

**General Faculty Meeting**  
**Apr. 18, 2018**  
**2:00PM – 3:15PM**  
**Donahue Auditorium**

**Minutes**

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

Quorum was reached at 2:04 pm and the meeting began.

I. Chair's announcements

- a. Minutes of Mar. 21, 2018 faculty meeting, posted on the Faculty Council website, were approved by acclamation.
- b. Important dates
  - Handbook open hearing in the Slovak Room (Grasselli Library)
    1. Monday, April 16, 12PM-1PM
    2. Tuesday, April 17, 12:30PM-1:30PM
      - April 20-27: Faculty election
      - April 25: Community forum on strategic planning
- c. A number of UCEP proposals are open for comment through May 11:  
<http://sites.jcu.edu/committees/home/ucep-university-committee-on-educational-policies/ucep-policies-under-review/>
  - Bulletin of Entry
  - Excused Absences
  - Grading System
  - Incomplete Grades
- d. Handbook proposal open for comment on Canvas—this will close after this meeting, since this is when the committee is presenting the amendment:  
[https://canvas.jcu.edu/courses/4458/discussion\\_topics/65644](https://canvas.jcu.edu/courses/4458/discussion_topics/65644)
- e. The Registrar's office is putting together a journal to recognize Jeanne Colleran's service--if you'd like to leave something for her (poem, etc.), get it to them by May 3<sup>rd</sup>.
- f. Board committee reports are on Canvas under Meeting Notes
- g. A few Faculty Council members will be meeting with President Johnson on Thursday to discuss the interim provost position and will be happy to take concerns with them (contact the Chair).

II. Call for nominations for 2018-2019 positions

- Butler noted that there is a large number of vacancies, both from retirements as well as the many other pressures faculty face as a result of people retiring and leaving. Council asked the ad hoc committee on the FC review to discuss making the group smaller, but that doesn't help for next year.
- Gallo noted that nominations would continue through tomorrow at 5pm.

### III. Core report and proposal

- Hessinger provided highlights from of 2017-18 year, the theme of the year being simplifying and streamlining. The committee worked on the creation of goals and rubrics related to the revisions of core, i.e. the change to one linked pair instead of two and the addition of distribution courses. They have made it so that a core designation is tied to a course, not instructor (though they also need to teach accordingly), in order to reduce errors in Banner. They've streamlined assessment by moving to sampling. rather than requiring everyone to assess all the goals of all the categories. Now for any category, one-quarter of the instructors will collect and assess. Of those instructors, five people will be chosen to meet on assessment day to score student work from other courses and discuss results. This may also lead to more meaningful data for instructors.
- Hessinger then made the following proposal: to disband the Core subcommittees, because most of the new courses have made it through and the new assessment model means they aren't needed for assessing.
- Discussion ensued. Question from a faculty member: I was thinking that this sounds great, but the commitment was to teach 3 iterations... will we need to make new courses or teach the same ones again? the linked ones make things difficult. Answer: re linked ones—yes, as people retire we'll need people to keep developing courses. Kilbride noted that CAP is enthusiastically in agreement with this proposal.

Peden moved that the proposal to go to a vote of the faculty; McGinn seconded. The motion passed unanimously.

### IV. CAP: Recommendations on UCEP proposals on the grading system

- Kilbride reported that CAP solicited feedback and got feedback. CAP endorses streamlining the grading scale.
  - FC proposed making this a 3-part vote.
  - CAP endorses FA, X; Agnostic on B, okay about the D- vote
  - Question from a faculty member: Do we really want to give D-? Answer: I was under the impression that D- was under more debate. I feel like usually we don't send things out without more of a rationale. Brossmann noted if we send out a thing for a vote and people don't like it, they can just vote it down.

Peden moved that the proposal be sent to a vote of the faculty; McGinn seconded. The motion passed, with the majority voting for it, one vote opposed.

### V. Handbook proposals

- Connell presented the last Handbook proposal of the year on amending the preface of the HB. She noted that the proposal provoked no discussion on Canvas and no one came to open hearings. The proposal would make the online version of the HB the official handbook. They will remove all the updates on the first page and all the changes and updates will be housed on the website. There will be a link to the current handbook and the old handbook will appear in a link in an archive. Because the faculty passed nine Handbook amendments last month, if we pass this amendment, we won't have to reprint the Handbook to include those.
  - Question from a faculty member: it talks about it being an evolving document, which contradicts the first paragraph which says that the handbook is a contract. I'm not sure about that language. Secondly, we know that stuff gets posted on the web and then things get changed without any notification. This will require extra vigilance and attentiveness to the website. There's nothing in the proposal that provides for those sorts of safeguards. But the words "contract" and "evolving document" seem counterintuitive. Answer: as for who looks at the website, the Provost's office takes care of the website.
  - Observation from a faculty member: my thing is that our assertion that this is a contractual document doesn't undermine it—it already has been undermined.
  - Observation from a faculty member: other people have been concerned about the appendices that are binding
  - Question from a faculty member: the new language removes the last sentence ("any other material contained herein is for informational purposes")—what does that do to the appendices? Is removing the red sentence superfluous or does it change something? Answer: it didn't seem that way to us.
  - Question from a faculty member: did Colleen Trembl or anyone from legal look at it? Answer: no.
  - Observation from a faculty member: it seems to me that we need to keep that last red sentence and get rid of the first blue paragraph. But it sounds like you're defining the Faculty Handbook as just parts 1-5 and not the appendices. Keeping the blue paragraph creates a potential loophole.
  - Question from a faculty member: How bad would it be to just take out the sentence? Answer: we can't make amendments to Handbook proposals here.
  - Observation from a faculty member: there was no canvas discussion, but now we're having a discussion. If someone had objected to this in an open hearing, could it have been changed? Answer: the open hearings is when the Handbook Committee is able to change things, but when they present a thing at a faculty meeting, that's when they can't change it.
  - Observation from a faculty member: maybe the way to go about it is to send it for a vote, but to have the handbook committee talk to a lawyer to see if there are changes that need to be made and figure out if there is a problem there. And then vote on the changes.
  - Observation from a faculty member: the HBC can make textual rectification without a vote.

- Observation from a faculty member: I'd like to ask the Handbook committee—is the urgency of getting this passed so that they don't have to reprint the amendments? If it's just reprinting, I'd suggest that the committee withdraw the amendment.  
Additional observation from a faculty member: if we pass something with a legal ambiguity that could be very problematic in the long run.
- Observation from a faculty member: it's sort of a genesis problem—you have two things that can define what the Handbook is. Also, we're voting to change the contract while we're on the contract. It seems to me that we need to consult legal.
- Handbook committee will meet to decide whether they will send it to a vote in the next election or not.
- Connell thanked the audience for the votes on the nine amendments. They passed, but only just barely because only 61% of the faculty voted. Next year the committee is going to work with departments to talk about what keeps people from voting. Because of the way the Handbook is set up, it's really important for people to vote.
  - Suggestion from a faculty member: there's nothing to prevent the HBC to send out the passed amendments as pdfs, withdrawing the current amendment, fixing it and putting it up for a vote next year.
  - Observation from a faculty member: those amendments aren't part of the Handbook until the board passes them, so they won't really need to be printed before September anyway.
- Connell concluded by noting that the Handbook committee makes recommendations, but it's the faculty that makes the amendments through voting. Also, this isn't a fast process—even those small amendments took a long time.

#### VI. New Business

- The Holocaust remembrance event was postponed to today at 5pm in Dolan auditorium.

The meeting adjourned at 3:11pm.