Faculty Council Meeting
Jan. 17, 2018

Faculty Council members in attendance: Medora Barnes, Brent Brossmann (vice-chair), Emily Butler (chair), Mina Chercourt, Larry Cima, Gwen Compton-Engle, Greg DiLisi, Jeff Dyck, Kris Ehrhardt (secretary), Brendan Foreman, Marcus Gallo, Nathan Gehlert, Richard Grenci, Dan Kilbride, Bo Liu, Michael Martin, Frank Navrati, Paul Shick, David Shutkin, Kristen Tobey, Mariah Webinger. Absent: Ruth Connell.

Quorum at 2:06

1) Chair's Announcements
   - Minutes of the Nov. 15 and 29 Council meetings (posted on the Faculty Council website) approved by acclamation
   - HR policy under review until Feb. 10: Flextime Work Schedule (staff) http://sites.jcu.edu/hr/pages/resourcespolicies/policies-under-review/
   - News about the new, all-faculty email listserv: they're waiting for the list of part-time, spring faculty to be complete—this should happen next week. Gehlert asked whether there were any messages we could send out to model good usage or instructions on how to be removed from the list. Butler agreed to send out a message about that.

2) Items for Business
   - Butler began with an update on the presidential transition: [the new president, Michael Johnson] is here today and meeting with the senior leadership team— he'll be back later in the semester and will have meetings across campus, including with staff and Staff Council. Santili noted that this trip was primarily to look at houses.
   - Update on Faculty Council Constitution review
     o Santilli introduced the group working on the review: Dwight Hahn, Ali Dachner, Annie Moses, Bill Elliott, Mariah Webinger and noted that the group would be meeting on Friday. In the fall, they put together a schedule to work through the constitution. Plan for semester is to have listening sessions—clarifying reporting structures/legal compliance-reporting structures; other people will come in as the process continues to help and consult with review. He asked for input about what the review committee should attend to. Some things that had already hit their radar included creating a schedule for review cycle, stipend recommendations and committee charges. Eventually they'll have a website with a form to allow for open feedback.
     o Butler noted that they should have their recommendations ready by April to bring to rest of faculty. She also suggested that another issue they should look at was the size of council relative to the overall number of faculty.

o Santilli added that they might also consider the relationship between Faculty Council and the Faculty Handbook Committee and whether it is worth creating some sort of connection. Brossmann noted that right now those are independent organizations with equal status—would this mean folding one into the other or putting one under the other? Foreman asked wouldn't that mean changing the Handbook. Brossmann noted yes—but there could also be informal connections. Butler noted that the administration gets anxious because they know where to go with governance things, except with anything that has to do with Handbook.

o Compton-Engle inquired about looking into ways to make the process more nimble so that proposals can make it through, noting that the timeline that's set up with the way that proposals work through things has many tiers. Brossmann suggested looking into using something like OnBase, like the Core Committee does, so that things can go back and forth. Foreman noted a further advantage of a speedier process, that if we can do things a little more quickly, maybe people wouldn't feel like they had to push things through more quickly. Because sometimes we wind up with a quick policy that the administration wants, and when we start talking about it we realize there are more problems. Webinger noted that there isn't anything really in the constitution about how things are procedurally moved through. Butler said that in Appendix C there are guidelines, but wondered further it that meant it's just up to CAP? Compton-Engle noted that a couple years ago CAP tried to map out how a proposal could make it through in a year, but that was a pilot and I don't know what happened to it. That's when I first realized what logistical obstacles there are—if that's what you were thinking, I think it was ultimately futile. If there are only x FC meetings, and y General Faculty meetings it makes it logistically challenging. Barnes added that another issue is that proposals come from different places—from faculty, FC, FHB, it's not just committees of FC that come up with proposals; Kilbride added that not all proposals go through CAP. Webinger noted that there is some verbiage about procedures in the FC Constitution ("The full procedure for preparation of reports to the Faculty comprises the following steps, not all of which need be followed in every instance." XI. G., p. 8). Brossmann pointed out that Item 2 under subsection G, namely the need to hold hearings, is the thing that takes the most time—maybe the committee should consider what sorts of proposals require this step. Santilli added that there might also need to be a reconsideration of what a hearing entails and if there can be a variety of ways to hold hearings. Finally, Foreman noted the usefulness of having an administrative liaison whenever something is sent to a committee, and suggested it be considered as an addition to the procedural language.

