

**General Faculty Meeting Minutes**  
**March 29, 2017**  
**Dolan Science Center Auditorium**

The following Faculty Council members were present:

Medora Barnes, Mary Beadle, William Bockanic, Larry Cima, Gwen Compton-Engle, Barbara D'Ambrosia (Chair), Roy Day, Kristen Ehrhardt, Jean Feerick (Vice Chair), Simon Fitzpatrick, Brendan Foreman (Secretary), Marcus Gallo, Nathan Gehlert, Richard Greci, Dan Kilbride, Michael Martin, Annie Moses, Mindy Peden, David Shutkin, Nancy Taylor, Peifang Tian, Mariah Webinger, Tom Zlatoper

The following Faculty Council members were absent: Mina Chercourt, Emily Butler

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

0. Quorum of faculty members was met at 2:06pm, and the meeting began.
  - I. Chair's Announcements
    - Minutes not ready yet.
    - Board approved FHB amendment on faculty pay frequency
    - Advising: in next day or so, an email highlighting all of the curricular changes to existing programs, will come your way.
    - CAP ready to hold hearings regarding proposal to revise the Integrated Core Curriculum requirements. There is an online discussion for this.
    - Jim Krukones: come to the Celebration of Scholarship. There is a Comm Dept event – a reading from the play Vanya, Sonia, et al. -- on the Monday of Celebration of Scholarship. This will be a Brown Bag lunch event, but desert and beverage will be provided. Also, Peter Wong will present also during a Celebration of Scholarship for East Asia Studies
    - Memorial for David Wilder, in Jardine Room from 12pm to 3pm, Saturday 4/1.
    - Important dates
      - o April 26: last general faculty meeting. Don't forget nominations for next year will be brought up then.
  - II. TRS Proposal

- The CAP report on TRS Proposal was presented by Dr. Peifang Tian, Chair of CAP
  - Reviewed proposal
    - Proposal will be backdated to July 2015
  - The hearings on this generated lively discussion – CAP tried to be as objective as possible and concerned only with academic merit issues
    - Benefits & concerns
      - B: Now the 200 and 300 level are narrow in scope and so will help critical thinking skills which will transfer
      - B: The 200 and 300 level may be more related to students major
      - B: Increase flexibility for transfer student and studying abroad
      - B: Fewer PT instructors needed
      - B: Core will be expeditiously finished by most students
      - C: Students will not get much Jesuit heritage or Christian ideas in their TRS courses here or just the opposite: not enough exposure to non-Christian religions
        - Response: these concerns are not really appropriate for the current form of the Core Curriculum.
        - Response: Students will still have exposure to Christian ideas
        - Response: All 200-level courses deal with religious diversity and the 300-level are Catholic based.
      - C: Will the 200 and 300 level courses be freshman-friendly?
        - Response: this is a 4-year curriculum. Freshmen are not required to take these courses. Advising will need to coordinate the efforts to get students in their appropriate courses.
        - Response: some 1<sup>st</sup> year students thrive in these courses.
- Q: There's no mention of transfer students in the report. This will be another loss of a 100-level option for incoming students. (the loss of SC 101 and PS 101 in the Core were mentioned by this faculty member)
  - Response: regarding transfer students: those who have taken the 101-equivalent off-campus will count as Core. This will translate easily.
  - We can't look at SC 101 or PS 101 with regard to this proposal. This is for TRS 101.
    - Sheila: FITW is still going for 2 more years. During these years, there will be sections for TRS 101. So, there will be 101-options for our 1<sup>st</sup> years for some time. Those placed in EN 125 will be OK in the 200 and 300 level courses.
    - Sheila: This proposal actually opens transfer credits for 100-level religion courses.

- Rodney: The specificity of the 200 or 300 level courses might give students more interesting options for them.
- Q: What data do you (Sheila) have to show that some 1<sup>st</sup> year students will do better in the 300 level than in 101? And will 101 be dropped completely after FITW?
  - We've got anecdotal evidence
  - We'll probably drop 101 temporarily after FITW in order to prevent default advising into 101. But after that hiatus we might bring it back
- From Rodney: Keep in mind that we'll soon be bringing back (probably) some 100 level courses.
- Motion to move the proposal forward to Faculty Vote: Liz then Roy. For: (All except 3) – 1- 2 (motion passes)

