

**General Faculty Meeting**  
**Jan. 24, 2018**  
**2:00PM – 3:15PM**  
**Donahue Auditorium**

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

Quorum at 2:01pm.

I. Chair's announcements

- a. The results of Great Colleges to Work for Survey are coming soon.
- b. Minutes of Oct. 18, 2017 faculty meeting, posted on the Faculty Council website were approved by acclamation.
- c. HR policy under review until Feb. 10: Flextime Work Schedule (staff):  
<http://sites.jcu.edu/hr/pages/resourcespolicies/policies-under-review/>
- d. Canvas discussion on Counseling's proposal for the Substance Use Disorder Program still open for comments. Additionally, an open hearing on Counseling proposal will be held Monday, January 29, 12-1:30PM in AD 248
- e. Important dates:
  - i. Jan. 31: Community Forum on Mission
  - ii. Feb. 7: Faculty Council meeting in Dolan A202/203
  - iii. Feb. 14: Community Forum on the Higher Learning Commission Comprehensive Visit
  - iv. Feb. 21: General faculty meeting
  - v. Feb. 28: Remarks from incoming president Michael Johnson

II. Student Resolution on voluntary diversity pledge

- a. The following two student representatives presented the resolution: Rebecca Ries-Roncalli, former Chair of the Academic Affairs committee of the Student Union and Amy Kato, former Chair of the Diversity, Equality, and Inclusion committee of the Student Union. The idea behind the pledge began as part of the Stop Bias campaign, which was also a voluntary initiative for faculty to eliminate bias in the classroom. Their hope was to bring back some of the energy of the prior campaign. Their presence at the meeting is to explain where the idea behind the pledge was coming from; they don't want to force people to do this, they just wanted to start a discussion.
- b. Ries-Roncalli noted that the pledge would be completely voluntary. Its point is not about including a certain number of readings, but to look at historically different outlooks within a given field, e.g., reading secondary literature exploring an African-American perspective in a class on Flannery O'Connor. Kato suggested how, a class in the business school could feature a discussion of an article on local entrepreneurs from historically underrepresented groups. While it takes some thought and effort, it would be a good way to bring historically underrepresented voices into the classroom.
- c. Question from a faculty member: Is the intent to include the pledge in a syllabus? How are we supposed to do this? Answer: We haven't gotten that far yet. It could be the

- inclusion of faculty names on a poster or the CSDI website. Butler noted that she encouraged them to come, even though nothing is set in stone yet and prompted the audience to consider whether there were ways that they could see this working better than other ways.
- d. Question from a faculty member: Can I ask that you try to come up with language that will work in many fields, e.g. sciences? There will be people who support this, but who only use one book. Answer: That was part of the reason that it's open-ended now. The goal really is looking at how we can do this, we're okay with trial and error
  - e. Observation from a faculty member: What you described for Boler isn't in your language; in your conversations, you may want to broaden your own language to include things like contributions in classrooms.
  - f. Question from a faculty member: I'm wondering how the library can support this, but we have subject liaisons, and we might be able to help faculty put lists together.
  - g. Observation from a faculty member: I would like to push you to be more aspirational, for example, when women's history started in the '70s they started to include women, but it's only been recently that history has written from new perspectives. Response: We want this to be more than just box-checking but to go further. Can we allow diversity to be an add-on? We see changes outside the classroom, but we don't see them continuing once you enter the classroom.
  - h. Observation from a faculty member: I think you should keep giving us a hard time about this. Thanks.
  - i. Finally, Butler noted that we can keep talking about this in the space of future FC and General Faculty meetings.

### III. Update on review of Faculty Handbook

- a. Beginning last year, the Handbook Committee began a review of the Faculty Handbook; They've been meeting twice a month: with Dean Farrar and university counsel about concerns about legal language; with Pam Mason about clinical faculty, with Nick Santilli about status of review.
- b. Last spring, there was a proposal for changing the voting requirements for changes to the HB, they are likely to try to pass the proposal with changes. They feel this needs to be passed because the issue is with people not voting being counted as no votes. They noted that proposals that pass had more than 77% voting while all the failed amendments had more than 60% of people voting on them. It turns out that when there is a faculty amendment on the ballot there is more voting. –
- c. Another amendment will be for changing the process for bringing proposals for changes to the HB because there have been issues with not being able to make friendly amendments before the proposal goes through.
- d. Other amendments will be to fix legal issues. For example, “retirement for age” (so once you reach 65 you have to retire; that's illegal); tenure ceasing for medical reasons—needs to fall in line with FMLA; EEO statement needs to be updated to agree with current university policy.
- e. Still other needed changes: remove the right of first class boat passage to meetings; remove long out of date appendices (where people were listed by name); some appendices need to be moved into the text; some language fixes; some other embedded changes.
- f. There will be open hearings and we'll have discussion boards. They noted that it is better to hear things in hearings than bomb-dropping at FMs

- g. Question from a faculty member: you proposed an amendment about how amendments move forward, but you put it after the first. Would it be smarter to do that one first?  
 Answer: we would definitely keep them separated, but maybe? we think that will improve the process
- Question from a faculty member: the inclusion of sexual orientation—is that to be in correspondence with fed policy? maybe we should use sex identity instead? Answer: I think we're keeping it in line with the university wording
- Question from a faculty member: how did you arrive at 60%? Answer: if it's 67% nothing will pass. 60% is still a super-majority, a healthy majority. In the case of a faculty amendment, then at least 60% of all faculty must vote, and 60% of those voting must vote for it.
- Butler noted that there would be an ongoing discussion with the Faculty Handbook committee at general faculty meetings.

