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INTRODUCTION

Overview of Carroll University

Carroll University, chartered in 1846, is Wisconsin's oldest institution of higher education. Known as Wisconsin's "Pioneer College," Carroll's historic commitment to the liberal arts remains the core of its academic program. Carroll offers 45 discipline-specific and interdisciplinary undergraduate majors in the humanities, social sciences, fine arts, natural and health sciences, business and education, and five graduate programs. Total student enrollment in fall 2011 was 3,523, including 267 graduate students. Carroll has experienced record enrollment over the past several years. It is a financially stable, carefully-managed institution that has achieved balanced budgets or better for the past 17 years.

The mission of Carroll University is as follows:

We will provide a superior educational opportunity for our students, one grounded in the liberal arts tradition and focused on career preparation and lifelong learning.

We will demonstrate Christian values by our example.

We shall succeed in our mission, when our graduates are prepared for careers of their choice and lives of fulfillment, service and accomplishment.

Context of the Focused Visit

The Comprehensive Visit in 2008 found Carroll University in the midst of important transition. Shared governance had been eroding since 2003. In 2005, the faculty voted to unionize under the United Auto Workers (UAW), a move which was approved by the National Labor Relations Board (NLRB) and appealed by the institution. At the time of the Visit, that appeal was still ongoing in the Federal Court of Appeals (the NLRB decision was vacated in March 2009 and the union issue is now closed).

By the time of the Visit in 2008 the Carroll community had already begun to make important and fundamental progress in addressing problems of shared governance since the arrival of a new
President in 2006 and Provost in 2007. We are proud to report that this progress continues to the present; it is fully described in Chapter Two.

Following our receipt of the Report of the Comprehensive Visit, the University requested a meeting of a Review Committee, as we felt that the Report did not reflect an understanding of the substantial progress on shared governance that we had made together since 2006. Following the meeting of a Review Committee in August 2008, and based on a Report from the Comprehensive Visit of March 2008, the Higher Learning Commission (HLC) did recognize the progress we had made to date and supported the Team recommendation for a Focused Visit in academic year 2012-2013 to review continued progress on mission review and shared governance.

Since the 2008 Comprehensive Visit, Carroll University has submitted four requests to the HLC, all of which were approved:

- For approval of the MBA program (2009)
- For approval of the M.S. in Physician's Assistant Studies (2010)
- For approval of the new Center for Graduate Studies as an instructional location (2010)
- A February 2011 request to remove the stipulations limiting the expansion of master's programs, and, regarding our Master of Arts in Education Learning and Teaching ("Learning Communities") program.

The February 2011 request for "blanket master's" approval had been discussed and developed over the course of two years with our then HLC liaison, and subsequently discussed with our current liaison. However, Commission regulations were changing during that period, and we were informed in June 2011 that our request could not be considered due to the pending Focused Visit. Our HLC liaison recommended that we move up the Focused Visit to Spring 2012 and that the "blanket master's" request be included as a third focus. We agreed to do so and received notice of the dates of the visit on October 14, 2011.

Report Development Process

During the fall 2011 semester, in anticipation of the scheduling of a Spring 2012 Focused Visit, the Provost compiled progress reports relevant to the three areas under review from the four
requests submitted to HLC since 2008. On October 31, 2011, the President created and charged three broadly representative writing groups to develop reports on progress towards mission review, shared governance, and on graduate program assessment and governance. In his memo to the three groups, he noted the short timeline and, to facilitate the process, sent each group the Provost's compilation of reported progress relevant to each area.

- **The Mission Review Writing Group** was co-chaired by the current and former chairs of the Carroll University Board of Trustees. Its membership included seven other Trustees; two faculty members of the Spiritual Life Advisory Board; Student Senate President; University Assembly President (also a member of the Spiritual Life Advisory Board); and a representative from the Staff Executive Committee.

As some of the Trustee members lived out of state, the first meeting of the Writing Group took place with some members joining by phone. The compiled document was discussed and a number of revisions, of content and form, were suggested. A revision was developed by the Provost and sent to the group. Revisions were again solicited and made to the document.

- **The Shared Governance Writing Group** was co-chaired by the President of the Faculty and the Provost. It consisted of the Assembly President; Chair of the Planning and Budget Committee; Director of Faculty Development; Chair of the Tenure and Promotion Committee; the Dean of the College of Humanities and Social Sciences; Dean of the College of Natural Science, Health Science, and Business; Dean of Students; Student Senate President; and the President of the Graduate Student Council.

We would like to call attention to the process through which this section of the Report was developed, as we feel it speaks volumes about the state of shared governance and community at Carroll University. The Writing Group met to discuss the compiled document and many proposed revisions. A number of longtime faculty members suggested, for instance, that a brief section on the past be included in order to provide context for the discussion of the significant progress we have made together. One of
those long-serving faculty members later expressed his pride in the many changes evident in the document, and in the spirit of the Writing Group's discussion. The revision was written by the President of the Faculty, who in the past was one of the most vocal leaders of the union effort when shared governance was a concern. A second meeting took place in which other changes were suggested, and the President of the Faculty again developed the revised document, which was submitted to the Provost. The Provost and Faculty President later revised other sections of the document, and both noted how positive and enjoyable the process had been. Chapter Two of this Report describes the many positive changes that have made such a positive experience of shared governance the norm at Carroll today.

- **The Graduate Program Assessment and Governance Writing Group** was chaired by the Director of Assessment. Members included the five graduate program Directors; the two College Deans; the Dean of Students; the President of the Graduate Student Council; and the Director of Academic Projects, who serves as the liaison to the Graduate Student Council.

The Director of Assessment met with the Graduate Council (which consists of the Graduate Program Directors) as a group and individually with program directors and faculty as indicated to respond to specific issues raised in the 2008 Self Study and Team Report. Those resulting documents were compiled by the Director of Assessment and drafts were shared with the Writing Group. Revisions were made and a revised document was submitted to the Provost.

The Provost combined all three topical reports into one document and drafted an Introduction and Conclusion. The document was then sent to the President, Senior Staff, Deans, and the chairs/co-chairs of the Writing Groups for review.
CHAPTER ONE: PROGRESS ON REVIEW OF THE MISSION STATEMENT

The Higher Learning Commission recommended a Focused Visit in 2012-13 to review progress on mission review and shared governance. The Visiting Team found that there was confusion within the Carroll community regarding the relationship of what were classified in the Self-Study as "mission documents" (these included the Mission Statement, the Vision, the Four Pillars of a Carroll Educational Experience, and the Carroll Compact). The team also identified uncertainty within the community regarding the way the institution and its members would "demonstrate Christian values by example." The team did not report uncertainty regarding the educational portion of the Mission Statement, which focuses on the provision of superior educational opportunities and preparing graduates for the careers of their choice and lives of fulfillment, service and accomplishment.

Some of the confusion expressed in 2008 regarding the "mission documents" was, in essence, a concern about shared governance, as the Four Pillars and Carroll Compact did not result from a collaborative process but were developed by the administration. For this reason, and for the more fundamental reason that we recognized that a demonstration of Christian values should begin "at home," our immediate responses focused on healing our internal community in two ways: 1) through reviving shared governance and a culture of mutual trust and respect; and 2) by considering together and rebuilding the spiritual life and shared values of our community. A report on our substantial progress on shared governance appears in the next chapter. In this chapter we will demonstrate the following three accomplishments:

1. Our work related to reviving spiritual life at Carroll and building a culture of trust, engagement and service.
2. The concrete demonstration of the myriad ways this now-flourishing community expresses Christian values in action through the extraordinary expansion of service and community engagement activity.
3. The current process of review and revision of the Mission Statement.
Following the process of review and potential revision of the mission statement, we will undertake a review of the relationship of the various "mission documents" and the usefulness of that designation. We discuss this process at the end of the chapter as we identify next steps.

