

General Faculty Meeting

April 27, 2016

A General Meeting of the Faculty was held on April 27, 2016 in the Dolan Science Center Auditorium and began at 2:03 pm.

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

The following members were absent: Mary Beadle and Nathan Gehlert.

The exact attendance of the meeting was not taken but clearly exceeded the necessary quorum of 39.

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

Minutes

I. Announcements

A. Minutes from the February 24, 2016, Faculty Meeting are posted at <http://faculty.icu.edu/facultycouncil/>. No changes were offered; the minutes were taken as approved.

B. Two upcoming meetings:
CAS meeting at 3:30 pm.
End of Year Celebration: Wednesday, May 4, 2:00 p.m.

C. The deadline for submission of new academic programs to be considered next year: "September" Faculty Council meeting. This was set by Faculty Council at their last meeting. The new procedure was distributed to the full faculty via email.

D. "September" Faculty Council meeting: August 31, 2016. This applies to letter C above.

II. Elections (Roy Day) – The ballot for the current round of elections will be sent out on Friday of this week. Day went over the openings on the ballot, noting the slots that need candidates. Some nominations were taken from the floor.

III. Proposal on changes to transfer credit policies (see Appendix) (Gwen Compton-Engle) – CAP is recommending that this proposal go out for a full vote. Open hearings and a canvas discussion have been held.

The proposal was developed by a policy group led by Maryclaire Moroney and which included members of CAP. Internal consistency and best practices were the chief considerations here.

The proposal has four components: general guidelines, a grade of C as the transfer standard, credits in residence (50% for the degree and major), and changes regarding CLEP exams. There was a question as to whether the 50% rule should apply to minors as well. The working group discussed it and leans toward a 30% for minors (but the document makes no mention of minors). Do the faculty want to add an amendment to the policy? No amendment was offered.

There was some discussion as to how transfer courses could be used for requirements for the new core. Peter Kvidera noted that there is already a policy in this regard. D'Ambrosia noted that courses from other institutions generally don't fulfill the requirements of the new core. Moroney noted that the policy under consideration today is oriented principally around transfer credits, not around coursework from other institutions satisfying JCU requirements.

Roy Day moved that the proposal be sent out for a vote (seconded Rebecca Drenovsky). It was asked whether this was a single vote on the entire proposal or separate votes on its different parts (answer: the former). The motion passed by an overwhelming majority; no faculty member voted against it.

IV. Proposal on changes to the "Examining the Human Experience" linked courses in the Integrative Core (see Appendix) (Gwen Compton-Engle)

CAP held an open hearing and a canvas discussion. Previously, one of the EHE pairs had to be a Humanities course. The current proposal adds new departments to that list (EC, PO, SC, PL, TRS). As before, the second course in the linked pair can be from any department.

Dan Kilbride noted that TRS and Philosophy already have their own place in the core. Now they're being added to EHE. Was anybody concerned about this? Compton-Engle replied that CAP discussed it. There are issues related to pragmatics, distribution of student coursework, and learning goals. Aesthetic appreciation is one of the learning goals of the EHE linked pair. CAP hopes that this remains an emphasis if this change is approved. Kvidera added that the learning goals for EHE have not changed.

Elizabeth Stiles moved that the proposal be sent out to the faculty for a vote (seconded John McBratney). The motion passed overwhelmingly; one nay vote was recorded.

V. Report from the Compensation Committee (Dan Kilbride)

Kilbride began by asking faculty to run for the openings on the committee.

He presented the new peer group, which has been accepted and endorsed by the administration. The new group is slightly aspirational. Most of the schools on the list do better than us in net tuition revenue. Most have better student test scores. The committee has also developed a larger comparator group (60+ schools) that can be used in the future for salary benchmarks by discipline.

Kilbride presented several PowerPoint slides addressing faculty salaries. IPEDS data demonstrates that the new peer group has slightly higher salaries than the old peer group.

Beyond the salary proposal, the committee is currently engaged in the following tasks:

CAS faculty are being surveyed about Dean Farrar's recent statement that publication every three years is expected from faculty wishing to retain their teaching reduction for research.

Work will carry over into next year on revising the annual self-evaluation. The committee is looking at a shift to electronic filing instead of paper. They are also considering how to make this a forward-looking document. The handbook stipulates that this is an annual process. Do we want to consider something different (less frequent)?

