

Faculty Council Meeting
April 4, 2018
Minutes

Faculty Council Members present: 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, Nathan Gehlert, Dan Kilbride, Michael Martin, Frank Navratil, Naveed Piracha, Paul Shick, David Shutkin, Kristen Tobey, Mariah Webinger. Absent: Medora Barnes, Richard Greci, Brad Hull, Bo Liu.

Quorum was achieved at 2:03pm and the meeting began.

1) Chair's Announcements

- Minutes of the Mar. 14 Council meeting (posted on the Faculty Council website) were approved by acclamation.
- Election open through 5PM on April 3 has concluded
 - Faculty representatives to the search committee for the VP for Enrollment
 - Proposed Handbook amendments all passed
- Canvas discussion boards open through April 3:
 - Feedback on final exam policies:
https://canvas.jcu.edu/courses/4458/discussion_topics/65150
 - Proposed four-day exam schedule:
https://canvas.jcu.edu/courses/4458/discussion_topics/65132

2) Items for Business

- Meeting with Dr. Johnson to discuss interim provost position
 - Butler stated that incoming Pres. Johnson will be on campus on April 19 and had asked to discuss the interim provost position with Faculty Council members because he wanted some input about what people are thinking about. The meeting will be at 11am on 4/19/18. Butler asked if anyone else was interested in attending. Foreman volunteered.
 - Webinger asked if this means Nick Santilli won't be our interim provost. Butler and Brossmann replied in tandem that he'll be retiring at the end of this year.
- Review of the Faculty Council Constitution
 - Butler noted that the Constitution review is on the radar, but nothing is coming up this year to handle. The group's recommendations will come in Sept of next year. Webinger confirmed that she has met with all the committee chairs, but the group hasn't met.
- Request for Handbook reinterpretation: charge RTP to review Appendix K
 - Butler noted that this proposal originally went to Handbook committee, they suggested that it should go through RTP. Connell (Handbook Committee Chair) noted that this is because it's an appendix, not a handbook document, so it's not a thing that has to go through the Handbook Committee.

- Butler explained that a number of departments on campus are being encouraged to revise their promotion plans. Connell pointed out that the issue is that there's a group of people who have been working toward full using their department's current guideline and would be affected by a change. Butler stated that the job of FC now is to decide whether to charge RTP to review this.
 - In the conversation about the proposal, Shick noted a concern about the highlighted portion of the proposal, namely that "approved" is an odd thing when it comes to these. Maybe it should state "in effect when" instead. Connell thought it might be chaotic to have 2 sets of promotion documents in effect. they might prefer to state that there's a window. Butler noted that if we send this to RTP they could suggest that. Martin thought that most people would choose the new guidelines because often they will make things clearer, but Butler pointed out that one of the people who started this would be required to teach a sort of class they hadn't been asked to teach before if held to the new tenure guidelines.
 - Webinger moved to send the proposal to RTP; Brossmann seconded. The motion passed, 19 votes for/none opposed.
- CAP: Core proposal to eliminated subcommittees
 - Kilbride noted that at the last faculty meeting, Rodney Hessinger (Core Director) described this proposal to get rid of the subcommittees. CAP thinks this is a very reasonable proposal. There are still representatives for the different areas on the main committee. We think this is absolutely uncontroversial and should go for a vote.
 - Brossmann moved to send the proposal to the faculty for a vote; Webinger seconded. The motion passed, 19 votes for/none opposed.
- CAP: First-year Advising
 - Kilbride noted that this is the first of two stages, namely does the faculty want to say yes or no for sticking with the cohort advising plan. Essentially, we need to decide whether to keep going with it or to go back to the old ad hoc system. Results of cohort survey were ambiguous—people noted lots of flaws with the system but overall, it seemed maybe a little better. He noted that Boler modified the system by hiring a full-time person to work with first years—their answers on the survey show that they're also much more bullish about the cohort system than CAS. Whatever way this vote goes, they're going to propose that CAS hires full-time advisors. to take the freshman work and give the mentorship aspect to faculty. CAP doesn't give an enthusiastic thumbs up, but all things equal, cohort system is good and we recommend faculty vote for it.
 - A good deal of discussion about this issue ensued. Gallo asked what happens if faculty vote no. Kilbride answered that it will go back to the old system. Piracha asked what the students thought. Kilbride replied that they weren't asked, though Brossmann pointed out that they might not be reliable judges of this, since they've only known their own system. Kilbride noted that CAPs position was that most people have done cohort advising, so people know on

a personal level whether they want to continue to do it. Navratil noted that the mentoring part of advising was what was important to students and that the best system he had seen is the University of St. Thomas, where they combine professional advisors and mentoring. Brossmann noted that if we have professionals who do the “grunt work” of advising, that would that changes things a lot. H thought that his vote about whether the cohort system stays would be dependent on whether they bring in professionals. Shick asked whether FC could vote to keep it the cohort system on probation for one more year while advising figures things out and wondered about the sunset clause on the cohort system. Butler noted that we were already long past the sunset date.

- Shick moved to defer the vote on the advising model to December 2018 to give Academic Advising the chance to advance its proposal for professional advisors to FC; Brossmann seconded. The motion passed: 18 voted for/1 abstention/none opposed
- Following the vote, Compton-Engle noted that regardless, cohort advising continues this year. Butler noted that if Advising raised a concern we can have an emergency vote.
- CAP: UCEP proposals on grading system and incomplete grades
 - Next, Kilbride reported the results of CAP’s discussion on the UCEP proposals. Regarding incompletes, CAP is not ready to say whether the new idea works and we’re engaged in further discussion about it. It needs further consideration before it goes to a vote for approval. Regarding the grading system, CAP thought that should go forward for a vote. There were also appendices—changing the definition of B and adding a D- grade. CAP thought those are small changes and noted that they didn’t get strong opinions on it.
 - Initially, Kilbride moved to send the proposal grading system back to UCEP to enact as they see fit and Webinger seconded, but as discussion continued the motion was withdrawn.
 - Shick thought there would be a lot of pushback from the faculty if UCEP changes the grading scale without faculty input. He thought there should be something reporting that CAP considered it and was fine with it and thought that it wasn’t necessary to go to a faculty vote. Gallo’s instinct was that faculty should probably vote on this, since it is a faculty issue. Gehlert wondered whether a vote through Faculty Council could be seen as representing the faculty’s voice in a faculty matter. Brossmann pointed out that FC does not have that power to say that here. We can state whether it is procedural or substantive. Shick thought that if we’re debating whether it’s procedural or substantive, it’s probably better to vote on it, especially since we have another election this semester.
 - Shick moved to send the UCEP proposals for faculty vote as three separate items; Webinger seconded. The motion passed, 19 votes for / none against.
- CAP: Final exam policies and procedures

- Finally, Kilbride reported that the four-day schedule proposal for final exams was not looking good and would not be going ahead. This is all to be continued.
- Nominations for 2018-2019 positions
 - Butler noted that there were many open positions for the upcoming election and that we need nominations by the General Faculty meeting in 2 weeks when we close the nominations.
 - Gehlert asked that since FC had talked about reducing the size of FC, what happens if seats are just unfilled? Butler said that she did not know when it becomes in issue in terms of function, but that FC has been working with an open seat all year. It would make me nervous if we didn't have at least 4 seats in each division filled. Martin noted that it is also an HLC issue: last time they were concerned when there were many unfilled seats. Butler noted that there are going to be some really tight years when we've lost faculty and aren't making new hires. Connell also noted that there will be 3 seats open on the Handbook committee.

The meeting adjourned at 3:14pm.