1. Living the Mission, Part One: Reviving Spiritual Life

At the time of the Comprehensive Visit in 2008, a number of important changes related to restoring the health of the Carroll community were taking root. Faculty, staff and students participated in Board of Trustee committees and meetings, a broad-based committee on academic restructuring had developed proposals to strengthen shared governance, and the core values of the community were re-emerging in action. This re-establishment of the vitality and core values of the Carroll community was seen to be foundational of a reconsideration of the language of the Mission Statement. Once this first step—creating the conditions in which our Christian values were again flourishing and at the forefront of our work and interactions with each other—was in place, then a review of how those values were written into the Mission Statement would have the most value to the Carroll community. That is, therefore, the process we have followed. The results follow.

In February 2009, the President created a Spiritual Life Task Force, chaired by the Rev. Dr. Lucy Forster-Smith, Chaplain at Macalester College and former Chaplain at Carroll, and the Rev. Dr. Deborah Block, a Carroll alumna and member of the Board of Trustees. The Task Force, whose membership was broadly representative of the Carroll community, was asked to examine and make recommendations regarding the way in which the Carroll community realizes its mission of demonstrating Christian values by example. In their roles as co-chairs of the Task Force, the Rev. Drs. Forster-Smith and Block proposed a site visit to campus in order to better understand the community, its aspirations, and any issues and concerns.

In preparation for a visit in March 2009, the two co-chairs/reviewers developed a schedule for consultations with all segments of the community in consultation with the President and Provost, and received a packet of background information. The visit began over dinner on March 26 at the President's home with members of the President’s senior leadership team. On Friday, March 27
the reviewers began the day meeting with the Spiritual Life Task Force, which was comprised of faculty, staff, students, alumni and Waukesha community members and clergy. The Rev. Drs. Forster-Smith and Block held listening sessions with faculty, students, staff, alumni and community members, and also conducted individual interviews with the Chaplain, the Dean of Students and other faculty and staff. They discussed their findings with the Task Force, and together they developed a Report to the President (Appendix 1), which included fifteen recommendations.

The first recommendation was to create a permanent committee focused on spiritual life that would include members of the local clergy; the Spiritual Life Advisory Board was formed immediately thereafter, in summer 2009. Headed by two members of the faculty, it reports to the President and meets regularly to engage in a thoughtful dialogue on actualizing our Christian values and to continue to act on Task Force recommendations. Its membership is broadly representative of campus constituencies, and includes clergy from local faith communities and a member of the University's Board of Trustees.

The Spiritual Life Advisory Board (SLAB) is focused on creating campus-wide opportunities for exploration of living Christian values and engaging with the community in purposeful interactions that demonstrate those values. The SLAB helps the chaplain set annual goals, supports his ongoing work, and develops new ecumenical initiatives, some of which are described below. It has also partnered with students to establish a Spiritual Life Student Committee that remains connected to the SLAB through its student members. The President's charge to the Spiritual Life Advisory Board is broad—in the words of one faculty co-chair, the SLAB has embraced his charge to “try things,” to plant seeds and nurture those that take root.

The Spiritual Life Advisory Board has participated in expanding campus programming related to world religions, faith, spirituality, vocation, and service. One example is the model Passover Seder dinner on campus in 2011, with more than 100 students, faculty and staff in attendance. The Seder was connected to the explorations of the student-developed campus theme for 2010-11, "Food," a cross-disciplinary series of curricular and co-curricular events aimed at raising awareness of the broad range of issues related to food – from hunger to health to religion to
cultural life to politics to travel, among others. The Seder will take place again in 2012 and annually thereafter.

Another initiative of the Spiritual Life Advisory Board was a new retreat for sophomores on vocation, "Creating a Life of Meaning" (CALM). The retreat, which was offered to returning sophomores in August 2011, was led by members of the faculty, staff, and trustees, and consisted of workshops and conversations highlighting vocation. The primary goal of the retreat was to help participants make space to “hear” individual callings. Several guest speakers shared their own stories of finding a calling, an external facilitator introduced “deep listening” as a discernment tool, and the participants practiced different ways of listening to their own sense of calling, such as meditation.

In November 2011, based on a recommendation of the co-chairs, the University joined the Network for Vocation in Undergraduate Education, created by the Council of Independent Colleges in 2009 to foster the intellectual and theological exploration of vocation among students. We expect that the opportunities created by participating in this national network of colleagues will continue to enrich the conversations and explorations on our campus.

2. Living the Mission, Part Two: Demonstrating Christian Values by Example
The years since 2008 have been marked by a broadened and deepened engagement of all Carroll constituencies in expressing through our actions the Christian values that are part of the common fabric uniting our university community. This resurgence has occurred across campus, as will be evident below. It has resulted in more explicit recognition of some of the threads that bind us to each other, and it has enhanced the spirit of collaboration and partnership across campus and beyond. We believe that these expressions are concrete and powerful examples of the values that are woven into the fabric of the Carroll community, and, that over the last several years, these Christian values have again come to define our daily interactions within and beyond the campus.

The dramatic growth of service and outreach activities to communities in need, while not always explicitly discussed in terms of the mission statement, nonetheless attest to the revitalization of
our community's capacity to actualize Christian values in the ways we treat each other as well as in the ways we engage with our stakeholder communities.

One noteworthy example of how a revitalized commitment to service has enhanced campus culture and cohesion is the working integration of several different offices on campus into an interdisciplinary and cross-functional group focused on civic engagement. The Civic Engagement Team partners in the development of engagement activities for students that include volunteerism, service-learning, community outreach and community service. The team, which formed on its own initiative, consists of the VISTA Volunteer Coordinator, the Service-Learning Coordinator, Director of Campus Employment, Director of Outreach Programs, the Dean of Students, and the Dean of Natural and Health Sciences. The work of the Civic Engagement Team has significantly enhanced the visibility of service opportunities across the curriculum and across campus, and that visibility, in turn, has led to a significant growth in service engagement by students, faculty, staff, and alumni.

The growth in community engagement initiatives, in which we actualize Christian values through purposeful engagement with communities in need, has continued in each of the last four years. In 2010-11, for instance, students logged more than 18,000 hours of volunteer service at community organizations in the Waukesha area—more than double the total of 2008-09. The collective efforts of faculty, staff, students and alumni have resulted in nearly $100,000 in labor, food, cash and services donated to community partners in the last two years, and in 2011 our first harvest from Carroll's Community Garden produced bushels of fresh vegetables that were donated to local food pantries. A recent survey of our community partners indicated the following:

- 90% say Carroll has enhanced the quality of their service.
- 50% say Carroll's efforts helped their agency increase services.
- 25% say Carroll volunteers have allowed them to serve more people.

Other examples abound of initiatives through which members of the Carroll community concretely demonstrate the Christian values of our mission through serving communities in need:
The "Service-Learning: Learning from Waukesha's Older Adults" project that, in its first year in 2010, supported 12 courses engaging 9 faculty and 189 students in service-learning. Six community partners and five other community organizations were engaged in these initiatives.