#### IV. Update on cohort advising

- a. Maryclaire Moroney began by talking about where the program came from; data from students and faculty who have participated—all reports will be posted on Canvas faculty board. The idea behind cohort advising is to help manage faculty workload—there's a burden on faculty in certain disciplines; as well as to increase consistency in student advising experience, and to help communication between faculty and students. As an overview, cohorts are derived from three groups: Boler, CAS, special programs. Students meet in groups with advisors in summer and then again in fall semester. She detailed the support for the program: faculty workshops, partnerships with student affairs, AR101 syllabus, and general AR101 Canvas site. She listed the learning goals for the program: increase contact with faculty early, to help students understand policies and resources, increase habits of reflection as students figure out academic plans.
- b. Overall, there have been fairly consistent results, with mixed numbers. This year just under half of the 1<sup>st</sup> years responded to the survey, given later in November. Some highlights from the data:
- i. a lot of students are reporting that they're going to a lot of meetings; including students beyond the Boler and special programs. In general, students report that they at least know whom to ask. Academic planning data lags a little, though the ones who are completing plans seem to think that the plans make sense.
  - ii. lower numbers—fewer students feel comfortable running degree evaluations; not everyone makes connections with the university community; students in general want more tools
  - iii. retention data (fall-to-fall retention)—not sure how to parse it. The past couple years are a little bumpy—we're moving up in retention now but 2014 and 2015 were a little rocky and numbers bounced around a little. numbers bounced up in Boler once Laurel Schneck was hired to give more help to first-years. Numbers don't look grim and this doesn't cover graduation rates; it's just one more document to go to persistence studies.
  - iv. 56 faculty (7 Boler and 49 CAS) answered long survey. In general, faculty thought it was just in the middle in terms of the effectiveness of this format. A concern is still in the workload—it's a longstanding logistical issue, especially for Boler and STEM.

- v. Overall, strengths of this is that it get students to meet with advisors before registering; weaknesses are that there's not always a great match between students and faculty interests and that students don't always go.
- c. NSSE 2017 data—students filled out survey for academic advising model—up against 56 other schools. Our experience is close to the comparable schools with respect to how many times students meet, student perception of faculty availability and on assistance with dates and deadlines. JCU scored lower on the categories of faculty listening to your problems; and how often faculty advisors contacted them on academic performance/progress; also a little lower on giving advice on actual courses.
- d. Overall, then, cohort advising has raised visibility of the importance of 1<sup>st</sup> year advising but workload still a challenge.
- e. Butler noted that at some point this semester we'll need to vote on whether this model will go forward.
- f. Question/observation from a faculty member: the graph of what we'd like advising to look like—I would suggest that you take the 2 bars on the left together, to show how, by and large faculty don't want to be in charge of everything.
- g. Question/observation from a faculty member: I'd like to give a shout out to the staff in student affairs who help out. They're overworked and it's great that they're willing to keep working with this.
- h. Finally, it was noted that this information will go up on Canvas in a module for cohort advising.

V. Faculty e-mail list

Butler noted that because it doesn't make sense for Faculty Council to send out things unrelated to FC, or things that would imply FC endorsement that a general email list would be created, [facultyforum@jcu](mailto:facultyforum@jcu). This will include part-time faculty, they're just waiting to get the finalized list for spring.

VI. Elections Committee/Call for nominations

Gallo announced that for the spring semester, there are currently 198 full-time faculty, 10 are on leave, so 188 active faculty; thus 98 is majority; while a quorum is 38. The following positions need candidates to stand in the upcoming election:

- i. Faculty Council, Division I (2019)
  - ii. Faculty Council, Division V (2020)
- Standing Committees of Faculty Council
- iii. Committee on Academic Policies, Division V (2020)
  - iv. Committee on Finance, Faculty Compensation, and Work-Related Policies, Division II (2018)
  - v. Committee on Finance, Faculty Compensation, and Work-Related Policies, At Large (2019)
- University Committees
- vi. University Committee on Administrative Policies, At Large (2020)

VII. Butler opened the floor for further discussion about the student resolution. A suggestion was made that the Gender and Diversity committee could also work with the students.

VII. The meeting adjourned at 3:09.