. Students planning to take CLEP tests should consult the Office of Admission or their academic advisor.

On a case-by-case basis, John Carroll University may recognize and accept other types of college credit than those listed (e.g., A-levels). Once students commit to John Carroll and submit their enrollment deposit, they should present official documentation to the Office of Admission at John Carroll for an official credit evaluation.

### **B. Proposed substitution:**

The College Level Examination Placement (CLEP) is designed to assist students who through personal study and effort may be developed the knowledge, understanding, and skills normally associated with certain college-level courses. The amount of credit granted will depend on the tests taken, the scores achieved, the degree program to be pursued, and the major field. Earned CLEP credits do not convert to letter grades and do not apply towards graduation honors. CLEP scores must be submitted at the point of matriculation, and may not be used to fulfill the last 30 semester hours of credit at John Carroll. Students planning to take CLEP exams should consult the Office of Admission for a list of exams accepted and scores needed for the award of credit.

The University awards transfer credits for various international exams on a case-by-case basis. The most common type is the General Certificate of Education- A-level, but other exams will also be considered. Students who have made an enrollment deposit at John Carroll, and who wish to submit their exam scores for award of credit, should present official documentation of those scores to the Office of the Registrar.

### **RATIONALE:**

- **The CLEP exams may be taken by students younger than 21 years of age. The new wording makes clear that we review only a specific list of CLEP exams for John Carroll**

**credit, and directs students solely to the Admissions office, which has that information, and not to faculty, who do not.**

- We make clear that scores on international exams other than A-levels will be reviewed through the registrar's office for credit.**

---

TO: Dr. Barbara D'Ambrosia  
Chair, Faculty Council  
FROM: Peter Kvidera (Director, Integrative Core Curriculum) and the Integrative Core Curriculum Committee  
RE: Revision to original core document: Integrated Courses (EHE)

---

### **Proposed revision to “distributive” requirements in Examining Human Experience courses (EHE) in the Integrative Core Curriculum**

The Integrative Core Curriculum committee proposes that the faculty consider changes to the requirements for Examining Human Experience courses. In brief, the committee recommends expanding the number of departments from which EHE courses can be offered. (We are not recommending changes to ENW or EGC requirements.)

#### ***Glossary:***

- EHE: Examining the Human Experience; two linked courses from different departments*
- ENW: Exploring the Natural World; two linked courses from different departments*
- EGC: Engaging the Global Community; one course that integrates at least two distinct disciplines, either team taught, or taught as part of a learning community*

Current integrated course requirements:

- EHE must include one course from AH, CMLC/CL/IC, CO, EN, or HS**
- ENW must include one course from BL, CH, MT/CS, PH/EP, or PS
- EGC must meet the EGC learning goals
- Students must take at least one course from each of {BL, CH, MT/CS, PH/EP, PS}, {AH, CMLC/CL/IC, CO, EN, HS}, and {EC, PO, SC}.

Recommended changes to integrated course requirements: Expand EHE to include “social sciences,” PL, TRS:

- EHE must include one course from AH, CMLC/CL/IC, CO, EN, HS, EC, PO, SC, PL, or TRS**
- ENW must include one course from BL, CH, MT/CS, PH/EP, or PS
- EGC must meet the EGC learning goals
- Students must take at least one course from each of {BL, CH, MT/CS, PH/EP, PS}, {AH, CMLC/CL/IC, CO, EN, HS}, and {EC, PO, SC}.

#### **Rationale for changes:**

While currently, the required course in an EHE pair is a humanities course, the Integrative Core Curriculum committee argues that “human experience” can and should be examined from a number of disciplines and understands that combinations of courses from departments outside of the

humanities can also effectively meet the EHE learning goals. For example, a combination of courses from SC and EC or PO and TRS (currently not allowed for EHE) can very well meet the required learning goals of integrated knowledge, critical analysis and aesthetic appreciation, and multiple forms of expression. By expanding the departments that can offer EHE courses, we allow fuller participation from the social sciences, PL, and TRS in the integrated courses.