The Bridges program developed by Education faculty provides programs, field trips, and classes for students in inner-city Racine. In the most recent count, 41 Carroll students supported more than 50 children in the Racine school district.

Alternate spring breaks that include trips to Cedar Rapids, Iowa in 2010 and 2011 to help communities still ravaged by an historic 2008 flood; a trip to New Orleans to join the Camp Restore project and assist with Hurricane Katrina clean-up; and a trip to Flagler Beach, Florida to build homes through Habitat for Humanity.

The efforts of a Modern Languages professor to connect students to the local Hispanic community through service learning and related projects, and her ongoing work with the Plowshare Center in Waukesha, which this year is sponsoring a Peace Vigil Workshop on campus.

The second annual "Jam the Van" community food drive in November 2011, which exceeded its goal of donations of non-perishable food items for the Salvation Army.

The Physical Therapy faculty's clinical work among aging and disabled populations in Waukesha.

The grant-funded development of a curricular strand in the Master's of Science in Physician's Assistant Studies that focuses on providing healthcare to medically underserved populations.

The Nursing faculty's clinical work with the Hispanic community and other underserved populations.

An annual Career Expo for middle school students in which, most recently, 13 Carroll students joined faculty and staff in providing guidance to 972 student participants from 14 middle schools in Waukesha.

A First-Year Student Orientation that features a Day of Service in which over 800 students, faculty and staff volunteered at 29 community organizations in Waukesha and Milwaukee counties.
• The Youth to Discover (Y2D) program in which 22 female Carroll students mentor teenage girls identified as at risk by the Waukesha County Department of Health and Human Services.

• A service learning course in Psychology that includes travel to New Orleans to engage in service with communities in need.

• The "Art for Life" program created by an Art faculty member, which provides older adults with opportunities to experience their creative side, while providing our art students hands-on experience in art education and art therapy.

• Student and faculty participation in the Waukesha County Hispanic Family Health Fair.

• The Carroll Community Walk for Water on Nov 5, 2011. In this service project, which is connected to this year's student-selected interdisciplinary theme of "Water," members of the Carroll community walked over a mile from campus to the Fox River with empty water containers and carried those containers back to campus. Walk for Water is a fundraiser for the community of Ribe, Kenya, which faces a critical shortage of potable water. Two emeriti faculty have been connected to Ribe for over 25 years and have led student trips there in the context of our New Cultural Experiences Program.

• The United Nations Annual Film Festival, highlighting issues of poverty and injustice across the globe.

• A "Poverty Simulation" program developed for the Physician's Assistant program and now being offered to all students.

• A trip of eight faculty and three staff in January 2012 to the Arizona-Mexico border to participate in the Borderlinks program to develop courses and travel programs for students to learn about life on both sides of the US/Mexico border.

• A service component for all recognized student organizations requiring them to complete a service project with a community partner each semester.

• United Way Day, in which students set up collection points to assist in achieving the fundraising goal of the campus’s annual campaign for United Way of Waukesha County.

• The Civil Rights pilgrimage bus tour to visit historical sites in the south and meet leaders of the civil rights movement.
This list is far from exhaustive, though it illustrates the multitude of ways that the Carroll community is concretely expressing Christian values through our actions in service to others.

A new initiative that has had a significant and broad impact on our stakeholders is the Carroll University National Day of Service, which extends the ongoing realization of our mission to alumni across the country. In our first Day of Service, held in April 2010, students, faculty, staff, friends and family, along with local alumni in Waukesha, Milwaukee, and Madison, connected with alumni across the country to "join together to make a difference." Alumni were encouraged to contribute time, talent or funds to charities in their areas as part of the effort.

Building on our initial success, this year (2011), the Carroll community began to hit its stride with the second National Day of Service in April. Partnering with the Target Corporation, Feeding America and Carroll alumni across the country, we engaged in a nationwide effort to collect the equivalent of 10,000 meals for local food pantries. The focus of the Day of Service coincided with Carroll's student-initiated, yearlong campus theme of "Food," described above. Nearly 21,000 plastic Target bags were stuffed inside informational brochures and sent to Carroll alumni and friends nationwide. Participants were asked to fill the bag with groceries and deliver it to a local Feeding America site or a neighborhood food pantry, then fill out an online form that tracked total donations. We exceeded our goals, collecting the equivalent of more than 25,000 meals. The effort had a far-reaching impact, as alumni in 28 states joined the effort. The second National Day of Service—2011 recently won national recognition in the form of two awards from the regional division of the Council for Advancement and Support of Education (CASE).

In Carroll's annual Day of Caring, which takes place each November, we partner with social service agencies to engage students, faculty, staff and alumni in volunteering with high-needs populations in communities across southeastern Wisconsin. As with the Day of Service, we aim to develop the Day of Caring into program that extends nationally.

One comprehensive curricular example of our revitalized connection to our mission of demonstrating Christian values by example can be found in the faculty's revision of the General Education program. This revision, completed in a remarkably short three years and implemented
in fall 2011, features "culture" as a unifying thread and requires that all students engage in a domestic or international cross-cultural experience. The program aims to develop students’ understanding of the diversity of human cultures, help them to intentionally engage other cultures, and foster their growth as contributing, ethical citizens in a globalized world. Among the learning goals of the General Education curriculum are that Carroll graduates will be able to:

- Understand world cultures and reflectively interact with cultures other than their own.
- Critically evaluate global issues from multiple perspectives.
- Understand and analyze multiple philosophical, ethical, and religious positions held by persons within their own and other cultures.

As was noted previously, not every example of service and community engagement described in this section is explicitly discussed in terms of our mission to demonstrate Christian values by example. But neither is the wide-ranging expansion of the ways we actualize our mission happening by accident. We believe, rather, that these expressions are concrete and powerful examples of the values that are deeply integrated into the fabric of the Carroll community, and, that over the last several years, these Christian values have again come to define our daily interactions within and beyond the campus.

3. Mission Statement Review and Revision
In summer 2010, in the context of a revitalized Carroll community in which concrete demonstrations of Christian values were flourishing within and beyond the campus, a review of the University Mission Statement was initiated. The President charged a task force chaired by the outgoing Chairman of the Board of Trustees, Dr. William Laastch ’60, to review and possibly recommend the revision of the mission statement. Representatives from the Spiritual Life Advisory Board, as well as from faculty, students, and staff, were included in that committee. In the spring of 2011, the task force submitted a proposed revision of the mission statement to the President, who sent it electronically to the Board of Trustees for comment and discussion. In that exchange, members of the Board developed a slightly amended statement.
Current Mission Statement

We will provide a superior educational opportunity for our students, one grounded in the liberal arts tradition and focused on career preparation and lifelong learning.

We will demonstrate Christian values by our example.

We shall succeed in our mission, when our graduates are prepared for careers of their choice and lives of fulfillment, service and accomplishment.

Task Force Suggested Revised Mission Statement

Carroll University provides a superior education, rooted in its Christian (Presbyterian?) and liberal arts traditions, that prepares students for vocational success, lifelong learning and spiritual growth.

Trustee Revised Draft Mission Statement

Carroll University provides a superior education, rooted in its Presbyterian and liberal arts traditions, that prepares students of all faiths for vocational success, lifelong learning and service.

