

**Provost's Advisory Council**  
**Summary of October 25, 2012 meeting**

Bert Garza	Stephen Pfohl	Larry McLaughlin
Judith Gordon	David Quigley	Maureen Kenny
Cy Opeil, S.J.	Tom Wall	Don Hafner
Patrick Byrne	Theresa O'Keefe	Timothy Crawford
Lillie Albert	Victoria Pinero	Diana Pullin
James Gips	Siobhan Kelly	David Wirth
Katie O'Dair	Harrison Kent	Fr. James Burns
James Bretzke, S.J.	Anthony Annunziato	Jeffrey Bloechl
Thanh Tran	Danny Willis	
Betty Blythe	Katherine Gregory	

---

1. The summary for the meeting of September 27, 2012 was approved, with the understanding that the item about academic integrity would be expanded slightly to note faculty effectiveness in raising awareness of the topic. The summary will be sent to the President's Office. All summaries are posted on the Provost's Office website; members are encouraged to share the summary with colleagues.
2. The Council discussed suggestions regarding the five-year review of Deans for reappointment. The Provost performs the annual performance appraisals of deans; deans are appointed and reappointed by the President.

Suggestions as to the design of reviews for reappointment were invited:

- For the annual performance appraisal, it was suggested that commitment to community building, and leadership vision, might be made explicit.
- For the reappointment review, questions were raised about whether the input of the entire faculty of a school would be solicited.
- At a recent Council of Deans meeting, it was agreed that a mechanism for confidential feedback to the President (which might be shared with the Provost) would be helpful, but the feedback should not be anonymous.
  - It was noted that an earlier review of a Dean was conducted by an external firm retained by the University, and utilized confidential and anonymous feedback from a subset of the faculty.
  - It was also observed that course evaluations are conducted anonymously.
  - It was suggested that signed, anonymous feedback could be shared with the Dean after the authors' names are removed.
- It was suggested that the reappointment review should be as "orderly, valid, and reliable" as possible and should draw on best practices for evaluation.
- A question was raised about whether it would be possible for the Provost to conduct a more comprehensive review (apart from the annual performance appraisal) that might be shared with the President as he conducts the five-year review. The Provost responded that he would conduct such a proposed review if the President requested it.

- A question was raised as to whether the reappointment review would be based solely on qualitative information, or would include quantitative elements. The Provost responded that it would be possible to include both qualitative and quantitative information in the review, and that would be the determination of the President.
- It was proposed that the Office for Institutional Research could play a useful and supporting role in the review of Deans.

Next steps:

1. Members of the Council will review the draft summary of this discussion and propose language for any amendments.
2. Some members asked whether a memo to the President outlining recommendations should be drafted by a subgroup of the Council. The summary of the entire meeting will be forwarded to the President, as has been past custom; if the Council determines that additional communication would be desirable, that will be explored in further discussions.
3. The Provost reported that in June, the Academic Affairs subcommittee of the Board of Trustees reviewed a report prepared by the Office of Institutional Research about key indicators for the University. The Trustees noted that the percentage of international students was low relative to Boston College's peer institutions and asked for more information. At the September meeting of the subcommittee, the group discussed the potential impact of increasing international student enrollment.

The Provost invited thoughts from the Provost's Advisory Council about the possibility of increasing undergraduate international student enrollment.

- It was noted that international students do not receive financial aid from the University. Some observed that increasing the numbers of full-pay international students would enlarge the revenue stream to Boston College. Others pointed out that having more full-pay international students would not necessarily promote diversity on campus.
- The Provost stated his general opposition to increasing the overall size of the student body. Thus were international enrollments to increase, the enrollment of domestic students would necessarily decrease.
- A member of the Council stated that Boston College has moved from being a commuter institution, to a regional institution, to a national institution, and now an international institution. In this context, the international student population plays a vital role in the trajectory of the University. It was also pointed out that the presence of academically strong international students can help to propel the overall academic performance of the classes in which they take part.
- Another member of the Council asked whether it would be possible to reap the benefits of international students by increasing the number of exchange students. It was noted that the exchange student level is dependent in part on the number of BC students studying abroad.
- It was reported that international students may require additional academic and co-curricular support, and that increasing the numbers of international students would necessitate additional investments in such areas.
- A question was raised as to whether the network of Jesuit Universities might assist in

enhancing the pipeline of international students. Alternatively, BC might form individual partnerships or relationships with key institutions overseas to enhance its profile among international students and their families.

- It was suggested that the question of international student enrollments could be more usefully viewed in the context of whether Boston College's mission.
- The University Council on International Exchange and Research has explored leveraging Jesuit connections, and it was suggested that the UCIER might play a role in such discussions.

Next steps:

1. Discussions with other groups about international student enrollments will continue at the University.
4. Comments about yesterday's Faculty Forum were invited.
  - Academic integrity as a topic has now been discussed by the Provost's Advisory Council, the Council of Deans, and the Faculty Forum. It was suggested that as a next step, the Provost's Advisory Council might view the undergraduate academic integrity tutorial, and familiarize itself with materials produced throughout the University in support of academic integrity.
  - It was proposed that information compiled by the Office for Institutional Research about the cultural competency of AHANA students on campus might be discussed with the Provost's Advisory Council as well as the Faculty Forum.
  - It was noted by some members of the Council that faculty attendance remains relatively low. A suggestion was made that in future Fora, pertinent articles could be circulated in advance.
5. Provost's Report
  - The Deans have been asked to develop specific and concrete suggestions for enhancing diversity in faculty hiring. Members of the Provost's Advisory Council are encouraged to work with their deans in formulating these suggestions.
  - Thoughts about the agenda for the November meeting of the Provost's Advisory Council were invited. It was agreed that the November agenda will include:
    - discussion of the FY14 budget
    - guidelines and procedures for non-tenure track faculty around promotion and grievance
    - conflict of interest/conflict of commitment

The first two items were raised in a recent letter to the Provost from a group of faculty.

(The February meeting of the Council will include a discussion of the current Core Revision project, and recommendations arising from an administrative program review of student conduct.)