A discussion of benefits has just begun and will be continued next year. Getting everybody on the same medical and retirement plan is one consideration as is a discussion of adjunct pay rates and benefits for adjuncts. Changing from a monthly pay check to a pay check every two weeks is another issue.

Kilbride distributed an executive summary of recent discussions with the administration about the salary proposal (for the text, see the Appendix below). There is not complete agreement within the committee on the issues to be worked out.

VI. Provost's Remarks: Accreditation, Assessment, and Governance (Jeanne Colleran)

Colleran began by noting that her main message to the faculty is one of gratitude, commendation, and hope.

She touched on the work done this year. The completed academic program reviews and assessment reports show a deep and broad engagement by the faculty. We have met the HLC expectations in this area. In the summer, the APRs will be reviewed and feedback will be given to departments. Resources will be aligned to planning and budgeting.

The strategic plan has been completed and endorsed. We turn now to implementation. The planning group meets weekly and is committed to it through 2020. Tactics are being developed.

Two minority post-docs have been hired.

The faculty survey of goal one of the strategic plan will be disseminated, as will a rubric for distinctive programs. Sports studies and exercise science have been combined.

In the coming weeks, several documents will be sent out to faculty soliciting feedback. This includes new aspects of the strategic plan and our report to the HLC. A report from the University Committee on Collaborative Governance will also be disseminated.

Colleran shared with faculty the list of examples developed by Faculty Council as evidence of collaborative governance this year.

VII. New Business – none

VIII. Adjourn – the meeting was adjourned at 3:19 pm.

Respectfully submitted,
Gerry Guest
Faculty Council Secretary

Appendix

PROPOSED CHANGES TO THE UNIVERSITY'S TRANSFER CREDIT POLICIES, FOR THE 2017-2019 UNDERGRADUATE BULLETIN

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY FEBRUARY 2016 (rev. April 2016)

Submitted to Faculty Council by a cross-divisional group of faculty and administrators charged by the Provost's Council with reviewing current academic policies and making recommendations for improvement: M. Moroney (chair), L. Atkins, L. Calkins, G. Compton-Engle, C. DeMarchi, R. Drenovsky, M. Finucane, M. Hendren, P. Kvidera, A. Kugler, G. Lacueva, P. Mason, C. Sherman

RATIONALE FOR REVIEW AND RECOMMENDATIONS:

The current higher education landscape is one of heightened student mobility. Given national concerns about college completion rates, it is in everyone's interest to make transferring credits as efficient and transparent a process as possible without compromising degree integrity. To this end, members of CAP, the University Registrar, the Assistant and Associate Deans of Boler and CAS, and the Assistant Provost for Advising and Student

Support, met to review our current policies and procedures. What follows distills our discussion of institutional needs and national best practices into a short list of recommended changes. In particular, we hope to build shared expectations concerning best practices in evaluating transfer coursework.

1. Replace current language concerning learning goals and the Integrative Core (p. 21) with an initial, more broadly applicable definition of what will be considered for transfer credit. The language of this recommendation is consistent with the HLC's description of best practices in assessing transfer coursework.

Coursework taken at another regionally accredited academic institution or foreign equivalent may be awarded credit towards a John Carroll degree. Courses are reviewed by department chairs, program directors, and academic deans for acceptability, comparability, and applicability to programs offered at John Carroll.

2. **Replace the C- standard for transfer coursework with the C for all students.**

Our current policy differentiates between new transfer students and current John Carroll students. Incoming freshmen and new transfer students may bring in coursework for which they earned a C- or higher (p. 25); current John Carroll students must earn a C or higher to bring in credits from another institution (pp. 118-119). According to Admissions, the change to the C standard would have a negligible effect on the credits brought in by new transfer students. The University defines academic good standing as a C or higher. It makes sense to communicate this consistently through our transfer credit policy. Thus, we recommend replacing the C- language with the C wherever needed in both the bulletin and on the admissions website.