At its October, 2011 meeting, the Board of Trustees discussed both suggested statements. Some of the discussion focused on the significance of declaring "Christian," as opposed to "Presbyterian," heritage. Noting the fundamental importance of the institutional mission statement, the Board decided to create a subcommittee to continue to discuss the proposed revisions among Trustees and with the other campus constituencies. That subcommittee was established in November 2011.

After these discussions have taken place and a new mission statement is adopted, the community will begin a consideration of the value of classifying other texts under the heading of "mission documents." The "Vision" referred to on the 2008 Self Study was that of a previous president and is no longer used. The two other documents, The Four Pillars and The Carroll Compact, aim
to provide action-oriented interpretations of the institutional mission, though, as noted at the beginning of this chapter, they were developed without the participation of faculty, staff or students. The Carroll Compact, for instance, is related to the values that underlie the mission—it asks students to enter into a voluntary compact with the Carroll University community to live and work in accordance with valuing human diversity and dignity, personal and academic integrity, concern for the campus environment, and others. The Four Pillars of a Carroll Educational Experience—integrated knowledge, lifelong skills, enduring values and gateway experiences—is a concrete expression of the mission to provide a superior educational opportunity to all students, one that prepares them for career success and lives of fulfillment and service. A consideration of the role of these documents in relation to the mission will begin after the process of review and revision of the mission statement.

**Conclusion**
Since 2008, Carroll faculty, staff, students, and alumni have demonstrated a reinvigorated and ongoing commitment to living our Mission, i.e. to expressing Christian values through our actions. Thus, while the wording of the Mission Statement itself is now being reviewed and revised, the values that undergird that mission and that guide our institutional purpose remain strong and constant.
CHAPTER TWO: PROGRESS ON SHARED GOVERNANCE

Based on the Team Report from the March 2008 comprehensive visit, the Higher Learning Commission recommended that a Focused Visit in 2012-13 include a review of progress on shared governance so that the University could demonstrate concrete results of the policies and processes that had been put in place through the two-year efforts of the *ad hoc* Committee on Academic Restructuring, which at that time had not yet been implemented. Through the development and implementation of those governance changes, as well as through subsequent initiatives, Carroll University's administration, faculty, staff, and students have effectively collaborated to establish an environment marked by transparency and shared governance.

Perhaps most reflective of positive changes in shared governance are the trends in the Higher Education Research Institute (HERI) survey data, as the two charts below illustrate. In 2004-5, 95% of the faculty responded that "faculty are typically at odds with campus administration." In 2007-8 the percentage decreased to 38%, and in 2010-11, that percentage dropped to 10%. We believe this is the result of comprehensive collaborative initiatives by administration, faculty, staff, students and the Board of Trustees to strengthen shared governance.

![Chart showing survey data]

Equally significant, in terms of the development of a positive, collegial and engaged teaching and learning environment, is the faculty's response to the prompt, "Faculty here respect each
other." In 2004-5, only 27% responded affirmatively. In 2010-11, that number more than doubled, to 56.3%:

Similarly notable are improvements in student-faculty academic relationships between 2008 and 2011 reflected in the National Survey of Student Engagement (NSSE) during a period of significant enrollment growth. First-year students and seniors were asked to mark that relationship on a scale of 1 (unavailable, unhelpful, unsympathetic) to 7 (available, helpful, sympathetic).

These three surveys attest to the continuing development of an engaged and supportive Carroll community.

In April 2010, a visiting team for a Focused Visit regarding a proposed MS in Physician Assistant Studies program paid careful attention to issues related to shared governance and the
campus climate. They found a remarkably collegial and positive environment. Two of their comments illustrate this:

In formal and informal interviews with administration, faculty, and staff the team observed a consistent positive attitude toward the institution, its goals and objectives, strategic plan, and operations.

Planning for the MSPAS degree was thorough and inclusive. University faculty were enthusiastic about the new program, citing the quality of students, opportunities for collaboration, and the increased enrollments with special strengths. The proposed program is also seen as fitting well with the mission and reflective of the University's strategic plan.

A Brief Recollection of the Past
The collaborative efforts to create a collegial environment based on shared governance contrast sharply with the environment existing in 2004. During the period from 2003 through 2006 the administration placed severe limits on faculty participation in governance. Governance committees were often bypassed and replaced with administration mandates. Meaningful faculty votes were frequently vetoed. Academic departments were abolished and replaced unilaterally by the administration with a two schools and three divisions structure, which further eroded faculty input in shared governance. Categories of non-tenure track faculty positions were expanded to avoid tenure-track hires, despite the faculty's efforts to invoke governance, which precluded this as a long-term hiring practice. Faculty and student attempts to discuss issues with the administration were denied and escalated to campus protests. Emeritus status was withheld from many retiring faculty members during this period. Faculty twice voted "no confidence" in the President, which the Board refused to recognize. Several tenured faculty members unwilling to continue in this combative environment resigned their tenured positions. Carroll faculty members were barred from contacting Board Trustees. In this environment in 2005, faculty organized and voted to unionize under the UAW, an action that was initially approved by the National Labor Relations Board but later overturned by the D.C. Federal Court of Appeals in
March 2009. Even before this decision, under a new administration the campus community began a series of recuperative initiatives toward genuine shared governance.

**Governance Restructuring**

In August 2007, the new Provost and the President of the Faculty announced the creation of an *ad hoc* Committee on Academic Restructuring. The committee was charged "to provide a process through which faculty and administrators can work together to consider ideas for improving the college's academic organization, the governance document and procedures regarding the allocation of faculty positions and the hiring and evaluation of faculty." The committee, which was co-chaired by the Provost and the Faculty President, consisted of six administrators, including the Vice Provost, Deans, and Director of the Library, and six faculty members, representing each of the major governance committees—Faculty Executive Committee, Academic Steering, and Tenure and Promotion. The *ad hoc* Restructuring committee began its work in fall 2007 and delivered recommendations to the President in May 2008. Those recommendations continued to be debated and refined over the course of the 2008-2009 academic year, with multiple opportunities for faculty, staff, and students to provide input, which was included in subsequent revisions. The final restructuring proposal (Appendix 2) was approved by the faculty and the Assembly on May 4, 2009 and by the Board of Trustees on May 9, 2009.

The Board of Trustees' discussion on May 4, 2009 is noteworthy. The Board expressed its appreciation "of the enormous progress represented by these significant accomplishments, which were achieved by faculty and administration working collaboratively together over the past 635 days." The Board requested one revision to the restructuring proposal that would more closely link annual goal-setting with the annual evaluation process and add a post-tenure review process. At the same time, the Trustees emphasized that they did not want to derail the very positive momentum that had been achieved by administration, faculty, students, and staff. They then voted unanimously to approve the governance restructuring proposal.
In fall 2009, the faculty presented, discussed, and approved a new Annual Faculty Evaluation process that honored the Board's request. The full academic restructuring package included significant changes, many aimed at improved shared governance:

- The elimination of an administratively imposed "two-schools" model of academic governance and establishment of a single Academic Steering Committee
- Changes in committee structures and membership to reflect restructuring for the benefit of more clearly defining and streamlining responsibilities and strengthening shared governance
- Changes in committee membership to reflect restructuring and to be more inclusive of institutional constituencies.
- Creation of two new standing committees: the Planning and Budget Committee and subsequently the Technology in Teaching and Learning Committee
- Creation of new position descriptions for deans and department chairs
- Creation of eleven academic departments, with elected faculty chairs
- Creation of two new faculty categories, clinical faculty and instructional staff—each with specific "Conditions of Employment," and the agreement to discontinue hiring in a vaguely-defined non-tenure track position.
- Agreement to convert some non-tenure-track faculty positions to the tenure-track
- Agreement on a tenure density target of 60%
- A new annual faculty evaluation process and post-tenure review process

