

Faculty Council Meeting

Wednesday, November 14, 2012, 2PM

Present: L. Koch, D. Hahn, T. Short, T. Hayes, M. Kirschenbaum, R. Day, D. Shutkin, M. Webinger, L. Curtis, S. McGinn, C. Lenox, A. Imam, R. Allen, A. Kugler (Chair), S. Young (Vice Chair), K. Gygli (Secretary).

I. Announcements:

- Distinguished Faculty Award Reception to honor Dr. Brenda Wirkus on Friday at 3PM in the Reading Room in Dolan.
- Carroll Collected and Selected Works reception on 5PM Friday in Grasselli Library.
- The Chair will draw the names for one discrimination grievance committee and one grievance committee from the faculty pool immediately following today's meeting.
- Barbara D'Ambrosia is unable to attend today due to a family emergency, so the proposal on transferring online credits will be postponed.

II. New Core Curriculum Proposal

Drs. Gwen Compton-Engle and Jeanne Colleran, Dean of Arts and Sciences, are present today to answer any questions that arise on the proposed curriculum, but it is understood that this proposal is in the first stage of multiple stages of review. Faculty Council today needs to vote to send this proposal to CAP to review and also will compile a list of questions and concerns for CAP to consider as they review this proposed new core. It is assumed that there will be numerous open hearings and that faculty will carefully read the entire proposal as they react to it.

Questions and concerns for CAP:

- Staffing of new core curriculum:
 - There needs to be a significant investment of faculty into this new core in order to make it work. Is there enough interest and commitment there in the faculty in order to create the new courses needed and to retool courses in order to link them? If there is not, will faculty be forced to do this?
 - Is there more support for new faculty hires, to teach, for example, some of the areas of Fine Arts such as dance and studio arts, for which the university does not presently have full-time faculty?
 - If current enrollment patterns continue, will the president support new faculty hires, when he has stated that new hiring lines must be put on hold in order to finance faculty pay increases?
 - How does existing expertise fit into this new core? Will this new use of expertise lead to a reduction of faculty in areas that are not emphasized in this new core, such as History?

- Resources and Compensation:
 - What resources and support will be available for new course development? How much will this proposed core cost the university?
 - Will the time and work needed to retool old courses and create new ones, along with linking them with other courses, be counted for merit pay increases, or will it only merit a one-time stipend?
- Possible unexpected consequences:
 - What is the rationale for placing the Fine Arts in a division along with Religion and the Jesuit Tradition? Is there a risk of censorship?
 - If students can fulfill a Fine Arts credit by taking a Literature course, doesn't that undermine the exploration of alternative texts (such as space, time, movement, music, visual motif, composition, etc.) in the new core? Many area high schools have more opportunities for exploration of these creative areas than John Carroll currently does. Does the new core really change this situation at all or is it just "window dressing"?
 - Does the new core require sufficient study of language? Is there flexibility for the study of language and cultures across the curriculum? Are we measuring an incoming student's language competency, or just assuming it when that student wishes to continue with their high school language in order to take less language courses?
 - With a smaller core, there will be more electives. Any discussion on what students are likely to do with these electives? Is there more room for experiential courses or programs like study abroad or internships?
 - A concern was expressed that students are still forced to take five courses a semester under this model, and that this proposed core does not more in-depth engagement in any area.
 - Because Calculus is not counted for the "Quantitative Literacy" requirement, yet some majors still require Calculus, could this lead to a student needing to take as many as three extra courses in order to get into Calculus, and thus, into certain majors which require Calculus?
- Process of the APTF, and of the proposed core's administration:
 - At one time, it was stated that there would be several models of a new core to consider. Now there is only one model proposed. How set in stone or preliminary is this model?
 - What other frameworks were considered?
 - Was conversion to a 4-credit hour structure considered?
 - How were the desired learning outcomes mapped to assessment methods? Should be included in conversation.
 - Is this proposed core a marketing feature for increased enrollment? Again, should be included in any conversations about this proposal.
 - How would this new core be administered? Is there a body envisioned by this committee that would be equivalent to the current Core Committee in terms of oversight?

- Was a study abroad requirement considered, since this core has a required “Globalization” course?

