

## General Faculty Meeting

February 25, 2015

A General Meeting of the Faculty was held on February 25, 2015 in the Dolan Science Center Auditorium and began at 2:05 pm.

The following Faculty Council members were in attendance: Roy Day (Chair), Barbara D'Ambrosia (Vice Chair), Gerry Guest (Secretary), Ryan Allen, Paul Challen, Jeff Dyck, Kristen Ehrhardt, Jean Feerick, Simon Fitzpatrick, Dwight Hahn, Dan Kilbride, Linda Koch, Cindy Lenox, Gloria Liu, Annie Moses, Mike Nichols, David Shutkin, Elizabeth Stiles, Sheri Young, and Tom Zlatoper.

The following members were absent: Scott Allen, Tina Facca, Simran Kahai, and Alissa Nutting.

The exact attendance of the meeting was not taken but clearly exceeded the necessary quorum of 41.

The agenda for the meeting was distributed in advance via email.

### Minutes

#### I. Chair's Announcements

A. Minutes of the General Faculty Meeting, January 28. No corrections were offered, and the minutes were taken as approved.

B. Next Faculty Council meeting: Wednesday, March 11.

C. Next General Faculty meeting: Wednesday, March 25.

D. The Chronicle Great Colleges to Work For Survey. Faculty are encouraged to complete the survey; a good rate of response is desirable. Part time faculty who have taught several times in the past have also been asked to participate. Please encourage your part time colleagues to participate.

E. Final call for nominations for the Ad Hoc University Committee to Study the Conflict of Interest Policy. Elections will start late this week and run until the Tuesday after Spring Break. No nominations were received from the floor.

F. Faculty Council received a letter from the Psychology Department regarding the Poster Competition for the 2015 Celebration of Scholarship. The last item on today's agenda is an open forum on the Poster Competition.

G. Faculty are encouraged to remain informed about the activities of important University committees such as the University Strategic Planning Committee and the Provost's Council. Information about these committees, including agendas and minutes, is posted on the web

- <http://sites.jcu.edu/uspg/>
- <http://sites.jcu.edu/provost/pages/provosts-council/>

At the start of each General Faculty Meeting there will be a short period when faculty members on these committees will be available to answer questions.

## II. CAP: Proposal on the Future of the Outgoing Core (see Appendix A below)

Mike Nichols (chair, CAP) reported on the proposal. Two issues are addressed in it: (1) a streamlining of the process for courses submitted to the incoming Core being forwarded to the outgoing Core for consideration and (2) a timeline for the disbanding of the outgoing Core Committee. Faculty Council noted that language would have to be added for decision making relating to the outgoing Core once the outgoing Core director position is retired.

Jerry Weinstein moved that the proposal be sent to the full faculty for a vote (seconded Patrick Mooney). The motion passed unanimously.

## III. Report to the Faculty regarding the Early College Program (Mark Storz and Anne Kugler)

Storz and Kugler offered an annual update on JCU's agreement with the Cleveland Heights-University Heights school district to have select students take courses at JCU. The program was developed and approved in 2011-12. In 2012-13 the first cohort of 33 9<sup>th</sup> graders was enrolled in the R.E.A.L. Early College program. In 2013-14, the second class was enrolled (numbering 78) and 17 sophomores returned to the program. In 2014-15, 8 juniors enrolled taking a total of 52 credits (in the Fall) and 73 credits (in the Spring); mentoring continues for these students. The third cohort contains 57 students. In Fall 2015, 8 students from the first cohort (now seniors) will continue; at least two of whom will be full time at JCU. It is expected that 15-16 students from the second cohort will enroll.

Storz and Kugler explained one important development that will affect the program going forward. A new state program known as College Credit Plus (CCP) mandates that students in grades 7-12 must be allowed to take college classes if they are college ready. All public school districts and public colleges/universities are required to participate in this program. If JCU does not participate in this program, the CHUH program will go away. We therefore cannot restrict participation in our program to high school juniors and seniors. The new regulations also impact our early admission standards which are higher than the state mandate.

In response to the CCP changes, Roy Day offered the following resolution: “● The Faculty call on the administration to make temporary adjustments to the admissions requirements

of the Early College Program to bring the ECP into compliance with the new College Credit Plus program and ensure that the ECP will continue during the 2015-16 academic year as a one-year pilot. ● The Administration should prepare a proposal on the university's participation in the College Credit Plus program and submit the proposal for Faculty review in Fall 2015."