Implementation of the governance changes began immediately following the Board's approval:

- One week after the Board's approval, on May 18, 2009, the Provost announced that seven non-tenure-track faculty positions had been converted to the tenure track following recommendations of program faculty, interim chairs, and deans.
- Three days later, on May 21, 2009, eleven new academic departments, with elected faculty chairs, were announced, effective on July 1st.
- Within a month, on June 16, 2009, the Clinical Faculty track was announced.
- The Instructional Staff track was implemented at the beginning of the next academic year in fall 2009.
In sharp contrast to prior administrative bypass of governance committees, restructuring has resulted in more clearly delineated committee responsibilities, evident respect by the administration for faculty and committee recommendations, and a demonstrated pattern of collaborations among administration, governance committees, ad hoc committees, faculty, Student Affairs staff, and students to achieve objectives. The new General Education program is a prime example of these collaborations and effective, responsive shared governance.

**Collaborations for a New General Education Program**

In 2007, a group was appointed to review the current Liberal Studies Program and report its recommendations to the Provost. Based on initial discussions, in the summer of 2008 fifteen faculty members volunteered to form three groups, each working independently to propose a new General Education program. During the 2008-2009 academic year, the General Education Committee (GEC) worked with the summer teams and the Provost to combine ideas and identify three components based on core requirements, distribution options, and cross-cultural experiences. In the summer of 2009, twenty faculty members continued to refine the program proposal, developing an emphasis on cross-cultural and interdisciplinary education.

The General Education Committee began holding a series of conversations in 2009-2010 open to all faculty, students, Student Affairs and other staff, and administrators, whose concerns and suggestions were addressed in the formal proposal. Those suggestions included establishing a new position for a General Education Director, and creating an *ad hoc* committee comprised of faculty, students, and staff, to establish an annual theme and institute a common summer reading for in-coming first year students. The new General Education proposal was passed in the Assembly by a faculty vote in April 2010 and pilot implementation began in fall 2010; full implementation took place in fall 2011.

The relatively rapid timeline of this comprehensive curricular change in a testament, we believe, to the restored trust, goodwill and shared values that characterize Carroll University today.
Staff and Shared Governance

Strengthened staff and student governance also characterize this period and have brought significant benefit to the Carroll community and its teaching and learning environment. Staff are represented by the Staff Executive Committee (SEC), which meets regularly. One of its functions is to administer a staff development budget, created three years ago by the Vice President for Finance and Administration and the Provost. The SEC operates in a manner similar to the Faculty Development Committee.

Staff are represented on many institutional governance and Board committees, such as the Academic and Student Affairs Committee of the Board and the General and Cross Cultural Education Committee. The Staff President, along with the Faculty President and Student Senate President, make formal presentations at meetings of Board of Trustees. Staff members are also working with faculty to develop the annual General Education theme, to identify a summer reading and provide orientation programs for in-coming first year students, and to create Cross Cultural Experiences.

Undergraduate Students and Shared Governance

The Student Senate is an effective and highly visible representative body of undergraduate students, who regularly collaborate with faculty, staff, and administration. Student Senate now manages its own substantial budget. It also helps to develop the annual themes incorporated throughout the new General Education program and to fund major speakers and events that address the annual theme, as well as sponsoring many other campus-wide and community events. Undergraduate students are also represented on several governance committees and vote on some Assembly proposals.

Graduate Students and Shared Governance

In spring 2009, a Task Force on Graduate Programs (discussed in the next chapter) and the Dean of Students worked with graduate students to convene the Graduate Student Council (GSC). In the following academic year, a new constitution and bylaws were developed, and a Graduate Student Council President was elected. The GSC was fully implemented in spring 2010. The Council is comprised of eight students representing all graduate programs. The Graduate
Student Council makes recommendations to graduate program directors and faculty to make improvements to graduate programs. The GSC is developing as an important voice for representing graduate student concerns as well as for developing programming to meet the specific needs of that population.

**Collaboration with the Board of Trustees**

The Board of Trustees has added Faculty representation to Board subcommittees. It has recently moved to provide its agenda and meeting materials beforehand to all in attendance. This is a significant change in shared governance; in the past official faculty and staff observers to the Board and other non-trustee attendees were rarely provided meeting materials. Board members have also become active, visible, and approachable members in the campus community, participating in campus Move-in Day and Service Day, welcoming students during First Year orientation, and visiting campus as guest lecturers. The Board Chair was joined by other trustees who participated with faculty and staff in facilitating the CALM Retreat for sophomores in August.

**A New Annual Faculty Evaluation Process**

As a follow up to the restructuring process, in September 2009, the faculty, led by the Tenure and Promotion committee (T&P), began discussions to develop individual departments' Annual Faculty Evaluation processes (AFE). In October 2009, the faculty approved language to define more clearly the principle and process of annual goal-setting and evaluation, responding to the Board's request (see Appendix 3).

The departmentally-based AFE was designed by faculty to support a transparent, peer evaluation process to replace the previous opaque administrative annual evaluation of faculty. The ongoing work of the T&P Committee with the Provost and academic departments to revise the annual faculty evaluation process aims to assure a process that will respond to disciplinary differences in scholarly activity while also assuring equity across the University. According to an initial set of general guidelines, each department submitted to the Tenure and Promotion committee a proposed set of disciplinary standards and a peer evaluation process. These department proposals were posted on the Carroll faculty website for open review and exchange of ideas.
The T&P Committee with the Provost and academic departments continue to hone the annual faculty evaluation process to balance the recognition of disciplinary differences while assuring equity across the University. Throughout the 2009-2010 academic year, T&P, the Provost, the interim Vice Provost, and Dean of Natural and Health Sciences worked with faculty to review and respond to proposals from each department to acknowledge disciplinary standards, particularly in scholarship, while establishing clearer institution-wide standards in the three performance areas. At that time, a number of unresolved issues remained, such as the place of grant writing as scholarship or service, the weight of SCTL course evaluations (Student Commentary on Teaching and Learning) in the area of teaching, and the department's role in bonus distribution. Even so, the mutual decision between faculty and administration was to move forward and work out issues that emerged after departments' experience with the first implementation. At the end of that year, the Provost and Tenure and Promotion agreed to give preliminary approval to the revised departmental plans, so that the new process could be piloted in 2010-11. An ad hoc committee with representatives from Tenure and Promotion and the Faculty Executive Committee (FEC) is currently working with the Provost and Deans to develop standardized institutional service weighting. The Provost also agreed to a request from Tenure and Promotion and the Faculty Executive Committee to share with faculty the aggregate numerical results of merit stipend distribution based on the evaluation process; this had not been done in the past.

