

Faculty Council meeting
August 29, 2018, SB 107

Faculty Council members present: Brent Brossmann (vice-chair), Mina Chercourt, Gwen Compton-Engle, Gregory DiLisi, Jeff Dyck, Kristen Ehrhardt (secretary), Marcus Gallo, Richard Greci, Gerald Guest, Brad Hull, Dan Kilbride (chair), Sokchea Lim, Bo Liu, Elena Manilich, Mike Setter, Christopher Sheil, Kristen Tobey, Mariah Webinger, Gerald Weinstein. No members were absent.

Also in attendance: Carlo DeMarchi, Jim Krukones.

A quorum was reached at 2:01pm and the meeting began.

Minutes

1. Chair's announcements

- Kilbride noted that the HR policy review team had posted revisions to the university's travel procedures over the summer: <https://inside.jcu.edu/2018/08/08/human-resources-policy-review-85/>. It is not a new travel policy, but some of the policies mentioned might affect faculty: it goes into detail about procedures and sets limitations (e.g. on meals), rules about kinds of flight, etc. He had asked HR to extend the feedback period, which they did, to 9/21. They will meet again on September 26th. There's a feedback link, but unlike Canvas discussions, you can't see other people's posts and build off those. He urged people to give feedback. Tobey noted that mileage reimbursement changes by a lot here--this might affect staff people, who don't have the same ability to advocate as faculty. There's also no provision in it to revisit these numbers. Greci noted that HR's goal was to prevent abuses and be as fair as possible; he suggested that someone from HR should come in and give some feedback about that; they did a lot of work on benchmarking the numbers.
- Inauguration is next week. There will be a coffee-break meet-and-greet on Wednesday, 9/5 in the Dolan reading room at 2pm. Then Thursday, the Mass of the Holy Spirit is at 9, then robing, and then the inauguration ceremony, with the procession beginning at 10:45 on the Hamlin quad. If it rains, it will be at Gesu, with no procession.
- Meeting with review team for advising. Academic Advising is undergoing a program review, and they'd like some faculty leaders to meet with the visiting review team. A council member asked whether Laurel Schneck (advisor in Boler) is part of this? Carlo DeMarchi responded that this is CAS-specific; Schneck will be at one of the meetings, but this is about advising in CAS. Maryclaire Moroney was hoping to have a lunch for the reviewers to meet with faculty leadership (i.e. FC members) and hoped that some faculty might drop in to talk with the visiting team.
- Non-faculty at Faculty Council meetings. Can non-faculty attend faculty meetings? Kilbride noted that Jacob Schupp, student union president, had asked to come to next FC meeting. He is a Boler student and asked to attend the entire meeting. The FC constitution is not clear on this: "meetings will be open to all faculty members:" do we want to do this? Brossmann noted that there's nothing preventing us from inviting non-faculty; the question is if we want to do it. Kilbride noted that this

student was part of the UCEP proposal of the 4-day final exam schedule, so he's aware of what's going on. Compton-Engle asked to clarify whether he just wanted to come the one time; Kilbride confirmed just once. Brossmann noted further that he is also the student representative for the Provost search. There were no objections to allowing Schupp to attend the next meeting.

- Next, Kilbride noted that Jim Burke (CIO) had asked to attend General Faculty meetings, because he thinks that things come up that he might have helpful input on. Kilbride noted that didn't see any reasons against it in, just that Burke would not have a vote. Burke would also be interested in coming to FC meetings if things are up for debate where he could help. General consensus was that this is already in practice and would be fine.

