

Faculty Council Meeting
October 7, 2015
Mackin Room, Grasselli Library

The following Faculty Council members were in attendance: Barbara D'Ambrosia (chair), Mindy Peden (vice chair), Gerry Guest (secretary), Scott Allen, Medora Barnes, Mary Beadle, Larry Cima, Gwen Compton-Engle, Roy Day, Jeff Dyck, Kristen Ehrhardt, Tina Facca-Miess, Jean Feerick, Simon Fitzpatrick, Brendan Foreman, Dwight Hahn, Sharon Kaye, Dan Kilbride, Annie Moses, David Shutkin, Elizabeth Stiles, Peifang Tian, Mariah Webinger, and Tom Zlatoper.

The following members were absent: Nathan Gehlert.

The agenda for the meeting was distributed in advance via email. The meeting started at 2:02 pm.

Minutes

1. Chair's announcements

- a. Minutes from September 9 Faculty Council meeting. With no changes being offered, the minutes were taken as approved.
- b. Community Forum on Wednesday, October 14 at 2:00 – Strategic Plan.
- c. Open hearings for the salary proposal (10/12, 1-2 pm, Dolan E244; 10/15, 11am-noon, Mackin Room).
- d. For consideration at a Faculty Council meeting, proposals must be submitted to the Chair of Faculty Council by noon on the Monday before the meeting.
- e. Discussion of change in open time (currently Wednesdays at 2 pm). This is being considered by the administration (a Tuesday or Thursday timeslot has been discussed). Details to follow.

2. Report from Provost's Council (Peden)

See the Appendix for a written report.

- At the 9/16 meeting, there was a long discussion on student withdrawals and leaves. Maryclaire Moroney is still working on the policy statement. Nick Santilli spoke about the Great Colleges survey.
- At the 9/30 meeting, Moroney discussed student persistence and retention; the report was data driven. Importantly, it was revealed that students who leave JCU are more likely to be high achieving than low achieving. Peden asked Faculty Council for feedback on the

idea of direct admit, noting that only some programs are being considered for direct admit (perhaps Business and Education). D'Ambrosia asked if this falls under the purview of the Faculty. In the past, it was a philosophical point-of-view that prevented the implementation of a direct admit model because it might prevent students from exploring different academic areas. Peden reported that the Provost argued that the new Core has changed the way students take classes. Hahn asked whether a direct admit policy requires faculty endorsement; in his opinion this may very well touch on our purview. Shutkin argued that there are issues for us as faculty. Would it be more difficult for students to change majors in this model? Hahn suggested that those in favor of this model should come up with a plan; then the faculty could consider it. Peden asked if (alternatively) this could be done without us. Kilbride suggested that faculty should have at least a consultative role here (in the spirit of shared governance). Day also argued for erring on the side of shared governance. **Hahn moved that any proposal pertaining to direct admit should be brought to Faculty Council for consideration on how it should be handled** (seconded Day). The motion passed (20 yes votes, 1 no, 1 abstention).

3. Items for Business

a. The Faculty Council has been asked to co-sponsor (with the Staff Council) a JCU night at the Cavaliers game (on Jan. 21); no costs are associated with sponsorship. **Stiles moved to have Council sponsor the event (seconded Zlatoper)**. The motion passed by a clear majority.

b. Election Results.

c. Faculty Council Elections.

i. Chair of the Committee on Academic Policies. Compton-Engle was nominated; no other nominations were received. With 21 yes votes, Compton-Engle was elected.

ii. Chair of the Committee on Revenue and Spending. No nominations were made. D'Ambrosia discussed the purview of the committee; Peden read its official charge from the Constitution. **Webinger moved that we dissolve the Committee (Cima seconded)**. Hahn opposed the motion, suggesting that we wait and hear from the members on the Committee. Kilbride pointed out that we have a University Budget committee that deals with these issues. D'Ambrosia added that any proposal can be brought to FC; there does not need to be a dedicated committee. Fitzpatrick echoed Hahn's opposition. **The motion passed** (11 yes votes, 8 no, 3 abstentions).

iii. Representative to the Integrated Core Committee. This person will need to attend the Monday 2-3:15 meetings (currently, every Monday). D'Ambrosia nominated herself (seconded Day). She was elected unanimously.