A review of the process by the Tenure and Promotion Committee, the Provost and the Deans indicated that despite some remaining issues noted above, there was uniformly positive feedback from faculty about the value of conversations that took place in departmental peer reviews. Faculty members reported that they came away from those discussions with a clearer understanding of the breadth of scholarship within departments, and of the range of service and teaching experiences. They also better appreciated the achievements of their colleagues, as well as some of the challenges they faced. This represents an important first step in the development of an Annual Faculty Evaluation process. The Provost, Deans, T&P, FEC, and academic departments continue to address concerns and refine the process. Faculty meetings have included opportunities for institutional discussions of the AFE process.
The Provost met with the T&P and FEC committees in September 2011 to discuss issues emerging from the pilot implementation of the new AFE process that reflected some inequities across departments in performance area ranking. They agreed to two next steps: the distribution of university-wide clarified guidelines and specific feedback to individual departments to identify particular areas in need of development. Standard yet flexible weights have been designated for performance areas. The Provost discussed these issues with faculty at the first Faculty Meeting of the 2011-2012 academic year in October.

The university-wide guidelines developed through a broadly representative process of revision appear in Appendix 4. These guidelines aim at assisting departments to refine their AFE processes to achieve a balance of disciplinarily-responsive evaluation and relative institutional equity in the assessment of faculty across the University founded on a principle of peer review. A post-tenure review process, which was part of the restructuring package, was designed by the Tenure and Promotion Committee and approved by faculty in 2009. The process emphasizes developmental support (rather than penalty) for any tenured faculty members who do not meet standardized expectations over a period of three years (included in Appendix 3). The process sought to acknowledge extenuating circumstances that can temporarily undermine faculty performance. The first implementation of the post-tenure review process will take place in 2013.

One other important change is marked by a new collaboration between the Tenure and Promotion Committee (T&P) and the Provost. When the new Provost arrived in 2007, governance language and practice had required that the Provost attend all T&P discussions. The Provost suggested an end to this practice, in part because the T&P Committee made its recommendations to the Provost and in part because, she believed, T&P should have greater autonomy in its proceedings. The Provost and T&P continue to collaborate on many matters including the strengthening of parity among faculty categories, implementing processes of promotion for Clinical Faculty and Instructional Staff, and refining the Annual Faculty Evaluation process.
**Additional Faculty Initiatives and Shared Governance**

The University's clear commitment to strengthening the ranks of faculty—tenured, tenure-track, clinical, and instructional faculty—all of whom are eligible for professional development funding and grants—is another demonstration of the positive shared governance environment at Carroll.

There has been a renewed commitment to a stable faculty invested in shared governance, as demonstrated by the significant increase in tenure-track hires. The Human Resources Office reports that from 2001 to 2011, thirty-one tenure-track faculty were hired. Twenty-one of the thirty-one were hired since 2007; this includes the seven "converted" faculty lines in 2009 from the academic restructuring, described above. In 2011-12 an additional thirteen tenure-track faculty members were hired.

In February of 2010, the Provost and Dean of Natural and Health Sciences convened a meeting with Clinical Faculty to review the Clinical Conditions of Employment. Although Clinical Faculty members had earlier voted to recommend the conditions as outlined the year before, faculty and administration subsequently recognized those conditions as onerous. The Clinical Faculty, who are non-tenure-track (a point addressed later), initially identified four areas of responsibility—teaching, scholarly activity, clinical activity, and service. The Provost suggested that faculty consider combining scholarly and clinical activity, both to recognize the link between clinical work and scholarship and to create three categories commensurate with the three performance areas for tenure-track faculty.

Simultaneously, in spring 2010 the Provost asked the Tenure and Promotion Committee and Faculty Executive Committee to work with the Interim Vice Provost, the Dean of Natural and Health Sciences, Chairs in Natural and Health Sciences, and clinical faculty to develop a process whereby clinical faculty with terminal degrees could become eligible for tenure-track positions. These ongoing discussions identify requirements for eligibility, and recommend a process for tenure track status, biennial reviews, and interdisciplinary support for developing peer-reviewed scholarship. Faculty Development entered discussions to set up mentorships and workshops to support scholarly initiatives for clinical faculty. The first tenure-track position in Nursing was posted in the summer of 2011, but remains as yet unfilled. Other departments are working with
Chairs and the Dean of Natural and Health Sciences to recommend clinical faculty for tenure-track positions.

In fall 2011, the Provost and the Tenure and Promotion committee worked together to establish a process of promotion for faculty still classified as fulltime non-tenure track, the positions unilaterally created by the former administration (a category into which we are no longer hiring). In spring 2011, the first two candidates in this category will enter that promotion process.

Conclusion
We celebrate the important and extremely positive changes in shared governance at Carroll. We also know that sustaining a positive and supportive campus culture requires ongoing care and attention. We do not expect that everything will be perfect—as indeed it is not—but we have come to expect respect, collegiality and partnership among faculty, staff and students in achieving the goals of our mission. We continue to address areas for growth, for example in strengthening tenured faculty density and creating parity across categories of faculty, refining the new General Education Program and Annual Faculty Evaluation process, increasingly incorporating undergraduate and graduate students in processes of academic program development, and continuing to create opportunities for administration, trustees, students, staff, and faculty to work transparently to enhance shared governance. So far, most of us would say that we have not been disappointed.
CHAPTER THREE: DISCUSSION OF GRADUATE PROGRAM ASSESSMENT AND GOVERNANCE, IN SUPPORT OF THE CHANGE REQUEST TO REMOVE STIPULATIONS REGARDING MASTER'S PROGRAMS

Introduction
In 2008 the Higher Learning Commission recommended a Focused Visit in 2012-2013 to review progress on mission review and shared governance. At that time, the HLC recommendation did not include what is now the third focus of the upcoming January 2012 Focused Visit, which relates to our request in February 2011, "to remove the stipulations limiting the expansion of master's programs, and, regarding our Master of Arts in Education Learning and Teaching ("Learning Communities") program, the request that the current limitation— 'delivered at up to five locations in Waukesha and contiguous counties' — be removed to enable delivery of this program throughout the state of Wisconsin."

As explained in the Introduction to this Report, in June 2011 we were notified that the Commission could not act on the request regarding the "blanket master's" due to the pending Focused Visit. Thus, the request has become part of the scope of this Visit.

The Institutional Self-Study prepared for the March 2008 Comprehensive Visit identified several areas of graduate program governance and planning that required attention as the institution moved to expand its graduate programs. The Visiting Team concurred with the Self Study's assessment and recommended that Carroll "review practices of institutions recognized for creating effective graduate governance structures, developing graduate programs outcome measures across delivery systems and programs, maintaining scholarship expectations of faculty, and implementing an appropriately rigorous system of oversight and evaluation." The Team Report also identified some additional concerns regarding the M.Ed. – Learning and Teaching program; the comprehensive response by the faculty of our Education Department to each issue is attached at Appendix 5.

This chapter details our progress to date in addressing the issues identified in the 2008 Self Study and Team Report. It describes the vibrant graduate culture that has developed at the Center for Graduate Studies, a newly renovated, state-of-the art facility that is three miles from Carroll's
main campus and conveniently located near the major east-west interstate highway. It provides more than 50,000 square feet of high-tech classroom and laboratory space centered around an interior courtyard with native plantings; the courtyard provides indirect natural light to classrooms and offices. The environment is enhanced by over 60 paintings and textile art installations donated to the university by the Kohler Foundation. The quality of this facility has garnered uniform praise from all stakeholders—faculty, students, staff, alumni, trustees, and community members. Three photographs appear below:

Over the past two decades, Carroll University has gained considerable experience and expertise in starting and sustaining high-quality graduate programs. Carroll currently offers five graduate programs: the entry-level Doctorate of Physical Therapy, Master of Physical Therapy, Master of Arts in Education, Master of Business Administration, the Master in Software Engineering, and the Master of Science in Physician Assistant Studies.