Jerry Weinstein asked if these CCP rules go into effect immediately (answer: yes). Storz noted that 2015-16 would thus be a pilot year for complying with CCP.

Barbara D'Ambrosia moved for a vote on the resolution (seconded Amy Wainwright). The resolution passed unanimously.

#### IV. Response to the Higher Learning Commission – open discussion on Governance

- What initiatives can the faculty take to improve shared governance?
- What can the administration do to improve shared governance?

Day called for a general discussion on the above issues. Jim Lissemore asked if this discussion is premature since we do not have the official HLC report. Graciela Lacueva commented on the low turnout at this meeting as part of the problem. Mindy Peden responded that faculty alone are not responsible for shared governance and that faculty get blamed for our shared governance problem. Dwight Hahn challenged the notion that empty seats are a problem and Gloria Liu noted that the people who are here don't need to be told about attendance issues. Day asked how can we persuade our colleagues to attend meetings more regularly. Paul Shick noted that all of our major decisions are by electronic ballot; therefore, some faculty feel that meetings can be skipped. If voting were to take place at meetings, meetings would then be more meaningful. Mindy Peden noted that we would need to guarantee anonymous voting in that case. Simon Fitzpatrick noted that there are legitimate reasons for faculty missing these meetings (i.e., our workload). Lissemore noted that if we voted at the meetings, it wouldn't take into account legitimate absences

Mindy Peden noted that "shared governance" has been identified as the problem by the HLC, not faculty governance. Day responded that the report will likely criticize both. Bob Kolesar suggested that faculty who aren't here may believe that we don't have shared governance.

Barbara D'Ambrosia asked what do we want shared governance to be regardless of the HLC report? Sheila McGinn responded that we could give a charge to the ad hoc committee currently working on faculty governance to address this issue. Day responded that if we did this, what do we want? Peden asked what do best practices look like? Do they involve unions? Medora Barnes noted that we have the chance to tell the administration what we want in the wake of this HLC report.

Dan Kilbride argued that the empty seats are a problem; we have an apathy problem that shouldn't be ignored.

V. The Poster Competition at the 2015 Celebration of Scholarship – open discussion. See Appendix B below.

Day suggested that this issue reflected the culture of notification that we have been objecting to. Jim Krukones was asked to explain the competition. Krukones explained that the Poster Competition has been introduced as a new part of the Celebration this year. It has been discussed for some time and Krukones approved the idea. Concerns have been raised by some faculty and are being taken seriously. Krukones noted that the competition is set up so that participation by students is voluntary and that it can be discontinued if it proves unsatisfactory. In the past there was an advisory committee for the Celebration; Krukones noted that we might want to reinstate it.

Helen Murphy presented her arguments in opposition to the competition. She noted that (1) there was a lack of faculty involvement in this decision, (2) it dampens the spirit of the Celebration, (3) it disregards affiliations between JCU and other institutions, and (4) it lacks judges who can evaluate posters across multiple fields of study.

Day noted that Faculty Council felt that this should be discussed here since a decision was made without Faculty input. Jeff Johansen responded that competitions at scientific meetings are common; this is a positive thing for student resumes. Other students aren't diminished if they don't win and that this doesn't seem like a stress-inducing competition. Overall, it's a nice idea. Roger Purdy asked about the judging criteria and judging across different disciplines. Krukones responded that Todd Bruce has helped to develop a rubric. We looked at how CWRU gives prizes in its poster competition. There will be a training session for our judges.

Sheri Young noted that the department of Psychological Science, which discussed this issue, is not against competition, but that the judging criteria are a problem – visual display is being judged.

Jerry Weinstein addressed the issue of non-experts judging the posters. As faculty we face this all the time. There's nothing wrong with a competition of this type. Since it's been announced, we can't pull back.

Day responded that it probably would be inappropriate to change it now. We could express our desire to be involved in the process for 2015-2016.