3. **Replace the 64 credit rule and the last 30 credits in residence rule.**

The Boler School has clearly stated rules concerning how much coursework can be transferred in for either Boler core courses or for a major in Boler. The College of Arts and Sciences uses several policies—one limiting transfer course work to 64 credits brought in from two-year schools and another requirement that the last 30 credits of a student's degree must be earned in residence at John Carroll. All of these policies are also applicable to Boler students, but CAS students do not, currently, have one consistent policy concerning what they may take away from the University and what must be earned here. Our proposal, which does not replace Boler's requirements but which offers clarity for CAS, is to replace the current policies with:

- **At least 50% of the credits for the degree must be earned at John Carroll or through an approved study abroad, exchange, or dual-degree program.**
- **At least 50% of the credits for the major must be earned at John Carroll or through an approved study abroad, exchange, or dual-degree program.**

Students in the Boler School of Business should consult Boler stipulations about transfer coursework for their majors.

- 4. Eliminate the age stipulation for the CLEP exams, and be more explicit about our willingness to review scores from international exams for the award of credit.**

ADDENDUM TO EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

This includes the passages from the current bulletin we propose for modification. Passages concerning transfer credits which are not affected by our recommendations are not included here. Recommended changes will include all instances of a particular policy (e.g., moving from C- to C as the standard for transfer credits).

I. GENERAL STATEMENTS ABOUT CREDIT TRANSFERABILITY

a. Current language in bulletin (p. 21):

Determination of credit transferability occurs at the time of admission evaluation and decision. A listing of the applicant's courses and credits which are transferable to John Carroll University will be sent to the admitted student shortly after the admission decision has been made, provided we have an official copy of the transcript. For all students new to the University, all requests of transfer courses for the Integrative Core Curriculum must be submitted by the end of the second semester after matriculation.

Credit for advanced standing will be accepted from regionally accredited institutions, subject to the following restrictions: Credit will not be given for courses completed with the lowest passing grade, though these courses need not always be repeated; courses completed with a "Pass" grade will not be accepted unless it can be established that the "Pass" was the equivalent of a "C-" grade or higher; no credit will be given, even as general electives, for courses in orientation, applied arts, athletics, or technical training which do not contribute to the goals of a liberal arts education.

Transfer guides for Lakeland, Cuyahoga, and Lorain County Community Colleges are available on request and online. The limit of transfer credits from a community college is 64 semester hours (96 quarter hours). In no instance will a degree be awarded to a transfer student unless the last 30 semester hours have been completed at John Carroll University.

Courses completed to satisfy the Integrative Core Curriculum requirements must conform substantially to the requirements, including learning goals, of courses offered at John Carroll University. Quantitatively, credits from other schools must be within one credit hour of the Core requirements in the subject area involved. Quality points and grades are not transferred, only credit hours. Approval of application of transfer credits to a major program

is determined by the chair of the department with the approval of the appropriate dean. Most departments require that at least half of the major be completed at John Carroll University. For the specific requirements, transfer students should consult the sections of this *Bulletin* devoted to individual departments and majors.

b. Proposed substitution:

The University offers students two ways to receive transfer credits towards the John Carroll degree. Prior to matriculation, students may earn college credits through exams administered by major testing programs or by coursework taken at accredited institutions of higher education or their foreign equivalents. Initial determination of credit transferability occurs at the time of evaluation for admission. All requests for transfer of credits earned prior to matriculation must be submitted by the end of the second semester after matriculation. To ensure transferability of credits after matriculation, students must have an approved petition in advance of taking courses through University-approved study abroad programs or at other regionally accredited institutions. Transcripts must be sent directly to the University registrar.

Courses proposed for transfer credit must be completed with a C or higher (not Pass/Fail, unless it can be determined that the passing mark is equivalent to a C or higher). Coursework taken at another regionally accredited academic institution or a foreign equivalent may be awarded credit towards a John Carroll degree. Courses are reviewed by department chairs, program directors, and academic deans using the following criteria:

*Acceptability: course work acknowledged by the university as having met standards for evaluation and award of undergraduate transfer credit, independent of delivery method

* Comparability: the coursework is comparable in content, expectations, and credit hours to courses offered at John Carroll

* Applicability: the coursework is deemed appropriate for use within a degree program to fulfill specific requirements

(These definitions will also appear in the Bulletin's glossary.)

Some restrictions apply. Qualitatively, credits from other schools must be within one credit hour of comparable work at John Carroll. Quality points and grades are not transferred, only credits. At least 50% of the credits for the degree must be earned at John Carroll or through an approved dual-degree or study-abroad program. At least 50% of the credits for the major must be earned at John Carroll or through an approved dual-degree or study-abroad program.