The committee also understands the current requirement to be driven by the concern that students take a wide variety of courses from different disciplines, something along the lines of the divisional distribution model of the old Core (Distributive) Curriculum. The EHE courses, as originally proposed, ensure that a student fulfills the “humanities” requirement of taking a course from AH, CMLC/IC/CL, CO, EN, and HS. The committee argues that the desired distribution of courses across disciplines will remain intact even with the proposed changes because we will not change the requirement that students must take a course from among the three categories of courses:

- (1) BL, CH, MT/CS, PH/EP, PS;
- (2) AH, CMLC/CL/IC, CO, EN, HS;
- (3) EC, PO, SC.

The proposed changes will allow students more freedom to complete this distribution requirement in a larger variety of integrated courses.

To ensure that students complete these requirements, we would include an attribute on all integrated courses, which notes that a particular course fulfills a particular category (#1, #2, or #3). A student’s degree evaluation will indicate completion of this distribution requirement.

**Note:** One of the courses in a linked EHE pair must come from the list above; the other course may come from any department or program. This allows for the inclusion of courses from ED, WGS, MN, etc., as part of an EHE pair. These other departments and programs can likewise contribute to an ENW pair.

---

## **Report from Committee on Academic Policies**

March 11, 2016

Submitted by Gwen Compton-Engle, Chair

CAP met on February 16 to continue its work on developing a mechanism for approval and communication of department-level curricular changes.

First, the chair summarized her conversation with the registrar, who had strongly emphasized the need for clear channels of communication and approval regarding changes to academic programs.

Discussion centered on revising a drafted procedure of approval and notification. Major points were:

- The effective date for new programs, changes to programs, and course renumbering should be the next academic year. Although Bulletins are printed in two-year cycles, an addendum could be produced in the off years to represent approved changes.
- CAP should not have a role in reviewing changes to existing programs.
- Instead, at a chairs’ meeting early each semester, chairs should discuss planned changes to their department’s major/minor programs, so that other chairs are aware of each department’s plans.

- So that chairs can predict the impact of their changes on other departments, there should be a master list of major requirements that lists all courses from other departments that are used by a different department/major. This could be maintained by the Provost's office.
- The Admissions Office (in addition to Registrar's Office) should be included in notifications about new programs or substantial changes in programs, so that their materials can be accurate.
- The Associate Dean responsible for graduate programs should be part of the approval chain for any graduate-level program changes
- Joint programs with other institutions (such as a 3-3 program with a law school, or a similar program with a medical school) count as new programs and should be submitted for CAP review.
- Also noted: the problem of which Bulletin governs a student's requirements—Bulletin of entry or Bulletin at major declaration? This needs to be addressed at some point.

After the meeting, the CAP chair gathered additional input from the Associate Deans from CAS and the Boler School of Business.

Next steps:

- Michelle Walker from the Registrar's Office and Jim Krukones from the Provost's Office will attend CAP's next meeting (March 15) to work with us on logistics (forms, deadlines, etc.) and other refinements to the draft
- The resulting draft will be shared with a chairs' meeting in April for further feedback, and then, pending further revision, will be forwarded to Faculty Council.

## **APPENDIX B: Board Committee Reports**

### **JCU Board of Directors – Academic Affairs Committee**

**March 8, 2016**

**Report**

**Barbara D'Ambrosia, Faculty Council Chair**

The meeting started with a motion to confer degrees on those students who have completed their graduation requirements. The motion passed, so our graduating students will, indeed, graduate.

Cheryl Jacobsen, an accreditation consultant, spoke about accreditation in general and our status in particular:

- The accreditation environment has changed substantially in the past 20+ years, from a consultative process to one of ensuring compliance with standards.
- Getting off Notice is not the end of the process for us; we need to continue to work on long-term change.
- While in the past, institutions could make claims that were accepted at face value, the new reality is that we must use evidence to document the claims that we make.
- JCU has done a tremendous amount of work in the last year and a half. We have clear structural changes, new reporting lines, and more cross-divisional activity.

- A major area of concern is the short timeline; the Action Letter from the HLC ask us to demonstrate mature processes, with evidence of sustainability. Given that we have only recently begun collecting data in a systematic way, it is difficult to analyze it and use it effectively in the time remaining before our report is due. Likewise, we face a challenge in demonstrating lasting changes in collaboration and communication structures.
- JCU needs a change of culture. The foundation of a change in culture is a change of attitude. This gets at the issue of morale.

Jeanne Colleran (Provost) mentioned that decisions based on Academic Program Reviews will be made in July.

