General Faculty Meeting Minutes
February 22, 2017
Dolan Science Center Auditorium

The following Faculty Council members were present:
Medora Barnes, Mary Beadle, William Bockanic, Emily Butler, Mina Chercourt, Larry Cima,
Gwen Compton-Engle, Barbara D'Ambrosia (Chair), Roy Day, Kristen Ehrhardt, Jean Feerick
(Vice Chair), Brendan Foreman (Secretary), Nathan Gehlert, Richard Grenci, Dan Kilbride,
Michael Martin, Annie Moses, Mindy Peden, David Shutkin, Nancy Taylor, Peifang Tian, Tom
Zlatoper

The following Faculty Council members were absent: Simon Fitzpatrick, Marcus Gallo, Mariah
Webinger

The agenda for the meeting was distributed to the faculty members before the meeting.

0. A quorum of faculty members was met at 2:05pm, and the meeting began
1. Chair's Announcements
    a. The Minutes of the January 25 meeting were approved
    b. The Chair noted that the President had approved all four of the proposals passed
        by the Faculty recently:
        i.   The Major and Minor in Data Science
        ii. The Minor in Actuarial Science
        iii. The Content Area Program in Mathematics for CCP Teachers
        iv. Recommendation for a Tobacco-Free Campus
    c. The Chair also noted some important dates coming up:
        i.   February 22: Presentation by the Working Group on Slavery -- Legacy and
             Reconciliation
        ii. March 1: Community Forum on Budget, Finance and Enrollment
        iii. March 14-15: JCU Board of Directors meeting
        iv. March 15: Next Faculty Council meeting
        v.   March 28: Online Canvas discussion of the TRS Core proposal will be
             closed.
        vi. March 29: Next General Faculty meeting

2. Discussion of proposed revision of university committee structure
   a. The proposed structure was presented (again)
      i. It was emphasized that this does not include faculty committees
   b. Faculty Member: Provost Council is mostly doing what the CSLE is meant to do, right?
      i. Chair: Almost. There are few things farmed out to other committees
   b. Faculty Member: We should be careful that these new committees are limited in scope. That they don't do more than they are supposed
   c. Faculty Member: Might we "mirror" FC committees to these committees?
   d. Chair: Reminder that I would like to form a committee to review faculty governance.
   e. Faculty Member: I'd like to note that FC just eliminated two redundant committees in order to show the administration how organizational streamlining is done.
   f. Chair: Are there any egregious aspects of this proposal that you want to point out?
   g. Faculty Member: I'm assuming that none of these comittees will take over from FC committees, e.g., CAPP.
      i. Correct.

3. Continued discussion of New Core Committee
   a. Presented by Dr. Peter Kvidera, Chair of Integrative Core Curriculum Committee
   b. Core Chair: you should have seen the notice about the survey regarding the 2 models discussed last week. We're looking to get as much feedback as possible before moving forward. The core committee will meet on Monday and consider the results of this survey.
   c. Vice-Chair: is there a discussion board for this?
      i. Core Chair: there is…. No, there is not.
      ii. Chair: I have not started a discussion on this. I can, if there is interest for that.
   d. Chair: are there other changes that you're considering for this year?
      i. Core Chair: there is some administrative changes we have in mind, regarding who is eligible to be directors of the various parts of the core. Passing any of the models might change all that. There are some small things…
   e. Faculty Member of Core Committee: this hasn't come back to the committee yet. But there's been an interest in shrinking the core. These models were not designed for this purpose. That might need a much wider discussion.
   f. Faculty Member: I am disturbed by Peter's comment that not changing the Core is actually an option. It seems clear that we really need to change this Core in order to make it work at all.

iii.　Core Chair: I appreciate that comment.
　　g.　Faculty Member: related to the Model #1: this model doesn't address Transfer and AP problems. These would still need to be addressed. How would we do that with Model #1? Granted that Model 1 is closer to the spirit of the original New Core, but Model 2 addresses these problem much more directly and obviously.
　　　　i.　Core Chair: yes, Model 1 is much more in the spirit of the original design. It *could* ease up some of these problems since there are more single-course experiences. But there are more work to do with this.
　　h.　Faculty Member: If this change is approved, will it be retroactive?
　　　　i.　Core Chair: yes.
　　　　ii.　Faculty Member on Core Committee: it's not so much retroactive as it simply opens pathways
　　i.　Faculty Member: How do we transfer in single-courses in as EHE, ENW or EGC without the requisite Learning Community? Would we waive that requirement then? Wouldn't that simply make Model 1 essentially Model 2?
　　j.　Faculty Member: This is probably naïve: but why can't we allow double-dipping in Model 2?
　　　　i.　Faculty Member: I think this is worth considering?
　　　　ii.　Faculty Member: we could allow the linked integrative courses to count towards the distributive requirements. This doesn't seem to me as double-dipping.
　　k.　Faculty Member: We should include in model 2 that students can overlap 3 credits between the integrative and distributive courses. This way, we won't be adding any new credit hours to the Core.
　　l.　Vice Chair: Is there just a practical reason as to why we're not addressing the entire Core as a whole?
　　　　i.　Faculty Member: because the integrative part of the core is a screaming holy catastrophe!
　　　　ii.　Faculty Member: I can't resist: a lot of us saw this problem coming a long time ago.
　　　　iii.　Core Chair: There's just too many things to work on before getting to a holistic re-examination of the Core.
　　　　iv.　Faculty Member: Shouldn't we have a projection model as a part of the proposal – this is what will probably happen if we implement this.
　　　　v.　Faculty Member: we don't have the capacity for that
　　　　vi.　Faculty Member: at least for model 2, we could work backwards with what has already happened in order to see how it would look like.
　　　　vii.　Faculty Member: for the science courses, we have a fairly decent model of how model 2 would work.

        viii.   Faculty Member: Aren't we already doing model 2?

4. Adjourned at 3:03pm