Special General Faculty Meeting
December 3, 2014

A Special General Meeting of the Faculty was held on December 3, 2014 in the Dolan Science Center Auditorium and began at 2:04 pm. The following members of Faculty Council (FC) were in attendance: Roy Day (Chair), Barbara D'Ambrosia (Vice-Chair), Gerry Guest (Secretary), Ryan Allen, Scott Allen, Ruth Connell, Jeff Dyck, Kristen Ehrhardt, Tina Facca, Jean Feerick, Simon Fitzpatrick, Dwight Hahn, Dan Kilbride, Marc Kirschenbaum, Linda Koch, Gloria Liu, Annie Moses, Mike Nichols, Alissa Nutting, David Shutkin, Sheri Young, and Tom Zlatoper.

The following Faculty Council members were absent: Simran Kahai, Elizabeth Stiles.

The exact attendance of the meeting was not taken but numbered over 100 faculty members, exceeding the necessary quorum of 40.

Minutes

I. Chair's Announcements

A. The search committee for a new Dean of the Boler School of Business will be chaired by Al Nagy (AC). There will be 5 faculty elected to the committee, four from the BSOB, one from the CAS. Nominations will be open until Thursday, December 11. The election will run from Friday, December 12 to Friday, December 19. Nominations should be sent to David Shutkin.

B. Nominations for the Curtis Miles award are now open. Submit nominations to Tina Facca by December 8.

II. Introduction of the *Resolution to form a collaborative relationship between the Faculty and the University Strategic Planning Group* by the Science Chairs

Paul Shick spoke for the Science Chairs. He noted that the resolution largely speaks for itself and was pre-circulated before today's meeting. The text of the resolution was developed in reaction to the Planning Open House and a perceived relative lack of faculty involvement in the current strategic planning process. Progress in planning had already been made at that point and was not as firmly centered on academics as had been hoped. The resolution asks the Faculty to speak with a single voice about this issue.

Since the Open House, significant developments had arise. The JCU community received an email from President Niehoff on November 21. Jeanne Colleran is now chairing the University Strategic Planning Group and a promise has been made that Academics will be central to the planning process. The Science Chairs applaud these developments.

Shick asked the Faculty to pass the resolution nevertheless.

III. Short remarks by Jeanne Colleran, Provost and Chair of the University Strategic Planning Committee

Colleran noted that President Niehoff reacted quickly to this situation. There will be a USPG meeting tomorrow. December 8 is our hearing with the Higher Learning Commission. Colleran stated that she expects to be asked at it about planning and how faculty are being included. She will speak to that.

Colleran noted that role of the USPG is to help develop a strategic plan. Strategic plans have to be flexible and adaptable. We are asking ourselves what it is we wish to be by 2020. Our last Strategic Plan confused strategy and tactics. This new plan should have at most 3 or 4 bold but capacious priorities, rooted in our academic desires and aspirations. There are four faculty members on the USPG. The Associate Deans and Associate Academic Vice Presidents are also members. This makes a total of 12 or 13 faculty members.

Roy Day wished Colleran good luck with the HLC next week.

IV. Open discussion of the resolution

Day began by posing a question: What is the best way for Faculty to give input on strategic planning without having more faculty representatives on the USPG?

Paul Shick suggested that we could consider a follow-up motion after the current resolution under consideration. This secondary motion could consider the mechanism for faculty collaboration in the planning process.

Mindy Peden suggested that the pre-circulated resolution as written is vague. What are we asking for? What is lacking at this point? Shick noted that most of what we asked for has come to pass, but we should pass the resolution with that fact being celebrated in the Minutes of the meeting. We could ask Faculty Council to put together an *ad hoc* Faculty Committee that would work alongside and with the USPG to guarantee that there is an undiluted faculty voice.

Sheila McGinn noted that we need a motion at this point to adopt the resolution. A motion was made by Jerry Weinstein to adopt the resolution (seconded by Marc Kirschenbaum).

Colleran noted that in adding Associate Deans to the USPG meetings, they could convene discussions at the department level and the divisional level. She is open to suggestions about a FC *ad hoc* committee.