VI. New Business

VII. Adjourn – the meeting was adjourned at 3:22 pm.

---

## Appendix A

### Proposal concerning the Outgoing Core

Submitted by: Earl Spurgin, Director of Core (outgoing) Curriculum  
Peter Kvidera, Director of Core (incoming) Curriculum

**Background.** We have been discussing some transition issues that will arise as the new Core begins. One of them is that, as faculty develop courses for the new Core, we might encounter issues with having enough courses for the outgoing Core. Although some new courses will be appropriate for both the outgoing and incoming Cores, we worry that faculty will be disinclined to apply to two separate committees for Core designations when they develop those new courses. Too many might not be inclined to apply to the University Core Committee that governs the outgoing Core for designations that students need to satisfy. They might reason, “Why deal with the outgoing Core and whatever its committee wants since I am developing this course for the new Core?” To be proactive about this issue, we proposed an idea to our respective committees that govern the outgoing and incoming Cores. Those committees approved the proposal outlined below.

**Proposal.** We ask that the Faculty Council approve the following:

1) After the end of the 2014-15 academic year, the committee for the incoming Core will include on its application form for Core course approval the following:

Do you believe this course also is appropriate for the outgoing Core until it ends? \_\_\_\_\_  
If yes, please indicate the Division and/or Letter Designations.  
If you indicated “yes”, your syllabus will be forwarded to the Director of the outgoing Core.

2) Once the Director of the outgoing Core receives a syllabus from the committee for the incoming Core, she or he will make the determination regarding whether the course at issue will receive any Core designations for the outgoing Core.

3) Since, if #1 and #2 above are adopted, the University Core Committee that currently governs the outgoing Core no longer will review all faculty Core course approval petitions, Faculty Council should consider disbanding that committee at an appropriate time. We suggest after the end of the 2015-16 academic year.

4) After the position of UCC director has been vacated, decisions regarding courses for the outgoing core will be made by the CAS dean or the relevant associate dean.

**Rationale.** The idea is that, after the 2014-15 academic year, faculty would submit approval applications only to the committee that governs the incoming Core. That committee would forward to the Director of the outgoing Core the syllabi of those faculty who believe their new courses are appropriate for the outgoing Core. That Director would then determine whether any Core designations should be granted to the course for the outgoing Core. With this procedure, faculty would not feel they have to go through two committees for the same course, thereby streamlining the process and helping to guarantee enough courses for the outgoing Core. In essence, this would make the process for outgoing-Core courses during the years it is phased out similar to the process that currently is used for Transient Student Petitions. That process allows the Director of the outgoing Core to review syllabi and make a judgment about whether the course satisfies John Carroll University's Core requirements. The goal of this proposed procedure is to make things easier on faculty who are developing new courses.

### **CAP Report**

TO: Anthony Roy Day, Chair, Faculty Council  
 FROM: Michael A. Nichols, Chair, Committee on Academic Policies (CAP)  
 SUBJECT: CAP Report to Faculty Council on the Future of the Outgoing University Core  
 Committee Proposal Submitted by Earl Spurgin and Peter Kvidera  
 Date: February 9, 2015

---

CAP was charged with studying the Proposal on the Future of the Outgoing University Core Committee submitted by Dr. Earl Spurgin, Director of the (outgoing) Core Curriculum and Dr. Peter Kvidera, Director of the (incoming) Integrative Core Curriculum (ICC) at the Faculty Council meeting held on October 8, 2014. Faculty comments on the proposal were solicited in the email announcement of the open hearings, which were held on February 3, 2014. No faculty attended the open hearings and only two email comments were received, both in support of the proposal.

**Concise Statement of the Problem.** The proposal has two essential elements to address issues and streamline course submission approval as the University transitions from the outgoing Core Curriculum to the new ICC. First, a streamlined process is proposed whereby courses submitted for approval in the new ICC will be forwarded to the Director of the outgoing Core Curriculum for appropriate core designation, if the proposer(s) believes that the course will fulfill those requirements. The second element is a proposal to disband the outgoing University Core Committee (UCC) at the end of the 20152016 academic year; this will require a vote of the Faculty as the original UCC was established by a vote of the Faculty.

**Recommendations.** *CAP unanimously agrees with the process to forward ICC course proposals to the Director of the outgoing Core Curriculum for appropriate course designation approval, at the request of the proposer(s).* In fact, this streamlined process is in use and faculty proposing ICC courses can request the proposal be forwarded for current Core

designation consideration. At open hearings, Earl Spurgin indicated that a few courses have already been forwarded for review by the UCC.