Main points in the responses provided by Jeanne Colleran and Gwen Compton-Engle concerning these questions:

- Responses to questions on staffing of the proposed new core curriculum:
 - The committee designed the new core so that it will not exceed faculty capacity already needed for current core. Most of the significant areas in the new core are unchanged or transferrable in terms of faculty staffing needs, in their view. For example, the required linked courses is not adding courses numerically; it is the linkage that is new, not the number of courses required (indeed, the overall number required for graduation is being reduced from 128 to 120.) It is their hope that the question on faculty needed to staff new core would come up and be discussed and answered in the open hearings. The committee is not recommending that First Year Seminar be continued, so that should free up some faculty members. Their earnest hope is that the faculty read the document carefully—no one wants a repeat of FYS. It was their sense that many on the faculty were enthusiastic about these proposed changes. One of the main questions considered was how much a paradigm shift faculty would support—for example, the change from a usual class of 3 credit hours to 4 credit hours was rejected by the committee for this reason. The committee assumed that the current number of faculty at JCU could deliver this curriculum. Even the Fine Arts requirement could be satisfied through many course currently offered.
- Responses to questions on compensation and available resources:
 - The committee did discuss course development and faculty development costs, and asked the Provost to commit to providing this. But beyond this, the committee believed that the consideration of costs and funds was beyond their purview. Ann noted that in the proposal, the Provost does promise support. Gwen asked CAP to consider what level of detail on costs the faculty would need in order to support the proposal and which office should provide this support.
- Responses to questions on unforeseen consequences:
 - The proposal is not territorial. No one department or program will be asked to change or give up anything. The Dean stated firmly that she did not believe any part of the proposed core was beyond the expertise of the current faculty. Indeed, the linked courses were included to raise the comfort level of current faculty. The new core should not necessitate hiring new faculty to implement. Not every faculty member will be comfortable teaching linked courses and not every faculty member needs to teach linked courses. The important element on which to concentrate is what students need to know and learning outcomes. The committee hopes that freeing up students from the current core load will allow them

to double major or have several minors. Although students can do this now, it is done accidentally or at the end of their college career, but not planned for at the beginning so that they can be better guided toward majors or other programs. The committee also wanted to encourage language proficiency while also encouraging students to try a new language as well.

- Responses to questions on the committee's procedures:
 - The committee had thought they would propose multiple models of new curricula. Since members found that they all were coalescing around one proposed curriculum, it wouldn't have been honest to develop others as "straw men." They decided it might be better to have one well-developed and fleshed-out proposal instead of several sketchy proposed curricula, especially since it was a big enough job to flesh this one out. They look forward to great ideas emerging in the open hearings on this proposal, or new ideas to improve this proposal. The committee's main efforts were not who would be teaching this curriculum, but which broader learning outcomes would best serve the students and reflect the Jesuit intellectual heritage; hence, the association of Fine Arts with Religion and Philosophy, and the need for intellectual rigor. The committee did not engage in discussions concerning how to use the core to diminish programs or faculty, nor was that the goal of the committee. The committee was not driven by marketing or enrollment concerns, but by learning outcomes which would best serve the students. While study abroad requirements would be desirable, the committee feared that such a requirement would be financially burdensome for students. This committee's proposal is the last of the working groups to complete their job. There is an overall working group report. The committee hopes to have this in place by Fall, 2015. This proposal needs many faculty eyes.
- Additional discussion: There was some discussion that of all the working groups, it was thought that the curriculum committee would be the nuts-and-bolts practical report and a launching pad for further discussion of faculty work, the real implementation model. The Dean asked whether it was best for faculty to start with what students should know, the educational merits of learning outcomes, before resources and compensation were addressed. If vote passes, the proposal, with questions raised at this meeting, will go forward to the Committee on Academic Policies.

Action: Dwight Hahn made a motion that the APTF's Core Curriculum Proposal, along with the questions raised at this meeting and any budgetary concerns, be sent to CAP for further review. Sheila McGinn seconded the motion. The motion carries, with 14 votes for, 1 vote against and 0 abstentions.

III. Committee Reports:

- Election Committee: Tom Short asked Council members if the Election Committee should schedule a special election to fill vacancies or recruit now for

the next regularly scheduled election. It was decided to add candidates for vacancies on the election concerning Handbook issues.

- Rank, Tenure and Promotion: Roy Day reported that there will need to be an interpretation of the Faculty Handbook regarding when to start the tenure clock for visiting professors who subsequently get hired as tenure-track. The Handbook states that the tenure clock should start on the first date of appointment as a visitor, but the practice has been to start the tenure clock when the tenure track appointment begins. RTS feels that the Handbook should be altered to match current practice. The administration expects the faculty to make this proposal. The practice of choosing when to start the tenure clock will be discontinued in the future, but faculty need to know whether currently signed documents will still hold? This is an especially pressing question in the sciences, since tenure-track faculty receive lab space and resources that visiting professors do not; if those visitors do not start their tenure clock when actually going on a tenure-track, they could be at a real disadvantage when going up for tenure in terms of research.

At this point, a quorum was lost, so no votes were allowed. The Council members were reminded to nominate colleagues for the Curtis Proctor award.

The meeting was adjourned at 3:25PM.

Minutes prepared by Karen L. Gygli, Faculty Council Secretary