Day noted that the USPG is now about 30 people and that committees of that size almost never make decisions. The Provost should address this issue. Day also offered a friendly amendment to the resolution: we were previously told that a strategic plan would be ready by next May, but now things have changed. There is no longer a hard deadline. Therefore, we cannot suspend deliberations as noted in the pre-circulated resolution. We should thus eliminate the penultimate paragraph of the pre-ciruclated resolution. Mike Setter suggested that it be replaced with an acknowledgment that the situation has changed. Paul Shick suggested the following wording: "Whereas, the faculty acknowledges that the USPG temporarily suspended its deliberations to allow further discussion and collaboration with the Faculty, in an effort to articulate the role of the Academic Affairs Division in long term planning for the health of the institution."

The Science Chairs agreed that Day's amendment was friendly. Mindy Peden moved that the friendly amendment be adopted (seconded by Jim Lissemore). The motion passed overwhelmingly.

Lissemore asked it we should also mention specifically that the USPG is now chaired by the Provost? Day added: "Whereas the Provost has assumed leadership of the USPG and additional faculty have been added to the USPG." Leslie Curtis noted that these additional faculty members are administrators. Shouldn't that be noted? Day noted that they have faculty experience. Sheila McGinn asked if we should record that the faculty in question are Associate Deans and Associate Academic Vice Presidents. The changed text read as follows: "Whereas the Provost has assumed leadership of the USPG and additional members from academic affairs have been added to the USPG"

Colleran suggested that the President should me mentioned, resulting in: "Whereas the President has appointed the Provost to lead the USPG, and additional members from academic affairs have been appointed to the USPG;"
[it is placed as the penultimate paragraph]
Paul Challen added the title "Academic Vice President" to the wording: "Whereas the President has appointed the Provost and Academic Vice President to lead the USPG, and additional members from academic affairs have been appointed to the USPG;" Jim Lissemore moved that this amendment be added (seconded by Sheila McGinn); the motion passed unanimously, save 3 opposed.

Phil Metres asked if minutes from USPG meetings can be shared; Colleran responded that there is already a USPG website for sharing minutes.

Julia Karolle Berg asked Paul Shick about the *ad hoc* FC Committee idea: Would this group be consultative and recommending but without any vote in the decision making process of the USPG? Shick replied yes but that hey could convey faculty concerns and recommendations. Karolle Berg asked if there are subcommittees for the planning process. Colleran replied not at the moment; the group is composed in

relation to divisional responsibilities. Continuous broad feedback loops are hoped for.

Bob Kolesar noted that the Faculty Handbook stipulates that faculty have primary say in academics. Shouldn't the academic part of the plan be presented to and voted on by the faculty? Colleran responded that a strategic plan is an integrated plan. Faculty shouldn't necessarily separate out academics. Kolesar responded that academic issues don't have to be separated for the faculty to vote on them. Jeff Johansen argued that we do not need an *ad hoc* committee because we can all give input on the process. Frank Navratil argued that if each department does a SWOT analysis, then the Deans and Provost can set priorities. There could be effective planning along these lines. Sheila McGinn noted that the FC chair could work with the Provost to develop a mechanism for ensuring faculty participation in the process. Leslie Curtis noted that the USPG is a top-down committee and that is the problem; broader faculty representation, from the bottom up, is what is missing.

Roy Day noted that when the USPG was first announced, Jerry DeSanto said there would be check points with the faculty. The Town Hall was one and faculty response has modified the process. One mechanism is to have regular meetings with the entire faculty, and then have a faculty vote at the end.

Scott Allen moved for a vote on the resolution (seconded by Jeff Johansen). A clear 2/3 of the faculty voted to close debate on the issue. Barbara D'Ambrosia asked whether we are voting to accept the resolution now or to send it out for an electronic vote by the full faculty? Shick noted that we have more than 100 voting faculty here, a quorum. Dwight Hahn questioned the constitutionality of not sending the resolution out for a full vote. Shick responded that he believed that resolutions are not included in the list of things that are sent out for a full vote. In either case, we can still have a vote at this meeting. Day argued that voting here would not be a faculty vote as such, but attendees can still vote on the resolution; we have a large turnout today.