### III. FHB Proposal

- Dr. Ruth Connell, Chair of the Faculty Handbook Committee, presented the proposal
- 3 parts:
  - To pass amendments: change to “60% of the faculty who vote, in order to pass an amendment.”
  - Faculty on leave may vote if they want to
  - Change quorum from 20% eligible to vote to 20% who are not leave.
- Open hearings and Canvas discussion is up
- Q: under this situation, 20 could vote and 12 say yes. Then it would pass. If, say, 2/3 of the faculty do not vote for something, it's not important enough to change the handbook over.
- Q: I completely disagree with that. If the faculty can't be bothered to vote, that's their problem. Why 60% and not 50% + 1?
  - If you can't get more than 50+1, then the proposal probably needs to be modified.
- Q: I agree that it needs to be a significant vote in order to change the FHB. FHB shouldn't be easy to change. Also, some people who don't vote, know that their non-vote counts as a No.
- Q: We should split the issues of this proposal when it comes to a vote.
- Q: BTW the administration has told us that the FHB needs to be changed. If we don't then they will change it for us. A silly proposal like the faculty salary schedule almost didn't pass due to non-voting. We need to be able to amend the FHB.
  - This may more extreme than is necessary. We haven't had an election with less than 50% of the eligible faculty voting.
- Chair: Discuss the rest online

#### IV. Discussion of Transfer Policy Proposal

- The Chair of Faculty Council presented this proposal
- Core committee put together a subcommittee to work on this. Becky Dinnen is providing data.
- Will meet with Provost in order to flesh out and clarify the policy.
- Q from last FC meeting: What does “Student responsible for” mean? Is it what they have to do at JCU? Or is it the one part of the Core they need to take care of altogether?
- Q: This is a really interesting precedent for policy: taking a poorly worded policy and working with admin to fix, rather just sending it back.
- Q: We need to look at Articulation Agreements with more specificity.
- Q: Use Becky’s data to address the main obstacles for transfer students.
- Chair: Look for open hearing announcements.

#### V. Discussion of University financial situation

- The Chair of Faculty Council asked for thoughts, comments, feedback, etc. from the faculty regarding the latest Academic Affairs meeting on the university financial situation.
- Community forum next week – reminder.
- The admin rolled out an Early Retirement Program for Staff
- **Faculty Comment/Query:** Recall the charge of the University Budget Advisory Committee. Shouldn’t this be the committee involved with decisions of this sort? It last met last October with no mention of financial troubles. Why hasn’t this committee been convened to discuss this?
- **Faculty Comment/Query:** We’ve found many, many “holes” in the data presented in the last meeting. For example, many of the low-enrolled courses cited as costing the University faculty time were found to be taught by non-faculty and thus cost nothing from faculty funds. We need good data in order to fully understand this. I found this whole situation very disconcerting.
- **Faculty Comment/Query:** We heard that there were about 170 comments to the website. And there were 2 listening sessions in which ideas were put forward. What happened to all those suggestions? Were none of them viable enough to save money? Why were the budget numbers, both before these suggestions and after, exactly the same?
- **Faculty Comment/Query:** it’s not just the data, it’s the interpretation. I’ve lost confidence in this process.
- **Faculty Comment/Query:** The proposed actions suggested last week, are supposed to lead to a long-term solution. But the majority of the solutions given, involved Early

Retirement of Faculty. But this will lead to another similar situation in just 5 or so years. This is just another attempt to eliminate full time positions to be replaced by part time positions. And we need to be very careful not to let this happen.

- **Faculty Comment/Query:** We're being too rushed for this. We should put the brakes on this.
- **Faculty Comment/Query:** We need to send communications to the administration before next week. Why hasn't the UBAC been involved?
- **Faculty Comment/Query:** What happens to this conversation? Are we just preaching to the choir?
  - o Brendan better be taking good notes  
[N.B. -- Brendan tried his best – and just about everything is here. Furthermore, he did not take this comment as a negative one at all.]
- **Faculty Comment/Query:** I want to know what's going on across the university, not just administration. How are we going to save funds elsewhere on campus? It was too vague. What about the other departments? We need to see how the rest of campus will be affected.
- **Faculty Comment/Query:** HLC is coming again 2018. These proposed changes would have us give up our academic excellence and research, for what?
- **Faculty Comment/Query:** The number of FT faculty have declined significantly while the amount of money spent for faculty per faculty has also declined. We have to ask very strongly for an account of where this missing money has been going for the past 14 years.
- **Faculty Comment/Query:** We need to find out if there is an actual market for a university that does not do any research. Is really a demand for this?
- **Faculty Comment/Query:** According to our HLC documents, we committed ourselves to be more strategic in our decision-making process. This doesn't seem a very strategic method for this decision.
- **Faculty Comment/Query:** The Administration needs to listen carefully what we've been saying here.
- **Faculty Comment/Query:** The staff have been given an even worse decision – if they take it, they know what they're going to get; If they don't, they don't know what happens.

VI. There was no other business that anyone had the heart, strength or general inclination to talk about this point, and the meeting was adjourned at 3:16pm.