

Faculty Council Meeting  
January 18, 2017  
Mackin Room, Grasselli Library

The following Faculty Council Members were in attendance: Barbara D'Ambrosia (chair), Jean Feerick (vice chair), Brendan Foreman (secretary), Medora Barnes, Mary Beadle, William Bockanic, Emily Butler, Mina Chercourt, Larry Cima, Roy Day, Gwen Compton-Engle, Kristen Erhardt, Simon Fitzpatrick, Marcus Gallo, Nathan Gehlert, Rick Greci, Julia Karolle-Berg, Dan Kilbride, Mike Martin, Annie Moses, David Shutkin, Peifang Tian, Mariah Webinger, Tom Zlatoper.

Nancy Taylor was absent.

The agenda for the meeting was distributed in advance as well as all other needed material. The meeting began at 2:02pm.

Minutes:

1. Quorum reached at 2:02pm (17) and meeting began
2. Announcements:
  - a) Minutes from November 30<sup>th</sup> meeting are online. With exception of one typo, they are approved by acclamation.
  - b) There will be a special faculty meeting on Feb. 15 called by the Chair of the Faculty Council to discuss the Integrative Core curriculum
  - c) There will be a General Faculty meeting next week
3. Business
  - a) Conversation with Jeanne Colleran

The Provost detailed the specific parts of the handout provided before the meeting.

- Dates for next HLC visit – Feb 11 & 12, 2019. This visit will include all 5 HLC criteria and federal compliance issues. Nick Santilli and Mike Martin are co-chairing the effort overall. Various subcommittees will be formed to address the criteria and the federal compliance issues.
- There are 3 upcoming Town Halls – on the U..G Report; on the Core and on the Budget.
- Enrollment/Marketing/Data  
Read: <https://www.nytimes.com/2017/01/18/opinion/sunday/americas-great-working-class-colleges.html>

- Trying to double the number of students in each signature program (Arrupe, Leadership, Honor). This should raise the qualitative profile of the school. Hoping to get about 35 more incoming students next year.
- What does Provost Council do? Started under John Day, originally a discussion group, has moved to more work-oriented and focused

Following this review, there was a brief Question and Answer period.

Q: Does the fact that the HLC gave a date for the next HLC review, mean that we've "made the grade" for the latest "on notice"?

A: No.

Q: How do you see Grad Programs fitting in with the current core and our programs in general?

A: We're interested in both quality of program and number of students. The Grad School [sic] is problematic. It has remained flat for several years now. However, our graduate programs are vital to our academics. For example, the research programs that we offer **and fund** at the undergraduate level give us a great deal of distinction above the schools in our comparator group. But, this is only possible with the presence of graduate students. We must grow the graduate programs. I am currently working with Anne Kugler and others to develop a different approach to developing and marketing graduate school at JCU.

Q: Who will the new AVP in marketing answer to do?

A: We don't know. Maybe Doreen, maybe the President. Niehoff wants me to do it, but I don't. I've got my hands full already.

Q: Isn't too early to predict 740 for the fall?

A: I'm getting daily analytics. So, barring a sudden (and very unlikely) spurt, we are only slightly above (2%) from last year. IPEDS tells us that we have 1000 less applicants each year than any of our competitors on the comparative list. Our 62% discount rate is a really bad place to be.

Q: Were the micro-tiles effective?

A: this was a short range strategy and was very fraught. There is no Marketing department steering the process (Richwalski gone, no videographer, etc.); and we started too late. "I don't want to tell the truth without telling the truth..." The leadership wasn't putting in a social media push, when they really should have. And they didn't buy enough names.

So, in making up for this, the bump at least kept us from sliding from 740 to 640. And it seems to have strengthened applicants in Chicago and Pittsburgh, albeit without an overall increase in applications. It also possibly increased the number of students coming into the signature programs. We need all sorts of things to get competitive.

Q: What about renaming ourselves as Loyola Cleveland in order to give ourselves a national brand?

A: I like it. But it's pretty clear that we're keeping the name. And, it wouldn't do to rename ourselves simply to hide aspects of our past (which isn't really our past, just our name). Neither the University nor any Jesuits directly associated with it, ever owned any enslaved people and was never a plantation. It's a very different situation with John Carroll University than it is with, say, Georgetown.

b) TRS change to Integrative Core proposal


After some discussion, it was voted (16-4-3) that this proposal needs to be voted on it by the faculty. This was moved initially by Dr. Karolle-Berg and seconded by Kristen Erhardt.

c) Dr. Bruce replacement

Upon reception of Dr. Martin's message regarding Katie Doud:

**Martin, Michael P**

Jan 16 (2 days ago) ☆

to Barbara, Annie, Anthony, me, Dan, David, Emily, Jean, Julia, Kristen, Larry, Marcus, Mariah, Mary, Medora, Mina, Mindy, 

Colleagues,

Since I was the one who brought up the point that Katie Doud was a visitor, I should let you know that I followed up with both Katie and Chrystal Bruce following our last meeting. I wanted to get a little perspective on the rationale behind the appointment and discovered that visitors were told this would be a good way to get to some service during their time as a visitor (with the prospects of counting this time towards the tenure track). After I professed my concerns about counting visiting time as a scientist (most don't have a lab space, money for research, research release, etc.), it was clear that taking on this job was in Katie's best interests. I always considered that she would have the upmost commitment to the task.

At this point, I think it would be best to appoint her to the position at our meeting this week.

However, I think we should consider whether a call should go out to all eligible faculty for future replacements to faculty committees.

-Mike

By acclamation, Katie Doud was voted in as the semester replacement for Dr. Chrystal Bruce on the ENW committee.

d) Elections

There is only one open position right now: The at-large faculty member on the Committee on Finance and Compensation. Dr. Day is open to nominations.

### **Faculty Eligible to Vote: Spring Semester 2017**

198 members of the Faculty

11 faculty are on leave

187 faculty eligible to vote

A majority of the faculty eligible to vote is 94

A quorum for faculty meetings is 38

e) Discussion with handbook committee

Dr. Ruth Connell and Dr. Paul Lauritzen discussed the review of the Handbook that the HB Committee is currently going through as well as changes in HB protocol with regard to amendments. Dr. Connell explained that the HB Committee is conducting a systematic look at the HB and has been meeting every other week to this purpose. She is also generating a set of “best practices” for the chair of this committee so that her successors will have a proper set of protocol procedures and methods to call upon.

In addition, she emphasized that she is attempting to modify the approach that the HB Committee takes towards new ideas and proposals. Rather determining whether a given proposal is against (or not against) the HB, the committee currently tries to understand how a given proposal would work within the HB – What would be the consequences? Can modifications to the proposal be made in order to eliminate any bad consequences? She very much welcomes any new proposals to the HB.

After some discussion about how the Faculty Council would be involved with this review process, it was decided that each Faculty Council member will read the HB thoroughly in the next month and discuss their ideas on an online discussion on Canvas. And each member will encourage her colleagues in her department(s) to do so as well. This will be done within the month. After this initial step, the Council will decide at the next meeting what further steps can or should be taken.

4. Adjourned at 3:17pm