2. Items for business

- Introductions: all members introduced themselves.
- Parliamentarian for 2018-19 will be Doug Stone.
- Representatives on board committees. Kilbride noted that orientation sessions are on 9/12, location TBA and that Doreen Reilly is very strict about not allowing substitutes, if you sign up to be a board rep and cannot go, then there will not be any faculty representatives in that session. For 2018-19, the representatives are:
 - Academic Affairs: Dan Kilbride (Chair of Faculty Council)
 - Advancement: Mariah Webinger
 - Finance: Jerry Weinstein (Chair of Faculty Committee on Finance, Compensation, and Work-related Policies)
 - Investments: Feng Zhan
 - Mission and Identity: Sheila McGinn
 - Property, Facilities, and Technology: Brent Brossmann
 - Student Affairs: Mina Chercourt
- Vote on FC committee chairs. The following slate was proposed, seconded, and approved unanimously (20 votes for).
 - Elections: Elena Manilich
 - RSFD: Gerry Guest
 - Compensation: Jerry Weinstein
- FC rep on UCRA (University Committee on Resource Allocation).
 - Jerry Weinstein was nominated.
 - Webinger moved to vote; Sheil seconded. 19 voted for, 1 against.
- Paperless campus proposal.
 - Kilbride introduced the proposal that Desmond Kwan submitted years ago to FC (to have ITS distribute 2-in-1 tablet computers to students and faculty with the goal of reducing paper consumption--to use fewer books, forms, paper resources). FC tabled the discussion at that time, but Kwan asked FC to look at it again. The questions for FC: what to do with this? assign it to a committee? Brossmann noted that ITS says students printed more than 1 million sheets of paper last year, faculty printed 2 million. Discussion ensued about the process to deal with this proposal, whether to assign this to a committee for study, if so, what committee. Compton-Engle noted that it requires resources beyond FC. Kilbride

- thought FC would have to liaise with Jim Burke as well and noted that the bookstore might have issues with this plan too. Dyck wondered whether we would just endorse it; Webinger noted that it might not be something we should endorse, since studies have shown that notes on keyboards aren't as effective. Gallo asked what committee should take it up. Kilbride suggested CAP, since one of their charges is "to review ... computing facilities and instructional technology." Sheil noted that a couple committees will need to talk about it at the same time. Webinger asked whether ITS should convene a committee like they did with the move from Blackboard to Canvas, which was mostly all faculty. Sheil asked what the condition of the proposal was; Brossmann said it still needs a lot of updating, but that Kwan thinks it's a revolutionary change. Sheil noted that this will be a change we'll need to deal with at some time in the near future, since school kids are already paperless. Grecni suggested asking Burke to make an open call to assemble a committee. Setter noted that Burke can evaluate the tech side, but he can't do the cognitive side of things. Grecni asked if we should begin by asking Jim Burke to see if it is even a financially feasible thing to do, noting that the proposal will still need to be updated.
- No formal motion or vote was made, but Kilbride will ask Kwan to update the proposal and ask Jim Burke to investigate the feasibility of the proposal.

3. Items for FC this semester

- Size of Faculty Council. Kilbride noted that when the FC constitution was written in 2009, we had 210 faculty, in Jan 2017 we had 185. We have six empty seats on Council now, and we may want to consider reducing the size of FC to make it easier for the Elections committee. We may also need to change the divisions.
- Review of FC constitution and committee structure. Webinger stated that the ad hoc FC Constitution review committee had met with all the committee chairs last year, but when Santilli left, this was suspended. Is the FC constitution review something Jim Krukones will take over? Kilbride suggested that it was the job of FC to continue the work. Brossmann noted that part of the reason that the review was undertaken was due to legal compliance and that the issue of committee structure was part of this process but not a necessary part. I don't think we need to go back to the full faculty until the review is done, this is just a continuation. Krukones offered to talk to Santilli; Webinger noted that she has access to the shared google drive—while some work has been done, but it hasn't been turned into a report. There are a lot of things in the constitution that need to be changed, e.g. redundancies, etc.
- Handbook revision. Kilbride asked whether there would be more controversial amendments this year since last year many were just legal language change. Brossmann thought yes, since the minimum voting threshold one will come up again and is usually controversial.
- When should committees give public reports? Kilbride noted that in the FC Constitution there's no charge that the Chair of Compensation Committee is supposed to give a spoken report to the full faculty, although in earlier years it had been done annually. Is this a thing that should be done at request of a committee chair? When should/should they ever report directly to the general faculty? Grecni thought that all committees are supposed to submit a report--understood as a written

report. Brossmann noted the importance of transparency, especially if FC is moving to a point of reducing the number of people in FC. Kilbride concluded that he would ask committee chairs to submit a report before the last faculty meeting of the year and let questions come from the floor.

4. Committee reports

- CAP: Sheil asked what the status was on the advising review. He noted that last year CAP was supposed to revisit the cohort advising model, for a bigger picture of retention. DeMarchi stated that the review is in process, and they are looking at the role of advising and professional advising. The report should be complete in a month or so.

Adjourned at 3:10