- d. Preview of the salary proposal, open hearings to be scheduled (Compensation Committee). Kilbride reported that the Committee now has a salary proposal (with supplementary documents). Please encourage people to read the proposal and give feedback (via open hearing or email); improvements are welcome. We have no policy in this area, so this is a significant issue and an example of shared governance that works. Hahn asked if the passage about faculty members getting written feedback from the Dean about their annual evaluation could be worded more clearly; Barnes agreed with Hahn.
- e. Faculty Council Constitution, with updated appendices (predistributed to FC). D'Ambrosia noted that the webpage is out of date here and that we now have to remove Revenue & Spending from the current version. No objections were made to posting the document to the Faculty Council website.
- f. Adjunct faculty – see the report from the Committee on Gender & Diversity (Barnes). Last year, members of the Committee felt strongly about JCU's treatment of adjunct faculty. This year the Committee decided that it is not in their purview, but the issue is being returned to Faculty Council. Some JCU part-timers are trying to organize to discuss issues of payroll schedules, offices, awards, etc. Full-time faculty have not done much here. A meeting was held with Ed Peck with some part-time and full-time faculty and some students. Do we need to do a survey to see how we could help? Day asked if we could get part-time faculty responses from the Great Colleges survey. D'Ambrosia asked if there is a Committee that could handle this. Peden asked whether we should include part-timers in our definition of faculty. Day responded that it's a handbook issue. **Hahn moved that we table this issue and return to it (seconded Day).** The motion passed with 21 yes votes and 1 no.
- g. Request to add ex-officio positions for administrators on Faculty Council committees. D'Ambrosia explained that this has been requested more than once. It's a loose proposal; these administrators would have non-voting positions in order to make the collaborative process more efficient. Allen asked if we should discuss this after Nick Santilli completes his committee audit as we may end up doing some re-organization. Stiles voiced her opposition to having such representatives on Faculty Council committees; it might affect the operations of the committee, limiting open discussions. Day supported Stiles; committee chairs could invite administrators to meetings as deemed appropriate. Facca-Miess noted that we should keep track of when we do engage with administrators in this fashion. Hahn noted that it might even be appropriate for different administrators to liaise with committees at different times.

4. Reports – for Faculty Council Committee reports, see the Appendix; reports from the Committees of the Board of Directors will be included in November's minutes.

5. Items for October 21 Faculty Meeting

- a. Progress report on the HLC writing effort
- b. Annual report to the faculty on the financial state of the university – Rich Mausser, Vice President for Finance/CFO. October 8 is the deadline for presubmitting questions.
- c. Great Colleges to Work For Survey – D’Ambrosia noted that we could use this data to initiate a conversation about work load and committee assignments.
- d. Discussion of strategic plan?

6. New Business – none

7. Adjourn – 3:15 pm

Appendix A – Provost’s Council Reports (Peden)

September 16:

1. Discussion of “permanent Withdrawals and leaves of Absence Policy,” submitted by Maryclaire Moroney, Claudia Wenzel, Marty Hendren and Sheri Crahen (attached)
 - a. Need for FAQ section on website
 - b. Need for Communication Plan for both Parents and Staff as well. Provost Colleran tasks Brian Williams with Calendar-ization of cutoffs contained in the Policy.
2. Maryclaire’s work with CAP on issues of Bulletin Policy revision was discussed, as part of a conversation about shared governance. Dean Farrar said that at Augustana some pertinent administrators were ex-officio on faculty committees but not Chair and that that seemed to work.
3. Nick Santilli gave a short preview of the Great Colleges to Work For Survey results
 - a. His interpretation is that the low morale is a consequence of the perception that there are “low performers in the office next door.” No evidence was provided for this interpretation.
 - b. Big picture is that we need to restore community and that our biggest challenges are “relational.”

September 30:

Provost reported many items that will be included in her Provost’s report (see report)

Maryclaire Moroney presented on Persistence and Retention; data driven, resulting in shift in thinking, because: Highest retention risk is high achieving students (measured by GPA)

Provost brought up Direct Admit for some programs of study; examples given were business and Engineering

What kind of avenue for faculty input/vote do we recommend? Handbook issues?

Provost reiterates major concern as Net Tuition revenue

Appendix B – Faculty Council Committee Reports

Report of the Committee on finance, faculty compensation, and work-related policies (Dan Kilbride)

So far in academic year 2015-16, the compensation committee is engaged on three fronts.

(1) We have completed a draft salary proposal per Council's instruction from its first meeting of the 2014-15 academic year. The specifications of that policy, as well as its background, are spelled out on the first page of that policy, which has been distributed to Council, so I will not repeat them here. We will be holding open hearings on this proposal next week. Barring serious objections, we will present the final draft of the policy to Council soon afterwards.

(2) It has been brought to our attention that some faculty members received excess salary during the summer 2015 semester. The mistakes were caught by the faculty members, not by payroll or anybody else at the University. Therefore, the committee has asked the VP for Finance if an audit of our payroll procedures might be in order.

(3) Following an order of Faculty Council at its meeting of Wed., Sept. 9, the committee has begun to examine the annual faculty self-evaluation process. It is likely we will recommend a revision or perhaps a wholesale change in that process. On Tuesday October 6 we will be meeting with current and former academic deans (Karen Schuele, Jeanne Colleran, Alan Miciak, Beth Martin [a member of the committee]) to hear their perspectives before we dive in ourselves.

September Report of the Committee on Gender & Diversity (Medora Barnes)

Summary: The committee discussed the projects that had been in a preliminary stage in previous year(s) and new issues that had been brought to our attention. It was agreed that this fall we would focus on two issues (following). Subcommittees were formed.

1) **The creation of a policy on the use of gender neutral pronouns** for transgendered, transitioning and gender queer students. These policies are becoming increasingly common around the country, as well as at neighboring OH schools. Any proposal would contain a policy for name/pronoun usage, how the student would report this to JCU, and a process for how faculty would be informed about the student's preference. This will involve working closely with the Registrar and IT. Subcommittee members: Emily, Meghan, and Kristen.

