

**Faculty Council Meeting**  
**Feb. 7, 2018**

**Minutes**

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

**Quorum: 2:02**

1) Chair's Announcements

- Minutes of the Jan. 17 Council meeting posted on the Faculty Council website were approved by acclamation
- There are a number of UCEP policies under review:  
<http://sites.jcu.edu/committees/home/ucep-university-committee-on-educational-policies/ucep-policies-under-review/>
  - Until Feb. 26:
    - Degree Completion Time Limit
    - Grade Change Time Limit
    - Summer Graduates Participating in Spring Commencement
    - Student Responsibility
    - Transcript Notation and Conduct Letter Policy
  - Until March 1:
    - Course Attempt
    - Grade Exclusion

2) Items for Business

- Naveed Piracha (PH) was unanimously approved as the leave replacement for Christopher Sheil (on Grauel in Spring 2018); 16 votes for, none opposed.
- Update on presidential transition: meeting with Dr. Johnson on Wednesday, Feb. 28.
  - There will be separate meetings with the incoming president for both Faculty Council and Staff Council, as well as a larger event in the afternoon. The time reserved for Faculty Council is 9 AM, for an hour. If you teach at that time, you could suggest someone else from your division (4 people noted that they would have potential conflicts with this meeting time).
- Update on Registrar's proposal to establish standard Monday-Thursday final exam schedule.
  - Butler opened discussion by noting that FC's perspective that this policy has clear academic implications seems to differ from the perspective of the people who are working on it. Right now, it's proceeding as if it is an administrative change—if we want to have a say on this, then we need to be clearer.
  - A number of faculty (Shick, Navratil, and Brossmann) thought it was already clear at the last meeting that this was an academic issue. Navratil noted that it affects a student's performance if finals are bunched up and suggested that the deadline to submit final grades should be moved back by a day.
  - Shick suggested that not only should final schedules be considered an academic matter, but also that it would be a good time to open up final exam policies in general; e.g. the rule that every class has to have a final, and exemptions need to go through the dean's office. perhaps it's something that CAP needs to consider. Butler suggested that it may be a thing that UCEP needs to consider. Catherine Sherman

(Assistant Dean of Academic Advising) noted that UCEP is looking at the issue of three finals on a day. She urged FC to come up with recommendations for UCEP to look at, noting that UCEP is the primary body for looking at academic matters, and that she couldn't think of anything more academic than this. Greci noted that UCEP was looking at a number of issues along these lines, e.g. the issue of new class schedules, and wondered whether they should be looking at scheduling overall. Webinger suggested that it would be a good idea to hold open hearings about final exam and scheduling issues so that the whole community could have a voice. Shick noted that part of the issue is that despite the requirement to hold finals, not everyone really carries through on having finals. Compton-Engle was in favor of it going through CAP, but noted the need to have an administrative liaison—in this case, someone who is familiar with the complexities of scheduling

- The following motion was made by Shick, seconded by Brossmann: We refer to CAP the question raised by the registrar on behalf of UCEP regarding the contraction of final exam week, that they take this up along with the broader question of final exam policies and regulations for review and possible revisions. 19 votes for, none opposed.
  - Liaisons to include someone on UCEP and someone from registrar's office.
- Following the vote, Greci asked what the line is between administrative issues and ones where faculty need to be involved, e.g. when the registrar changed the number of credit hours (37.5 credit hours, which affected summer classes). Barnes noted that as chair, she's definitely been aware of how schedule changes affect faculty, e.g. times when classes can't be held, and thought it's a good larger issue that faculty members need to have a voice in. Martin suggested that there's a difference between when it affects teaching schedules (which we don't always follow) than things like final exams schedules—which affect students. Although Greci noted that there are other things that affect teaching that we don't always insert ourselves into, Brossmann pointed out that we pick our battles—there's an argument for why we think this affects our students' learning so we fight for it. Finally, Cima noted his objection to the policy requiring faculty to have final grades in by 3pm on the Monday following finals.
- Status of Counseling proposal.
  - Kilbride noted that CAP held open hearings which resulted in a couple comments on Canvas, one substantial. From there, they kicked it to the next level, which led to two minor clarifications. Overall, CAP is happy with the proposal.
  - Canvas comments: [https://canvas.jcu.edu/courses/4458/discussion\\_topics/60411](https://canvas.jcu.edu/courses/4458/discussion_topics/60411)
  - Cecile Brennan (Counseling) noted that she didn't know where to add a comment about how a student has gotten their 2000 hours in but that this is up to the student to keep track (we give them a log) and to present that with the state. Counseling licensure works the same way.
  - Webinger moved to send the proposal to the full faculty meeting for a vote. Kilbride seconded. 19 votes for, none opposed.
- Faculty Council response to the student resolution on voluntary diversity pledge.
  - Overall, the debate began by discussing whether FC should try to change the pledge, if so, who would be tasked with making those changes. It then shifted
  - Butler opened discussion by posing the question of whether to leave this in the students' court or task Gender and Diversity to work with them. However, one issue was that the faculty on G&D are not in fields where instituting this proposal would be challenging. Dyck asked if G&D could be responsible for reaching out to faculty in fields where this would be challenging. Martin pointed out that the students noted that this could be tough in some fields, including his own. Additionally, he pointed out that the