The meeting quickly moved into Executive Session, so that the members could go through the draft Notice Report in some detail. I was asked to remain, along with Fr. Niehoff, Dr. Colleran, Dr. Santilli (Associate Provost for Accreditation and Institutional Effectiveness), and Dr. Jacobsen. Prior to the committee meeting, members of the committee were assigned in pairs to read a portion of the draft report closely. During the roughly two hours of the Executive Session, each pair described where they saw strengths and weaknesses in what they had read. Members of the committee asked clarifying questions, mostly of Drs. Jacobsen and Colleran. Many committee members later gave Dr. Colleran detailed notes on the sections that they had read. It was clear that the committee members were deeply engaged in the report and sincere in their efforts and desires to help the University get off Notice.

At the end of the meeting, the committee praised Dr. Colleran for her leadership.

### **Advancement Committee of the Board of Directors**

Meeting of March 8, 2016

Notes by Gerry Guest (Faculty Council secretary)

**Note:** This was a relatively short meeting, with only two members of the Board in attendance.

The Forever Carroll Campaign. The campaign, which began in May 2013, is now extremely close to reaching its \$100 million goal (less than \$500,000 remains to be raised). Board giving and board participation has been a huge part of the success of the campaign.

The Carroll Fund is struggling to hit its goals this year (dollar wise). One-on-one meetings (as opposed to phone calls or mailings) are what is needed to bridge the gap.

Data from the 2015 undergraduate alumni survey has been assembled into a results booklet that is now ready for distribution. Among the areas singled out for improvement by our alumni are internships and jobs; many of the alumni who responded to the survey indicated that they did not receive a lot of assistance from JCU when it came to finding internships and jobs. It would seem that we could work more integratively to improve this.

Doreen Riley and Dave Vitatoe indicated that it would likely be possible for academic departments to pull out slices of the alumni survey data to see how their graduates responded.

Finally, Riley reported that the consulting report prepared by Campbell and Company with regard to the work of the Development team would be used as an external review for that component of the Advancement Division.

Minutes of the Board Finance Committee, March 8, 2016  
Dan Kilbride

The board began by reviewing changes in the financial statement over the last few months. We had a 94% fall-spring retention rate for the freshman class, slightly below what we usually have. Also some issues with the sophomore class. It cost us a \$350,000 decline in NTR for the spring semester, and a \$300,000 room and board shortfall. We lost 30 more students than our modeling had predicted (3-year average). We had forecast to be \$250,000 in the black as of 11/30/15; the estimate as of 3/8/16 is \$250,000 less – so we will break even for the year.

(350) NTR + (300) RB -150 (health care) – 200 (utility savings) – 50 (interest savings) = (250,000).

Discussion of retention and cohort advising followed.

Medical claims helped us in the last quarter but we and everybody else are getting slammed by high & growing drug costs, driven by companies raising drug prices.

A \$2 million principal payment to bonds not made due to refinancing; that 2 million, or a lot of it, will be devoted to capital spending, which has not been funded for several years running. Discussion of spending just some of that 2 million, pouring the rest into the budget, coming out with a surplus?

Budget modeling, FY 2017-2020. 765 freshmen the stated goal; 800 the “stretch goal.”

We begin FY 2017 with a \$900K deficit; some temporary savings this year will **not** be repeated in FY 17, hence the (\$900). Endowment down to \$180M from \$205M because of the market. Forecast: balance FY 17, \$1.2M surplus FY 18, \$1.8M FY 19, \$2.9M FY 2020.

Faculty/staff wage pools: 2% annually.

Postdoc positions add \$270K in expenses; \$120K for title IX staffing.

Discount rates rising nationally: 2% this past year; average 46% to 48%. A very competitive environment. Everyone is doing the same thing.

Moody’s downgrade; our bond position reaffirmed at A3 with a negative outlook. Discussion – we are pleased with this; Moody’s wants to see budget surpluses, for us to meet enrollment goals, and for us to get off the HLC’s bad side. Opinion is that Moody’s was being careful; said the negative outlook could be short lived; JCU’s foundations are sound. Discussion of bringing in, say, 50 more freshmen; need more “touches” (contact with people at JCU) – faculty, dept. chairs, alums. Discussion of new director of marketing & strategies for “touches.” Why will

this person report to Doreen, and not Brian? Will the right hand know what the left hand is doing? Board chair thought this was a **very** good question.

I reported on the salary proposal, and asked for the board's support.