o Hahn asked how FC feels about the reporting structures between it and the other university committees. Santilli noted that a recent example of the connection between FC and UCEP was when UCEP brought some policies to FC; he asked if there was a worry that university committees will implement things without enough faculty input. Brossmann said

there's always a fear that faculty won't be involved enough, but so far hadn't seen anything gone awry. Though there were issues with the closed nature of the presidential search. Webinger noted that one inconsistency in the FC Constitution now is that it mentions faculty representatives on the Provost Council but that committee no longer exists. She also asked how faculty plug into all those committees. Santili pointed out that faculty were voted as reps to all the university committes. Navratil, shifting back to the discussion of the Faculty Handbook noted that while other committees are made up of a mix of people, FHC is comprised of faculty only and wondered if perhaps it should come under the supervision of Faculty Council. Barnes noted that it would be good to know who was serving on the various committees and to have some way of knowing what was happening in them. Butler suggested something like a policy hub—so you can see what's happening. Santilli said this was something they were working on and that every university committee would have a website, including the minutes and what they're working on. A further issue is what the mechanism or expectation is that FC reps on university committees report back to FC and to the faculty as a whole. There needs to be proactive work to give the committees feedback when there are things that faculty as a whole will need to look at. It was suggested that every faculty member who represents the faculty on a university committee should memorize the preamble.

- o Dachner asked whether there were ideas about the size of FC. Butler suggested that maybe committee chairs don't need to be FC members. Size of council was original chosen to be 10% of the total faculty. Webinger asked what about divisions? Originally it was about 50 faculty per group. Barnes noted that some divisions rarely lack candidates because of the way it was divided up (e.g. Div III because it includes librarians who value service); she further suggested including a couple "at-large" candidates. Brossmann suggested that one easy reduction would be to go to 4 reps per division, although that misses the question of whether the divisions make any sense at all.
- o Finally, Santilli noted that regarding the Faculty Handbook—FHC and Colleen Treml (legal counsel) have met—she's developed a dozen amendments, where we're out of compliance or things that are outdated.
- o Butler then encouraged Santilli and the committee to check back with FC as needed and Santilli agreed.
- Replacement—we need to replace William Bockanic who retired at the end of last semester.
- Registrar's proposal to establish a standard Monday-Thursday exam schedule
  - o The registrar proposed changing the final exam schedule so that all exams would take place on Monday through Thursday in finals week; Friday would be reserved to extraordinary circumstances (e.g. emergency make-ups, courses where multiple sections meet to take the exam together).
  - o Butler asked what problems FC could see arising with doing this. Kilbride objected, noting it will jam up exams. Students will always have 3 exams

on a day. Compton-Engle noted that the advantage from not having exams on Friday would be that we'd be able to get those last exams graded quickly.

- o Cima asked whether there was any reason that we need to have grades in by Monday since those were the rules when things were done with mail.
- o Navratil agreed with Kilbride, noting that he didn't think it's good for students to have to take multiple exams all on one day—it's bad academic practice.
- o Brossmann asked how many problems are there where they need to set Friday aside to take care of them? Why not keep five days and standardize it. Navratil added they could set aside two slots for special situations in those five days.
- o Brossmann thought the change would impact pedagogy in a huge way. Shick noted that given that students can't move an exam for any reason that students can be stuck with up to four finals on a day. He suggested that we should use this as a way to discuss final exam policies from the ground up.
- o Grenci noted that UCEP is picking up some scheduling issues—there's probably going to need to be a discussion Martin wondered about giving up the reading day (though it was further noted that there is no reading day in the fall semester).
- Update on Faculty Handbook review – there was no update beyond Santilli's remarks above.
- Counseling proposal – there was not enough time to have gotten feedback on to send it out to faculty at the upcoming general faculty meeting.
- Student Resolution on a voluntary diversity pledge for faculty
  - o Butler introduced the pledge and asked whether this is something we'd be willing to take to a broader discussion at the meeting next week?
  - o Barnes noted that this was something that the Student Union passed in September. Since they're acting for voluntary support, it would be good to give students an audience for what they're looking for.
  - o Butler said that originally student representatives were going to come today with ideas of what this completely voluntary thing would look like. They were going to talk to Ed Peck & CSDI to figure out what it looks like if faculty say that they do want to do it? Butler's inclination would be that it's worth having them come and talk to faculty in general.
  - o Shick noted that it isn't completely voluntary, since some of us only use one book; other members also discussed how this might fit into their own fields. Barnes said that her understanding is that they want faculty members to use what works in their own field. If there is a list of faculty members who are participating, and you're not on it I get that you might feel like that's not good. But there's already a list on the CSDI website of who's gone through safe space training—that doesn't mean that if you're not on it your office isn't safe.
  - o There was a general consensus that the issue should be put on the agenda for the general faculty meeting next week and that the students be encouraged to attend the meeting. Though there was still concern that

they might consider change the wording of the statement to include authors or issues in their field.

- o Butler also asked if we want UCEP to come next week to talk about item #9. Grenci noted that Marty Hendren (the former registrar) was the key person for that issue, but he's not sure what the UCEP is doing about it.
- o Finally, Barnes noted that the Town Hall on the 31st would be about getting input from the community about adding a strategic diversity plan to fit into the overall university strategic plan.

3) Adjourn 3:19