2) **The creation of exit interviews for full-time faculty members who leave JCU** either to take another job or due to non-renewal. This perspective of "what went wrong" or how JCU's leadership, faculty, and culture could be improved is not collected anywhere now and could be useful assessment data. We believe this is relevant to our committee, as the majority of faculty who in recent years have experienced negative tenure outcomes or have left during the tenure track (voluntarily or non-voluntarily) are minority or female candidates. This will involve working closely with HR. Subcommittee members: Gloria and Naveed.

The committee agreed that creating a formal Family Leave policy is an important issue, but it will be pushed off until the spring. Preliminary conversations with administrators about current practices may begin to take place. As this involves economic resources and a highly decentralized (often department-specific) process, this will be a harder proposal to create and get approved by the faculty and administration.

The preliminary research on having a childcare center on campus or for the campus community is being shelved until the committee is not working on so many other projects.

Last year this committee began exploring adjunct faculty issues on campus. The committee felt strongly that there should be a group of full-time faculty members working on issues related to part-time or adjunct faculty members; however, believed that due to the multi-faceted nature of the issues, they were outside the purview of the Gender and Diversity committee. Committee members recommended that Medora speak to the Chair of Faculty Council and/or Council about having an existing committee or new committee examine these issues.

Next meeting: On October 12, we will be meeting with Kendra Silva, the JCU Title IX coordinator, who has asked to talk with us.

**Committee of Enrollment, Financial Aid and Student Life
Meeting Minutes September 17, 2015**

Attending: Ali Dachner, Penny Harris, John McBratney, Elizabeth Stiles and Peifang Tian.

The committee reviewed its charge from the Faculty Handbook. With such a broad charge, members discussed areas to focus on for impact. Enrollment was identified as a key interest. The Chair relayed Brian Williams' interest in having our committee become engaged in some way with the strategic planning and/or program review for enrollment. The committee

responded favorably to his idea because it might offer a way to affect policy in a systematic way.

Members who had served on this committee before felt that there was no mechanism for how opinions expressed in meetings with key administrators in enrollment, financial aid, etc. could be carried beyond the room in a systematic manner to affect strategic vision, policy and the like. The possibility of being involved in planning and program review may provide a means for doing so at least in enrollment. The committee agreed that the Chair should contact Brian to arrange a meeting to discuss how the committee can become engaged in these processes.

Another area of interest is in financial aid, specifically how the University is helping low income students. How does the University track, identify and assist students facing financial stress? This issue is an important factor in retaining students. The Chair will reach out to Claudia to learn about this issue and either to arrange a meeting with the committee or to see who she suggests we should meet with. Retention more generally is also of interest to the committee.

Another area of interest is how academics can present current information about what we offer to enrollment and advancement so that they can present the most up to date information to potential students, donors and other stakeholders. A related issue was how enrollment represents signature and non-signature programs to potential students. A concern was raised that the University, while doing a good job scanning the environment for potential opportunities, is doing less to develop the historic and current strengths of the University into signature programs.

We also discussed what key issues from previous years we should attend to. The question of Direct Admit, a central topic in last year's meeting, was named. The Chair will follow up with Brian and ask him about the current status of thinking about direct admit.

The committee also expressed an interest in meeting with Doreen Riley as this had not been done in the recollection of the long-standing committee members.

The committee agreed to meet as needed but to keep in touch and deposit relevant documents in a digital format (Canvas has a course called Faculty Business for example).

Committee on Elections: Report to Faculty Council (Roy Day)

The first elections of the fall semester were successfully concluded on Friday, October 2. The results are posted on the Faculty Council website.

All the important vacancies were filled. The elections committee discouraged faculty from running for the open seats on the Committee on Retirement Allowances because this

committee has not met for several years and we have been unable to find a chair or coordinator for this committee. Nobody volunteered to run for the At Large seat on the elections committee.

Committee Business

The committee met on September 19, 2015 to plan the elections and discuss committee business for the coming year. Items we discussed were:

1. **Election software:** The existing software was written by a student team many years ago, has no technical support, and can be flaky. We would like to move to more a robust election platform that has technical support. We are looking into the possibility of using the anonymous survey feature of Canvas.
2. **Confidential voting at faculty meetings:** It has often been suggested that votes at faculty meetings should be confidential but the time required to pass out and collect paper ballots has discouraged any action. Polling could be done with the personal response systems (clickers) used in several departments but this would require distributing the clickers at the start of meetings and collecting them at the end. Canvas has a polling app (available on iOS and Android) which could be used. The main problem would be if some faculty do not have smartphones or tablets. If this only applies to a few faculty we could probably have a few tablets on loan at the start of each faculty meeting.
3. **Faculty voting rights:** Concerns have been raised about faculty voting rights. For example, although the faculty are on at least three different benefit plans, any change in plan requires a vote of all the faculty. Another example, faculty frequently complain that they cannot vote when on leave. We will be conducting a survey to determine which issues are of concern to the faculty and if there is support for trying to make changes. Any change in faculty voting rights will require a handbook amendment.

[end of Appendices]