students had passed this in the fall and that he didn't want to wordsmith their document, "I feel bad that we haven't just approved it—typos and all." Webinger appreciated that comment, but felt like if we just say, go for it, then it could become less meaningful. She asked whether diversity should be considered a part of teaching-excellence and thought it was important to support student efforts in this way. Tobey noted that the students who came up with the proposal saw the potential problems and thought that if we asked them to retool it, they could handle it on their own. Foreman thought the faculty's objections were typical of older generations toward younger generations and that in spirit, most people agree with this; he didn't want to throw a barrier up to them. Shick stated that his concern was not getting locked into language like "2 authors."

- Barnes noted that because this was a student union bill for them it might be really hard for them to change it, since the students who created it aren't on the committees anymore. It might make more sense to make a motion here in support.
- Motion: Faculty Council supports the spirit of the Student Union resolution regarding the diverse curriculum pledge (RES2-F17). Professors who sign this will commit to include at least two writers, texts, issues, cases, topics, or examples of diversity as defined in the resolution in their courses. Webinger moved, Compton-Engle seconded; 17 votes for / 1 opposed.
  - Following the vote, Webinger asked what the logistics of this would be: will they be including real signatures? Martin suggested including it in an election. Webinger noted that this isn't an official policy. Barnes said that they're going to house this on the CSDI website. Shick suggested that the students could email the faculty list (or give them a physical list of all the faculty email addresses), faculty can reply to that email, and then they can handle it.
  - Webinger suggested that we ask G&D to work on diversity and teaching excellence. Barnes noted that one of the goals that DEI is working on in the strategic plan is including diversity training for faculty and rewarding faculty who do diversity work and value that work. She didn't know whether this is the semester to task G&D with that or if it's worth seeing if it plays out on its own. Tobey (chair of G&D) noted that there are many ways for faculty to have input but was worried that if G&D takes it over, it might not have much traction in the long run.
  - Santilli asked whether this is policy or a set of practices—that is, does FC want to raise it to the level of policy or to infuse practices at the course level that include diversity? He noted further that there was a plan to build diversity into the university strategic plan and that this would be an opportunity to add a diversity component to it from an academic perspective.
  - Finally, Cima stated his objection to the diversity pledge as follows: I want to say I've been teaching a capstone course in economics—there's hardly any teaching—it's only writing papers and taking a standardized test. If students don't want to write about diversity, that wouldn't work. I think there are circumstances where calling for two sources could be calling for blood.
    - Barnes pointed out that the pledge doesn't say all your courses. Webinger noted that the pledge is not policy.
- Faculty e-mail list: should administrators be included?
  - Butler noted that looking back, we never said explicitly that no administrators should be on the list—do we want to include administrators? Shick noted that most of those individuals have faculty rank. I think if it's an organ of faculty council that they should be included. Webinger stated that this was supposed to be an easy way to communicate. Compton-Engle noted that if you want to email something that you don't want your

dean to see, you shouldn't be emailing it. The consensus was to include administrators with faculty status on the faculty email list.

3) Agenda for Feb. 21, 2018 Faculty Meeting

- Annual update from the Provost/AVP
- UCEP proposals: Butler asked if should we include UCEP on the agenda for the next meeting while the policies are still under review? do we want them to talk about these things more generally?
  - Shick noted that it would be a good idea to get UCEP members in front of the faculty at large so they can talk about what they are doing so that Faculty know what's going on and the sort of input that's been going on. Brossmann thought they should also talk about the policies.
  - Sherman noted that UCEP even has a process document that they can share and that they see it as a cross-collaborative process.

4) The meeting adjourned at 3:16.