Two counts were made on the vote in favor of the resolution. Either 100 or 107 faculty members voted in favor of it; no one was opposed; two abstained.

The follow-up issue is how will the faculty work with the USPG. McGinn suggested that the FC take up this issue.

V. New Business – none

VI. Adjourn – the meeting was adjourned at 3:04 pm.

Appendix A

Resolution to form a collaborative relationship between the Faculty and the University Strategic Planning Group
(final version as voted on at the meeting)

Rationale: As stated in the Constitution of the Faculty Council, approved by President Niehoff, S.J., and the Board of Directors, *"The Faculty shall have primary responsibility for recommendations on policy in such fundamental areas as curriculum, subject matter and methods of instruction, research, faculty status, faculty development, and those aspects of student life which relate to the educational process."* Acknowledging and affirming our commitment to this charge, the Faculty offer the following resolution:

Whereas, John Carroll University is, first and foremost, an institution of higher learning, the work of the Academic Affairs Division is at the heart of the institution;

Whereas, Faculty are concerned with the diminishing investment in the Academic Affairs Division, which may continue to see: an erosion of the ranks of faculty, an erosion in the ranks of our staff colleagues who help implement our programs, a decrease in access to full time faculty for students, and a potential loss of quality of academic programs;

Whereas, we are concerned that: the recent University Strategic Planning Group Town Hall did not adequately address the Faculty's concerns about a long term planning process that places the Academic Affairs Division at its center; the USPG did not articulate a method for including feedback from the Academic Affairs Division; and the USPG did not outline a mechanism for integrating the priorities of Academic Affairs Division with non-Academic divisions;

Whereas, the Faculty acknowledges that the University Strategic Planning Group temporarily suspended its deliberations to allow further discussion and collaboration with the Faculty, in an effort to articulate the role of the Academic Affairs Division in long term planning for the health of the institution;

Whereas, the President has appointed the Provost/Academic Vice President to lead the USPG, and additional members from Academic Affairs have been appointed to the USPG;

Resolved: The Faculty ask that Faculty Council work with the University Strategic Planning Group to develop a mechanism for continuing collaboration between the Faculty and the USPG throughout the process of developing a strategic plan.

Appendix B
Resolution to form a collaborative relationship between the Faculty and the University Strategic Planning Group
(version circulated before the meeting)

Rationale: As stated in the Constitution of the Faculty Council, approved by President Niehoff, S.J.,and the Board of Directors, “The Faculty shall have primary responsibility for recommendations on policy in such fundamental areas as curriculum, subject matter and methods of instruction, research, faculty status, faculty development, and those aspects of student life which relate to the educational process.” Acknowledging and affirming our commitment to this charge, the Faculty offer the following resolution:

Whereas, John Carroll University is, first and foremost, an institution of higher learning, the work of the Academic Affairs Division is at the heart of the institution;

Whereas, Faculty are concerned with the diminishing investment in the Academic Affairs Division, which may continue to see: an erosion of the ranks of faculty, an erosion in the ranks of our staff colleagues who help implement our programs, a decrease in access to full time faculty for students, and a potential loss of quality of academic programs;

Whereas, we are concerned that: the recent University Strategic Planning Group Town Hall did not adequately address the Faculty’s concerns about a long term planning process that places the Academic Affairs Division at its center; the USPG did not articulate a method for including feedback from the Academic Affairs Division; and the USPG did not outline a mechanism for integrating the priorities of Academic Affairs Division with non-Academic divisions;

Resolved: The Faculty ask that the University Strategic Planning Group temporarily suspend its deliberations to allow further discussion and collaboration with the Faculty, in an effort to articulate the role of the Academic Affairs Division in long term planning for the health of the institution;

Resolved: The Faculty ask that Faculty Council work with the University Strategic Planning Group to develop a mechanism for continuing collaboration between the Faculty and the USPG throughout the process of developing a strategic plan.