**CAP also unanimously agrees with the proposal to disband the current UCC at the end of the 20152016 academic year.**

**Alternatives Considered and Results Expected.** No alternatives were considered for the first element of the proposal.

For the second element, it is important to state two facts. First, the last class under the current Core started in Fall 2014, and those students' 2nd year will be 20152016. The second is that the UCC is only involved in the course/designation approval process; the course petition process is handled only by the Director.

Disbanding the UCC after the 20152016 academic year would leave current/outgoing Core curriculum course approval decisions in the hands of the Director for the remaining two years. Alternatives could be proposed to disband the UCC after the 20142015, 20162017 or 20172018 academic years. Disbanding the UCC after this current semester might be too early as there will be three years left in the final class' Core and a number of new courses might be submitted for dual core approval/designation. In the final two years of the current/outgoing Core, it is less likely that new courses will be submitted for approval and maintaining the UCC will require continued elected faculty representation.

CAP has confidence that Dr. Spurgin, as a very experienced Director will not require UCC input in the core course/designation approval process during the final two years of the current/outgoing Core. Dr. Spurgin has agreed to remain as the current/outgoing Core Director until at least the end of 20162017 and it is unlikely that any new courses or designations would be proposed/requested in 20172018, the final year of the current/outgoing Core. In the absence of a Director for the final year, any course approval or designation requests will need to be made by the appropriate Associate CAS Dean, as they will after most of the final class under the current/outgoing Core has graduated.

**Therefore, CAP unanimously supports this Proposal and would make the motion to place the Proposal on the agenda for the February 25, 2015 General Faculty meeting and ultimately sent to a vote of the Faculty.**

Respectfully submitted,

CAP Committee:

Jennifer Catellier  
 Brendan Forman  
 Rick Greci  
 Penny Harris  
 Michael Nichols  
 Dianna Taylor  
 Peifang Tian

TO: Anthony Roy Day  
Chair of Faculty Council, 2014-2015

FROM: Department of Psychological Science  
(Dr. Helen M. Murphy)

RE: Poster Competition at the 2015 Celebration of Scholarship

---

On February 10, 2015, the Department of Psychological Science discussed the introduction of poster competition at the 2015 Celebration of Scholarship at John Carroll University. The information was promulgated from the Provost and Academic Vice President's Office on January 29, 2015.

Celebration of Scholarship has always been a special community event at JCU. "Since 2002, the Celebration of Scholarship has showcased the academic accomplishments of both students and faculty, which represent one of the hallmarks of John Carroll University...We're looking for undergraduate and graduate students, faculty, and staff who would like to take part in panel and paper presentations, poster sessions, performance art, and artistic exhibits for an opportunity to share scholarship already completed or in progress " (<http://inside.jcu.edu/2014/11/10/2015-celebration-of-scholarship/>) .

We believe that the spirit of this celebration will be lost with the introduction of poster competition. It is not an athletic event where there are "winners" and "losers". Everyone is a "winner" (not just 3 undergraduate students) by the fact that he/she is participating in the celebration. In the Celebration of Scholarship, the community comes together to applaud all of the participating individuals. It is a JCU "family affair". This event has always been a morale booster for the community:

- Students interact with one another (do not have to stay at their poster for the entire session)
- Faculty members attend
- Parents and grandparents attend (some come from as far away as Columbus)
- Friends of the participants attend
- Staff members of the Cleveland Clinic come to campus for the event.

What impact will this have upon the many students who have conducted research projects at institutions such as the Cleveland Clinic? Staff members of the Cleveland Clinic have been very generous with their time and expertise in affording our students a unique research experience at a renowned institution.

Regarding judging of the posters, judges cannot possibly have expertise in all areas that will be represented at the Celebration of Scholarship (e.g., judging of a Cell and Molecular Biology poster by an individual who has expertise in Theology and Religious Studies).

At this time of their lives, students have enough competition to contend with (e.g., admittance to graduate or professional schools, seeking job opportunities, etc.).

Why is it that competition will occur only with posters? Students are encouraged to give oral presentations, panel presentations, and display art exhibits.

[end]