RATIONALE FOR CHANGES:

- **More detailed description of transferable credits, along with definitions used nationally (acceptability, equivalence, and so on) to examine categories of transferable courses. This replaces the language of learning outcomes, and moves beyond the Integrative Core to include a single standard for all credit transfers.**
- **Standardize C/C-. On p. 119 of the bulletin, “A grade of C or better is required for transfer of credits” for currently enrolled John Carroll students, as distinct from the C- currently required of students prior to matriculation.**
- **Remove the language of what will not be considered (courses in orientation, applied arts, and so on), given the lack of consistent definitions of such coursework.**
- **Replace the 64 credits from community college and the last 30 credits in residence with a 50% requirement for the degree and for the major. This is a baseline requirement; individual programs (e.g., Boler majors) may have a higher requirement.**

II. CLEP and Other Credit options

A. Current Language in Bulletin (pp. 31-32)

Adults, 21 or older, who through personal study and effort may have developed the knowledge, understanding, and skills normally associated with certain college-level courses, may be permitted to earn up to 30 semester hours of credits on the basis of high achievement on the General and/or Subject tests administered by the College Entrance Examination Board in its College Level Examination Program (CLEP). The amount of credit granted will depend on the tests taken the scores achieved, the degree program to be pursued, and the major field. Earned CLEP credit does not convert to letter grades and does not apply toward graduation honors. CLEP exams may not be used to fulfill the last 30 semester hours of credit. Students planning to take CLEP tests should consult the Office of Admission or their academic advisor.

On a case-by-case basis, John Carroll University may recognize and accept other types of college credit than those listed (e.g., A-levels). Once students commit to John Carroll and submit their enrollment deposit, they should present official documentation to the Office of Admission at John Carroll for an official credit evaluation.

B. Proposed substitution:

The College Level Examination Placement (CLEP) is designed to assist students who through personal study and effort may have developed the knowledge, understanding, and skills

normally associated with certain college-level courses. The amount of credit granted will depend on the tests taken, the scores achieved, the degree program to be pursued, and the major field. Earned CLEP credits do not convert to letter grades and do not apply towards graduation honors. CLEP scores must be submitted at the point of matriculation. Students planning to take CLEP exams should consult the Office of Admission for a list of exams accepted and scores needed for the award of credit.

The University awards transfer credits for various international exams on a case-by-case basis. The most common type is the General Certificate of Education- A-level, but other exams will also be considered. Students who have made an enrollment deposit at John Carroll, and who wish to submit their exam scores for award of credit, should present official documentation of those scores to the Office of the Registrar.

RATIONALE:

- **The CLEP exams may be taken by students younger than 21 years of age. The new wording makes clear that we review only a specific list of CLEP exams for John Carroll credit, and directs students solely to the Admissions office, which has that information, and not to faculty, who do not.**
- **We make clear that scores on international exams other than A-levels will be reviewed through the registrar's office for credit.**

Proposed revision to “distributive” requirements in Examining Human Experience courses (EHE) in the Integrative Core Curriculum

From: Peter Kvidera (Director, Integrative Core Curriculum) and the Integrative Core Curriculum Committee

The Integrative Core Curriculum committee proposes that the faculty consider changes to the requirements for Examining Human Experience courses. In brief, the committee recommends expanding the number of departments from which EHE courses can be offered. (We are not recommending changes to ENW or EGC requirements.)

Glossary:

- *EHE: Examining the Human Experience; two linked courses from different departments*
- *ENW: Exploring the Natural World; two linked courses from different departments*
- *EGC: Engaging the Global Community; one course that integrates at least two distinct disciplines, either team taught, or taught as part of a learning community*

Current integrated course requirements:

- **EHE must include one course from AH, CMLC/CL/IC, CO, EN, or HS**
- **ENW must include one course from BL, CH, MT/CS, PH/EP, or PS**

- EGC must meet the EGC learning goals
- Students must take at least one course from each of {BL, CH, MT/CS, PH/EP, PS}, {AH, CMLC/CL/IC, CO, EN, HS}, and {EC, PO, SC}.

