

General Faculty Meeting Minutes
April 26, 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), Simon Fitzpatrick, Brendan Foreman (Secretary), Marcus Gallo, Nathan Gehlert, Dan Kilbride, Michael Martin, Annie Moses, Mindy Peden, Nancy Taylor, Peifang Tian, Mariah Webinger, Tom Zlatoper

The following Faculty Council members were absent: Richard Greci, David Shutkin

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

0. Quorum of faculty members was met at 2:01pm, and the meeting began.
 - I. Chair's Announcements
 - Minutes of last General Faculty meetings approved.
 - Fr. Niehoff has approved the proposal revising the TRS requirements for the Core Curriculum
 - Important dates
 - o April 26: last general faculty meeting. Don't forget nominations for next year will be brought up then.
 - II. Elections
 - Dr. Roy Day reviewed the number of open positions in Faculty Council and other faculty committees for next year and asked for nominations
 - o There are a lot of open seats coming up
 - o The Chair of FC noted that there will be 100% turnover for the leadership of Faculty Council and Faculty Committees next year. None of the current leaders of FC nor any of the FC committee chairs will be returning to those positions next year.

- There were nominations for the Faculty Grievance Committee (nominated: Dr. Linda Seiter, Dr. Roger Purdy, Dr. Abdul ...) and for the Faculty Board of Review (nominated: Leslie Curtis)
 - Nominations will close tomorrow, April 27.
- III. Proposal to revise the integrated course component of the Core Curriculum
- Dr. Peifang Tian, chair of CAP, presented a summary of the proposal
 - She noted that CAP reviewed the proposal with the two Administrative Liaisons (Dr. Anne Kuegler and Dr. Rodney Hedding) and that all concerns that CAP initially had, were addressed in the most recent draft of the proposal
 - CAP recommends that the proposal move forward for a vote by the Faculty
 - **Question from Faculty Member:** This is a clarifying question: under the new proposal, introduction-level science courses will count for the Natural Science Experience course and thus count as part of the Core Curriculum requirements
 - **Answer:** Yes, one of the goals of this proposal is to send these kinds of decisions back to the appropriate departments. If the Biology Department thinks that a course should count as a “Natural Science Experience,” then it will count as such in the Core Curriculum.
 - All chairs will be asked on June 1 (should the proposal pass) which courses should count for which distributive part of the Core.
 - **Question from Faculty Member:** Do the linked courses count for the distribution course? (Question actually specified whether science courses within a Linked Set of Courses would count)
 - **Answer:** Already-ENW-approved classes count for Natr. Sci, but future linked courses with a science but not-ENW-approved will not count for Natr. Sci.
 - **Additional Answer:** This is still an unanswered question regarding double-dipping between Distribution and Integration
 - A motion to put this proposal forward to a vote by the faculty was brought by Dr. Sheila McGinn and seconded by Dr. Jim Lissemore. The motion passed unanimously.
- IV. Proposal to revise the administrative structure of the Core Curriculum Committee
- Dr. Michael Martin, Chair of the Compensation Committee, presented the proposal
 - He noted that it was a very well-written and timely proposal. There were no questions, comments, criticisms made by anyone regarding it.
 - After no discussion whatsoever, Roy Day moved to put the proposal forward to a vote by the faculty. This was seconded by Michael Martin and passed unanimously.
- V. Transfer Policy for Core Curriculum

- Dan Kilbride summarized the proposal which delineates the Core Curriculum obligations of incoming transfer students with the intention of encouraging more students to transfer to JCU
 - o Dan noted that this was a proposal that was first brought to the Faculty Council by the Provost, Dr. Jeanne Colleran, and which Faculty Council charged the Core Committee to flesh out and hold hearings for.
 - Discussion for the proposal was brief:
 - o **Question from Faculty Member:** Must the Jesuit Heritage obligation be completed at JCU?
 - For those bringing in 45+ credit hours, yes.
 - o **Question from Faculty Member:** So, our math and science courses are not distinctive in the JCU brand?
 - No, sorry but no. We're just trying to make this as transfer-friendly as possible.
 - A motion to put forward this proposal to a faculty vote was put forward by Dr. Mindy Peden (seconded by Dr. Jim Lissemore). It passed unanimously.
- VI. Faculty Handbook Proposal on amending the voting percentage needed to pass a Handbook amendment
- Dr. Ruth Connell, Chair of the Handbook Committee, presented the proposal, highlighting several pertinent issues:
 - o For legal compliance reasons alone, several parts of the Handbook need to be amended or re-worded. This process will be quite cumbersome if we retain the current amendment practices.
 - o The Handbook committee is (roughly) in favor of this amendment (5 For/ 4 Against/ 1 Abstain)
 - The Chair of Faculty Council noted that this will be the last open discussion for this amendment before it goes to a faculty vote.
 - There was a great deal of discussion and quandaries about this proposal:
 - o **Question/Feedback from Faculty Member:** I move to divide up this amendment splitting it up into two parts.
 - **FC Chair:** This will simply send the amendment back to committee
Why? Because this body (the General Faculty meeting) does not have the authority to make changes to FHB proposals
Is there no provision for a friendly amendment? Nope.
Is this motion then "out of order"? No, it's simply irrelevant.
 This proposal has already been through open hearings. It's ready for a vote by the faculty unless the FHB Committee withdraws it.

- **Question from Faculty Member:** If this passes, how does this change the procedure for changes in fringe benefits?
 - **Response:** All changes in fringe benefits will have to be approved as a FHB amendment and this will fall under these new voting rules if the amendment passes.
- **Feedback from Faculty Member:** As a point of order, please note that all changes to fringe benefits have been traditionally treated differently as FHB amendments
 - **Parliamentarian:** whether it's an actual FHB amendment or not, changes to benefits have always had the necessary voting threshold as those of FHB amendments. Either way, it's actually a FHB issue
 - **Further input from an FC member:** As far as I know, the only reason why we get to vote on fringe benefits is that it's in the FHB
 - **Input over the input:** The vote on fringe benefits is not an amendment of the FHB; it's amending an appendix to the FHB which is not subject to the voting restriction.
- **Feedback from Faculty Member:** I appreciate the work that you did on this, but I feel that the issue is not the voting threshold, but the mechanism by which we interact with the FHB
- **Feedback from Faculty Member:** There are other reasons why this is a bad amendment, but you haven't mention them.
 - **Ruth:** I apologize, but many of the concerns raised here were mentioned before.

V. The meeting was adjourned at approximately 3:16pm.