

Faculty Council meeting

October 3, 2018

SB 107

Members in attendance: Faculty Council members present: Brent Brossmann (vice-chair), Mina Chercourt, Gwen Compton-Engle, Gregory DiLisi, Jeff Dyck, Kris 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.

Minutes

A. Quick items:

1. Jacob Schupp introduced as President of the Student Union.
2. Minutes from August 29: <http://faculty.jcu.edu/facultycouncil/files/2018/09/FC-meeting-minutes-83018.pdf> were approved by acclamation, pending typo correction.
3. Pres. Johnson's address: 2 pm October 10, Donahue Auditorium. This is the speech on his vision for the university and how the faculty fits into that vision; please encourage people to come out for it.

B. Items for discussion:

1. Board committee liaison reports

Mission and Identity: Sheila McGinn submitted the report she gave to the committee and noted the following aspects. She talked about the core curriculum. She noted the lack of faculty to do the job of faculty and that there were only 4 TT faculty in the last group of hires: in terms of longevity, she wondered whether that's a good plan. She also noted that the issue of faculty committees having open seats may be because there are not enough faculty. The Board put the ball back into FC's court, and asked if committees could be merged—she noted that they have an interest in helping make faculty governance more manageable, though she's not sure who would address that.

- Gallo asked whether we keep historical data on how many full-time faculty we've had over the years. Several people replied that this is recorded in the university Factbook.

Academic Affairs: Kilbride gave highlights of his report (given to the board by Jim Krukones, in Kilbride's absence). He reported that we're in a good place with the Core, that adjustments have been made. Faculty seem cautiously optimistic about the new president but are glad to have a faculty member chairing the Provost search. He noted some awkwardness about committee structure and the coordination between committees and some uncertainty about who's responsible for what. The size of incoming class vs. discount rate needs to be addressed—some disappointment that the size of the class didn't help us on that. He also noted worries about the full time/part time faculty ratio. With respect to the upcoming HLC visit, all hands are on deck.

Governance structure needs to be addressed, especially size. He also noted that last year's Faculty Handbook amendments were passed, but still not everyone voted, and some people voted no.

- At this point, Brossmann reiterated that all eligible faculty must vote in handbook elections. If you don't vote you ARE VOTING NO. Sheil asked if there is there an option for abstaining? Gallo noted that he had included abstentions on last year's HB amendments, and also some no-answers. But Brossmann responded that in Handbook elections, anything that is not a yes is a no. Krukones, who attended in Kilbride's absence, noted that the course of the Board meeting itself was primarily dedicated to discussion of the upcoming HLC visit; they wanted to make sure that HLC got its due and they broke into small groups to work on different issues. Two board members were assigned to five different sections—overall, they were happy with what had already been developed. One of the questions that came up was the issue of exploitation in the increase in the number of part-time faculty. Mostly, however, they addressed faculty participation and they wondered about faculty willingness to do service.

Advancement: Webinger noted that the committee chair highlighted the alumni-giving spirit store. They're also beginning a parent giving fund—Jill Johnson head of that. They noted that there were 83 delegates from other universities at the Inauguration. There is a new executive director of marketing, Kathleen Lawry. They mentioned the new CAS website development and that they wanted a report of the Boler campaign.

- Compton-Engle asked about new CAS website; Webinger said that they showed examples.

Property, Facilities, Technology: Brossmann reported that they were asking for ideas as part of a new master plan regarding the space on campus, as part of the strategic planning for the university; i.e. for Boler, library, etc. Nothing was being proposed as a plan—rather, these are calls for plans. When things like Sweet Melissa's go bankrupt, that's not good for the bottom line. They are making decisions about what properties to keep and sell. They're happy about the new Banner roll-out. While this is not the biggest thing to affect faculty, tech and space are big issues.

- Weinstein asked about the 1886 corporation; Brossmann noted that Pizzazz and other tenants are dissatisfied with the property manager, they're interviewing.

Finance: Weinstein reported that they talked about compensation; he noted that a previous president, Fr. Lavelle, once said that we should raise faculty salary to 50% of CUPA. He discussed how the faculty believe that they are being underpaid. Board members noted that including benefits maybe compensation would be at 50% CUPA.

- Kilbride asked whether they said anything about the compensation study; Weinstein said no. But a staff resource person said similar thing about staff compensation.

Weinstein also noted that they were looking at key performance indicators (e.g. headcounts) and they were planning tuition and fee increases for the next year.

- Webinger asked whether they said anything about the discount rate. Weinstein replied that it's too high, but not much was said.