Recommended changes to integrated course requirements: Expand EHE to include “social sciences,” PL, TRS:

- **EHE must include one course from AH, CMLC/CL/IC, CO, EN, HS, EC, PO, SC, PL, or TRS**
- ENW must include one course from BL, CH, MT/CS, PH/EP, or PS
- EGC must meet the EGC learning goals
- Students must take at least one course from each of {BL, CH, MT/CS, PH/EP, PS}, {AH, CMLC/CL/IC, CO, EN, HS}, and {EC, PO, SC}.

Rationale for changes:

While currently, the required course in an EHE pair is a humanities course, the Integrative Core Curriculum committee argues that “human experience” can and should be examined from a number of disciplines and understands that combinations of courses from departments outside of the humanities can also effectively meet the EHE learning goals. For example, a combination of courses from SC and EC or PO and TRS (currently not allowed for EHE) can very well meet the required learning goals of integrated knowledge, critical analysis and aesthetic appreciation, and multiple forms of expression. By expanding the departments that can offer EHE courses, we allow fuller participation from the social sciences, PL, and TRS in the integrated courses.

The committee also understands the current requirement to be driven by the concern that students take a wide variety of courses from different disciplines, something along the lines of the divisional distribution model of the old Core (Distributive) Curriculum. The EHE courses, as originally proposed, ensure that a student fulfills the “humanities” requirement of taking a course from AH, CMLC/IC/CL, CO, EN, and HS. The committee argues that the desired distribution of courses across disciplines will remain intact even with the proposed changes because we will not change the requirement that students must take a course from among the three categories of courses:

- (1) BL, CH, MT/CS, PH/EP, PS;
- (2) AH, CMLC/CL/IC, CO, EN, HS;
- (3) EC, PO, SC.

The proposed changes will allow students more freedom to complete this distribution requirement in a larger variety of integrated courses.

To ensure that students complete these requirements, we would include an attribute on all integrated courses, which notes that a particular course fulfills a particular category (#1, #2, or #3). A student’s degree evaluation will indicate completion of this distribution requirement.

Note: One of the courses in a linked EHE pair must come from the list above; the other course may come from any department or program. This allows for the inclusion of courses from ED,

WGS, MN, etc., as part of an EHE pair. These other departments and programs can likewise contribute to an ENW pair.

From the Compensation Committee (Dan Kilbride, chair)

Important points from the provost's response to the salary proposal:

On February 26, 2016, the committee proposed a set of broad salary principles to the administration. The committee agreed that, in the current financial environment of the University, implementing the salary proposal was unrealistic. The committee suggested these principles as a way to make progress on improving faculty salaries while moving toward the ultimate goal of implementing the policy.

Those principles were:

- For the next several years, JCU would commit to a 2-3% salary raise pool, independent from the tenure and promotion pool (as was done for the 2016-17 contract period);
- In the medium term (5-7 years) the University will strive to have faculty salaries achieve 100% parity with the average salaries of our IPEDS peers.
- The salary proposal would be implemented when and if NTR allows.

The Provost responded:

- “We want to meet the immediate-term and medium-term salary goals that the Committee proposed. But we must stress that the University must meet its enrollment goals and continue to pursue greater internal efficiencies in order to produce a compensation pool.”

Some responses to specific points in the salary proposal:

- The new peer group? **Accepted.**
- Cost of living increase? **A major policy change; requires consultation with academic deans, Provost, CFO.** Suggests conversations begin October 2016.
- University “salary group” (the larger group that provides data on salary by discipline)? **Requires further study.**
- Barnes amendment (faculty receiving tenure and/or promotion should receive the mandatory increase **and** the merit raise and/or market adjustment)? **Agreed, in principle. Some more study required.**
- Long-term salary targets (i.e., full professors with 8-15 years in rank @ 50th percentile of discipline as per the University salary group)? **Hard to achieve. Possibly by separating Boler & CAS. Easier to meet goals for Assistants and Associates than for full profs.**

“In conclusion, we thank you for the collaboration that has made it possible to agree to the peer group, to affirm some of the principles set forth in the salary proposal, and to respond to the immediate, and the medium term goals. We will need to continue to collaborate on the salary proposal for the long term, and the peer group being used to benchmark salaries by rank and discipline. We believe that your work and the collaboration that has ensued sets the stage for continuing positive interactions and achieving goals.”