Our planning processes are deliberate and strategic, and graduate enrollment growth has been carefully managed to align with institutional capacity. The comprehensive nature of these planning processes have been recognized by the reviewers of each of our proposals for graduate programs, most recently by the 2010 visiting team for the Focused Visit regarding the proposed MS in Physician Assistant Studies. The team Report found that the institution's planning process related to graduate programs was thoughtful and strategic:

The University has approached the addition of each graduate program thoughtfully and strategically. Its three graduate programs – the Master of Art in Education (MEd), the Master of Business Administration (MBA), and the entry-level Doctor of Physical
Therapy (DPT) (as well as its forerunner, the entry-level Master of Physical Therapy), were carefully planned and are stable programs. In 2006 Carroll University’s Carnegie Classification was changed from Baccalaureate II to Master’s S (small) to reflect the changes in the student population.

[NB: The Master of Software Engineering was inadvertently omitted here.]

The chart below illustrates the deliberate growth of graduate enrollment over the past twenty years. In fall 1991, graduate enrollment totaled 78; in fall of 2011 it was 271.

![Graduate Enrollment Chart](image)

We are confident in the strength of our academic community and in our ability to develop and deliver high-quality graduate programs to serve the existing and emerging educational needs of the region. Below we describe the planning and assessment processes through which we assure program quality and currency, and the success of our graduate students.

**Assuring the Quality and Currency of Graduate Programs and Graduate Student Success**

On November 4, 2008, a Task Force on Graduate Programs was convened by the Provost and charged with addressing the issues identified in the 2008 Self Study relating to graduate programs. Task Force membership included the Deans of what were then three academic divisions, the Interim Dean of Student Affairs and Assessment Director, the Chair of the Department of Education, and a library faculty member. The Task Force Report was delivered
to the Provost on January 23, 2009 (Appendix 6). Below we detail how we have continued to strengthen our institutional capacity in each area.

**Graduate Outcomes and Assessment**

As a result of the work of the Graduate Task Force, faculty discussed and developed new graduate learning goals, and in spring 2009 Carroll faculty approved a statement of graduate learning goals with an embedded assessment plan. The Director of Assessment collaborated with faculty in the development of the plan and oversees ongoing assessment. In its initial implementation, the assessment process identified the need to better connect annual assessment plans in two graduate programs to the overall graduate learning goals and assessment process. Faculty and the Director of Assessment have subsequently closed that gap. Currently all graduate programs have articulated how program level student learning outcomes flow from Graduate Goals (Appendix 7).

**Curriculum and Course Assessment**

Carroll University has implemented a broad-based effort to coordinate and standardize assessment on campus, to critically analyze the assessment processes and data, and to include assessment outcomes in the institution's planning and decision making processes. This broad-based effort is coordinated by the Provost, the Director of Assessment, and the Office of Institutional Research. The University's assessment plan incorporates ongoing review at various levels, including institutional, curriculum, program, and course levels. Annually in October, academic programs submit their Curriculum Assessment Report to the University's Director of Assessment and the Assessment Committee for review (the rubric appears as Appendix 8). Programs are asked to: 1) demonstrate evidence of clearly articulated student learning outcomes that flow from graduate goals, and reflect what students know and are able to do, 2) provide evidence of the variety of instruments and measures used to assess student learning and show that the instruments and measures reflect the program/graduate goals and are adequate to measure all learning outcomes, 3) show linkage between the measures and the student learning outcomes, 4) provide a summary of results that reflect the data analyzed, evaluated, and interpreted, and 5) establish assessment goals for the following year(s).
Programs receive an annual Program Assessment Report Card from the committee that contains an evaluation of the program's report and recommendations for improvement. The Director of Assessment and the Assessment Committee submits an Annual Assessment Report to the Provost which is included in the annual Institutional Assessment Report, published in summer. This report is shared widely throughout the university. Deans and chairs annually review each program's Curriculum Assessment Report and include information from these reports in division and area planning initiatives. (These reports will be available in the Resource Room.)

Academic Program Assessment

Each spring, program faculty receive Program Profile Reports which contain the program's goals for the current academic year, statistical data, enrollment trends, full-time and adjunct faculty loads, course enrollments, student credit hours, and institutional and unit goals. Programs are asked to provide evidence of achievement of their program goals and to formulate program goals for the following academic year using the statistical data provided and the outcomes in the program's Curriculum Assessment Report. Each program then meets with its chair and dean to review program achievements and confirm subsequent year program goals. Program faculty then review their individual achievements related to current academic year goals and professional development plans related to effective teaching, scholarship, clinical/professional activity, and service and set subsequent year individual goals.

In addition, each academic program undergoes a self-study and external review every five-to-seven years. The Program Curriculum and Assessment Committee (PCAC) serves as the internal review body and makes recommendations to the Provost. This process (Appendix 9) requires faculty to prepare a detailed narrative and analytical document on the program that includes the following: 1) program overview of accomplishments since last review, strengths, weaknesses and goals, 2) student learning outcomes with evidence of how the outcomes are being met and factors that impact learning, 3) curricular offerings and links between courses and learning outcomes, quality of the curriculum in terms of academic or professional standards, and changes that have occurred since last review, 4) analysis of the Institutional Research Data (provided by Office of Institutional Research), 5) role of faculty including general qualifications and
accomplishments, 6) contributions of the program to the University's Academic Mission, 7) resources utilized to support academic programming (e.g. library, technology), and 8) comparison with five peer institutions. Program faculty recommend three candidates for external reviewer, with the final selection by the Provost in consultation with the PCAC subcommittee on program review. The program faculty submit a Self Study to Program Review Subcommittee; upon consideration of the Self Study and external review comments, the Program Review Subcommittee makes recommendations regarding the program's effectiveness, resources, and student learning. After meeting with the program faculty, chair, and dean an action plan is developed, the Provost comments, and the faculty act on the recommendations and report the outcomes of implementation.

Recommendations for Course, Curriculum or Program Improvements

Changes to existing curriculum or the addition of new programs are based on the evaluation of annual assessment reports and the program review outcomes. Reviews of all proposed revisions (Appendix 10), including major or minor changes and any new program proposals are conducted by the Program Curriculum and Assessment Committee (PCAC). The PCAC renders approval and denial decisions and, as applicable, the additions and deletions are referred to the University's Assembly for action by the faculty. Faculty recommendations on new courses, curricular changes, or new programs are then submitted to the Provost for final action. Requests for resources that emerge out of the assessment process are made by the department chair to the Dean and Provost. Many of those requests can be responded to quickly and routinely through existing, budgeted funds in the current fiscal year. Larger requests, such as for new capital equipment, can sometimes be addressed quickly within the current year as well. For instance, we can act quickly on requests that are considered high-priority based on particular assessment details; this has taken place in recent years for unanticipated classroom needs such as smartboards, projection and other instructional technology. Other large requests with less immediate need are considered through the annual budget and planning cycle, which includes review input from governance committees and review by the Planning and Budget Committee.
Faculty Expectations

Faculty with teaching responsibilities in Graduate Programs are generally expected to have one academic degree higher than the program they teach in, though exceptions are made for relevant professional experience, in which case the respective chairs make a request to the dean who approves. All full-time faculty credentials are maintained in the Provost's Office; part-time faculty credentials are kept in the Dean's office of the relevant college. They will be available in the Resource Room.