Student Affairs: Chercourt reported that the residence hall occupancy is down, while counseling center visits are up. There was a presentation from Erik Butler, the new Title IX Coordinator, who said JCU has a lot of work to do but we're in good shape. Pat Mullane talked about the new professional development program in CAS. Wellness put out a survey about stress, anxiety, sleep—they'll tailor their services to results of survey.

- Gallo asked if there any indication about what the Title IX issues are? Chercourt replied no.

2. MS in Innovation & Entrepreneurship

Doan Winkel is proposing a new academic program; he included letters of support. With no discussion needed, Webinger moved to send the proposal to CAP; seconded by Compton-Engle and others. The motion was approved unanimously.

3. Faculty self-evaluation

Kilbride noted that revising the faculty self-evaluation has been in process since he had been chair of the compensation committee (2016). The next year, Mike Martin revised it, brought it to a meeting and recalled that he was shouted down, since it was a year without raises.

Compton-Engle and Hessinger noted that that the issue of revising the form had come up at the recent chairs meeting. Ultimately, the big question is how does it move forward?

At this point, the discussion branched in two directions, discussed simultaneously: what sort document should it be? and, under whose jurisdiction should revising it be? Kilbride remembered that some people wanted it to be an aspirational document. Webinger asked whether we use the same form across the university. Kilbride wanted to bring this up at a faculty meeting, but Brossmann asked what would be brought up? the previous rejected revision? or should it go back to the compensation committee for more work? Weinstein noted that, decades ago, he had served on a committee that thought about changing it, and it didn't really happen. Grenci suggested simplifying it. Tobey thought the question of "why are we even doing this if there are no raises" was still valid. Weinstein suggested that an aspirational document, on how you did the things that you wanted to do, would still be valuable, even without raises. Dyck noted that the science chairs had felt that it was important that the faculty to have a say about what we think needs to be valued. Nevertheless, Webinger pointed out that there isn't a policy about what happens when we hit a year with no raises but when you publish an article. Gallo suggested the policy ought to be averaged over a period of years; Webinger replied that in practice it now it rolls over three years, but Grenci noted that there is no policy in place that defines that. Compton-Engle mentioned that one suggestion that was that maybe we need to separate out the issue of raises; maybe this form is doing multiple things, that both reflecting and aiming for bonuses are two different things. Grenci stated that another issue is who is judging the balance between 40/40/20. Dyck noted that over the course of a career, this balance will ebb and flow. Sheil noted that right now service is incredibly important, so maybe that needs to be weighted more now. Sheil also noted that folks who are pretenure have to record this information twice.

Webinger moved to send the self-evaluation document to the Compensation committee for evaluation and recommendations for a new instrument/form. Brossmann seconded. 17 votes for/one vote against.

Finally, there was support for revisiting this next year to examine the process.

4. Travel procedures

Kilbride reported that Jennifer Rick followed up after the last general faculty meeting. HR will reach out to everyone who submitted a comment to correct misunderstandings. Rick asked Kilbride to stress that everything was at the discretion of supervisors, though he noted that he had heard that another faculty member who took a student to a conference had expenses denied. Comments will go to the senior leadership team (SLT) for review and maybe approval. SLT will make final decision. Grenci asked to address some misconceptions: first, about per diems: in Boler we've worked under the idea that per diems are not the norm; in my understanding, people receiving per diems should probably not have been doing that. The \$15/\$15/\$30 for meals is a suggestion. They're trying to prevent people from going to excess. Also, any Enterprise location will work. Compton-Engle stated that she felt like the outrage was a little misplaced, especially when we have so many part-time faculty who have none of these benefits. Setter noted that the university may get sweet deals, but what's the benefit to faculty members to jump through additional hoops? Grenci will ask them to commit to an annual review of it.

5. HR compensation study

HR sent out a request for proposals (RFP) to companies to partner in a compensation study. They would like a liaison from the compensation committee who will need to sign a non-disclosure agreement.

6. Faculty Handbook maintenance

The Board passed all the amendments from last year. We need to decide who is in charge of maintaining the website for the faculty handbook.

C. Committee Reports

1. Gender & Diversity

Tobey noted that a couple faculty members have come forward to address that faculty hired prior to 2013 have a grandfathered plan that doesn't include contraception coverage. In talking with HR, they favored everyone having the same health care plan. Brossmann pointed out that this went back to a handbook amendment vote because the health care benefit affects overall compensation. Weinstein asked why that would be a Gender and Diversity issue and suggested

that it should be a Compensation issue. Tobey made no objections.

With great haste, a motion was made and seconded by a variety of people simultaneously to send this issue to the Compensation committee. 13 votes for/2 opposed/3 abstained.

The meeting adjourned at 3:19