

**General Faculty Meeting Minutes
November 16, 2016
Dolan Science Center Auditorium**

AGENDA

- I. Chair's announcements
 - A. Minutes of the October 19, 2016, faculty meeting (<http://faculty.jcu.edu/facultycouncil/pages/minutes/>)
 - B. HR Policy Review – Mandatory Reporting for Incidents of Sexual Harassment and Interpersonal Violence (available for review through November 17) (<http://sites.jcu.edu/hr/pages/resourcespolicies/policy-review/>)
 - C. Next Faculty Council meeting: November 30
 - D. Morning Social: Friday, December 2
 - E. Next General Faculty meeting: Wednesday, January 25, 2017
 - F. Call for nominations – Curtis W. Miles Faculty Award for Community Service
- II. David Sipusic, Title IX Coordinator – Introduction and discussion
- III. Faculty Handbook Committee
 - A. Amendment on frequency of faculty salary payments
 - B. Update on review of Faculty Handbook
- IV. Faculty Governance review - Discussion
- V. New Business
- VI. Adjourn

The following Faculty Council Members were present:

The following Faculty Council Members were absent.

- 0. A quorum of faculty members was reached at 2:04pm and the meeting began.
- 1. Due to another upcoming meeting at 2:15pm, Dr. David Sipusic began presentation at the beginning of the meeting, with Chair's Announcements following afterwards. Dr. Sipusic briefly described some background of his pre-JCU existence: he began as a music educator (Bachelor's degree from Youngstown State) and moved onto law, earning his J.D. at the Cleveland Marshall School of Law. He served as legal counsel for the Cleveland Metropolitan School District as well as a compliance officer for the University of Dayton, before coming here to JCU.

Dr. Sipusic described the primary goal of Title IX as the elimination of discrimination and harassment of students within higher education institutions. He noted that we have all been informed of a complaint to the Office of Civil Rights at the Department of Education by a former student. Typically, the OCR has used such complaints as a means to justify a full-blown audit of a university's compliance to Title IX, which is what is happening in our case. For JCU, this means that we've provided OCR with thousands of pages of documents and that they are now reviewing them. Since OCR is rather understaffed (only 700 people to handle several thousand cases), it will probably be about 2 years before this particular case gets resolved.

Dr. Sipusic indicated that he didn't see any missteps on the part of JCU regarding the specific OCR complaint, but it's completely impossible to tell what come of this. In the mean time, a draft of a unified policy regarding Title IX issues will be presented online in 10-14 days for comment by the entire JCU community.

2. Chair's announcements

The Chair made the announcements as given in the Agenda:

- A. Minutes of the October 19, 2016, faculty meeting (<http://faculty.jcu.edu/facultycouncil/pages/minutes/>)
- B. HR Policy Review – Mandatory Reporting for Incidents of Sexual Harassment and Interpersonal Violence (available for review through November 17) (<http://sites.jcu.edu/hr/pages/resourcespolicies/policy-review/>)
- C. Next Faculty Council meeting: November 30
- D. Morning Social: Friday, December 2
- E. Next General Faculty meeting: Wednesday, January 25, 2017
- F. Call for nominations – Curtis W. Miles Faculty Award for Community Service

Dr. Rebecca Drenowski commented on the lack of nominations for the Miles Award. She suggested that our lack of nominations might be due to the protocol of our nominating procedure. Those making nominations have to put together the nomination application, which can be too hefty a task for some folks to undertake given the large workload of all faculty members in the middle of a semester. Other institutions have the nominated faculty member do the actual heavy lifting putting the packet together. She suggested that, maybe, we could think about implementing this protocol instead.

3. Faculty Handbook Committee

Dr. Ruth Connell present a proposed amendment to the Faculty Handbook regarding the pay frequency of faculty salaries. Currently, the Handbook specifies precisely when each check is paid during the academic year (at the end of each month of the academic year). The amendment would eliminate this specificity but still require "regular and timely" payment of salary. As explained by both Dr. Connell and the Chair, it is hoped that this amendment would make it easier to change the pay frequency of faculty members without having to re-write portions of the Handbook (e.g., in case the administration needs to align the pay frequency of faculty with that of the rest of JCU employees).

Dr. Jerry Weinstein pointed out that under the proposed change, it might be the case that the September paycheck be eliminated since often the academic year begins after September 1. This was a grave concern to the members of the Handbook Committee, who had not thought of this issue. And, after an admittedly longer than needed discussion, the amendment was withdrawn, so that that Handbook Committee could rework it to include a mandatory September check.

Dr. Connell also discussed the current review of the Faculty Handbook as currently being conducted by the Handbook Committee. This review started in April 2016, during which an open-to-the-Committee hard drive with the Handbook on it was put forth for annotations and comments by the Committee members. They found several issues that have continually arisen for the Committee over the years, e.g., pay frequency, faculty evaluations, crediting of prior experience, clinical faculty, etc. etc. The current pay frequency amendment was a consequence of this work, and the Committee hopes to present relatively soon another amendment that would establish a coherent, organic protocol for developing and presenting amendments to the Handbook.

A discussion about the overall goal and need for this review ensued. It was pointed out that this review was actually requested by the Committee for Collaborative Governance last year. However, this review was intended to be conducted by a wide range of “stakeholders” other than solely the members of the Faculty Handbook Committee.

After a great deal of discussion, it was decided that at the next Faculty Council, we will invite the members of the Faculty Handbook Committee to work with Faculty Council in creating an ad hoc committee to pursue the recommendation of the Committee of Collaborative Governance.

4. The final piece of business involved a review of faculty governance. The Chair noted that at the last Faculty Council it was decided that a working group of faculty and administrators would be put together to review the current form of faculty governance.

Several faculty members noted some obvious problems with the current system: frustration at policy minutiae impeding progress of resolutions (such as the need for the Handbook Committee to re-meet and to have more open hearings just to change one word in a proposed amendment); low faculty participation and engagement with faculty governance. It was suggested that maybe we should have substantive votes as faculty meetings.

Two of the original architects of the Faculty Council system expressed enthusiasm in reviewing the current system. It was also mentioned that we may be able to bring in an external consultant to help us in this review. Amid other concerns, it was especially noted that we lack a good flowchart or any visualization of the current governance and committee structure on campus.

The Chair asked for any self-nominations to this working group. After hearing crickets, she announced that she would be happy to get nominations later on.

5. There being no new business, the meeting was adjourned at 3:09pm.