Scholarship expectations for faculty teaching in graduate programs are the same for all Carroll faculty given that we have no separate graduate faculty. Scholarship for all Carroll faculty continues to rise organically here as elsewhere in higher education. The faculty itself through the Tenure and Promotion Committee is in the forefront of these ongoing changes. Specific criteria for Tenure and Promotion for Tenure Track Faculty and Conditions of Employment for Clinical Faculty can be found in Appendices 11 and 12.

Graduate Governance Structures

The University is fully committed to the ongoing development of a rich and vibrant graduate student culture, and supports graduate faculty and students in developing the structures and processes that enable their participation in governance. In March 2009, the Provost convened the Standing Graduate Council chaired by the Interim Vice Provost and composed of Academic Deans, Dean of Student Affairs, and Graduate Program Directors. The Provost charged the Council with graduate program planning and administrative oversight of graduate programming. As the Graduate Council evolved, the Deans recognized that they were no longer needed as members of the Council; the Council now consists of the Graduate Program Directors with an elected chair. The Director of Academic Projects, Director of Graduate Admission, and the Center for Graduate Studies Building Coordination also participate. The Graduate Council meets monthly throughout the academic year and provides ongoing counsel to the administration on issues related to graduate education. For instance, the Council worked to assure that students were provided with shuttle services to the main campus at appropriate times and frequency, developed an orientation program, and expanded the website for graduate programs.
The Graduate Council played a significant role in advising the Carroll administration on the renovation of the new Center for Graduate Studies; in particular, the Council made recommendations about how best to provide Business Office, Registrar, Public Safety, Library, Bookstore, and information technology services to graduate students at the Center; these were all accepted.

Meeting Graduate Student Needs

To address the divergent needs of Graduate students, beginning in fall 2008, the Task Force and Dean of Students worked with graduate students to convene the Graduate Student Council (GSC). In the following year, a new constitution and bylaws were developed, and a Graduate Student Council President was elected. The GSC was fully implemented in spring 2010. The Council is comprised of eight students representing all graduate programs. The Director of Academic Projects is the liaison to the GSC, assisting in the development and implementation of programs and assuring that issues and concerns are quickly brought to the attention of the appropriate offices. The Graduate Student Council’s mission is to advocate for graduate students at Carroll University. The GSC accomplishes this in the following ways:

- Serving as a communication facilitator among the graduate students of all programs and communicating graduate student concerns to program faculty and University administrators
- Advising the University President, Provost and other senior officers upon request
- Collecting information and discussing matters relating particularly to graduate students
- Appointing graduate students to all standing committees on which they have representation except otherwise specified
- Sponsoring events to improve the academic and social environment for graduate students

In the past two years, the Graduate Student Council identified several issues as important to graduate students and worked with the appropriate faculty committees or administrative offices to address them. These included reviewing and revising the student course evaluation form for graduate courses, expanding opportunities for graduate students in all programs to network with each other, considering how service learning projects could be incorporated into graduate program curricula, and bringing speakers to campus to discuss networking and finding
employment. The GSC is working with the Office of the Dean of Students to develop a needs assessment survey to be sent to all graduate students to identify the level of satisfaction with graduate support services.

**Graduate Student Academic Support**

Carroll’s academic support services address range of specific needs of graduate students. These services include Career Services, Learning Commons, Informational Technology, Library and the Carroll Scholars Center. Brief descriptions appear below.

- The Office of Career Services responds to the needs of our graduate students through classroom presentations, career advising appointments, an online job database, as well as print and online career development resources. These classroom presentations include: resume and cover letter writing, interviewing techniques, networking, finding a mentor, understanding your values and how they affect your communication in the workplace, career resources and multicultural implications. Graduate students have met with Career Services Advisors for help with the following topics: Career Services resources, interview preparation, mock interview, resume and cover letter writing and continuing education information. In addition, Career Services provides online resources to graduate students such as Pioneer Career Net, Carroll's online job database. Pioneer Career Net hosts over 2,400 employment opportunities throughout the year.

- The Learning Commons serves currently enrolled graduate students through the following services: welcoming space for group meetings, writing assistance, academic workshops such as time management, strategic study and test taking, math support and career services.

- Information Technology Services provides support to Carroll graduate students primarily through support of the technology available at the Center for Graduate Studies. There are two computer labs in the center and all classrooms are equipped with computers and projection screens. Several classrooms are outfitted with dual projectors/screens. Specialized technology is provided for the Physician's Assistant and Physical Therapy programs that allow the recording and evaluating of student participation in practice patient treatment assignments.
• The Carroll Library's collection development policies assure that its books, periodicals, and databases serve the needs of students in all of the university's graduate programs. Librarians seek recommendations from graduate faculty for additional materials to support their courses and actively monitor *Choice Reviews* and other sources of reviews of recent materials appropriate for the university's graduate programs. Librarians participate in orientation sessions for graduate students, and graduate students are invited to seek librarian assistance at any time as well as to make appointments with the appropriate Library Liaisons for one-on-one research assistance.

• The Carroll Scholars Center provides graduate students with an opportunity to present their scholarly work at Celebrate Carroll, an annual on-campus conference. In 2010, 22% (62 of 287) of the presentations/posters at the conference were presented by Carroll University graduate students. The conference provides graduate students a chance to "practice" presenting their work in a familiar setting. Many go on to present at regional and national profession venues, and the Scholars Center provides funding to support travel to conferences. Funding is awarded on a competitive basis, and applications are accepted three times during the academic year. Carroll has increased student scholarly travel grant funding by 66% over the last five years, and graduate students have been the major beneficiaries of this increase. Each student may receive a maximum of $500. In 2010, 55% of the student scholarly travel grant funds went to Carroll graduate students. Thirty-two graduate students presented their work at regional and national conferences. In 2010, the University installed a campus chapter of *Phi Kappa Phi*, the nation's oldest, largest and most selective all-discipline honor society. The top 10% (as measured by cumulative GPA) of graduate students receiving their degrees each year are invited to join this prestigious group, which gives them a lifelong connection to a global network of academic and professional activities.

Conclusion

Since 2008, Carroll University has made important progress in assuring the quality of the graduate learning and teaching environment. We are effective planners and efficient
implementers, and we continue to engage in assessing and improving programs and services that support the success of all of our graduate students. We look forward to continuing to work together, and with our stakeholder communities, in developing quality master's degree programs that serve the current and emerging needs of the region.
CHAPTER FOUR: CONCLUSION

As this Report details, Carroll University today is a vibrant, healthy and engaged community, bound together by our mission to provide superior educational opportunities while demonstrating Christian values through our actions. The three topics of this Focused Visit—mission statement review, shared governance, and graduate program assessment and governance—are naturally and inextricably linked: a positive and vital campus culture impacts program quality as much as it does shared governance. The concrete actualization of our mission is the foundation of our collective culture, and the embodied expressions of excellence and Christian values demonstrated in this Report are currently driving our discussions about revising the statement of that Mission.

This Report finds Carroll University at a unique and very positive moment in its 165-year history. We are proud of our accomplishments to date, and we are mindfully engaged in the ongoing work of building upon these efforts as we continuously strive to enhance our capacity to achieve our mission and goals.