

General faculty meeting
October 17, 2018
2 pm, LSC Conference Room

Minutes

Faculty Council members in attendance: Brent Brossmann, Angie Canda, Mina Chercourt, Gwen Compton-Engle, Greg DiLisi, Jeff Dyck, Kris Ehrhardt, Marcus Gallo, Richard Grenci, Gerald Guest, Dan Kilbride, Sokchea Lim, Mike Setter, Christopher Sheil, Kristen Tobey, Mark Waner, Mariah Webinger, Gerald Weinstein. Absent: Brad Hull, Bo Liu, Elena Manilich.

Quorum at 2:07pm

Chair's announcements

1. The minutes from the September meeting were approved by acclamation:

<http://faculty.jcu.edu/facultycouncil/files/2018/10/minutes-GFM-9-26-18.pdf>

2. Important dates:

- a. October 24: Community forum on university finances in Dolan at 2pm
- b. Nov. 7: Faculty Council meeting.

3. Compensation committee has been charged with looking at the full-time, faculty self-evaluation instrument. They've been charged with this for at least the past 5 years. This came up at the last FC meeting—they'll look at what Mike Martin's committee came up with a couple years ago and try to come up with a more forward-looking instrument. Weinstein noted that Dean Farrar had brought this up in a CAS Chairs meeting. Hessinger noted that her suggestions included: no self-evals before tenure, and self-evals every 3-5 years post-tenure; with the intention that people make a more reflective report. But she was not interested in writing it. Kilbride noted that the usual objection is that self-evals don't make sense if we're not getting raises, but usually at this time of the year, we don't know yet whether there will be raises. He also noted that when he served as the compensation chair, they looked at what other institutions used and found that everyone hates what they have. He reiterated that every 3-5 years and not before tenure are big, good ideas.

4. Jennifer Rick called to talk about what had happened at the last meeting. HR is inaugurating a compensation study, and they're looking to find a firm to do that. Jerry Weinstein will be helping with that.

New business

1. Travel policies from HR: is this a handbook issue?

Kilbride noticed that someone mentioned that this amounts to a reduction in benefits and thus could be a handbook issue. Rick said the next steps were, 1) if you used the feedback form, they will respond; 2) the next step is that they will revise the policy and then send it to the senior leadership team (SLT).

Kilbride asked whether or not this is a Handbook issue. Does the faculty need to claim jurisdiction? A good deal of debate followed (details below), but ultimately led to the conclusion that the proposed policies did not rise to the level of a Handbook issue.

Issues raised during floor discussion:

- Comment from a faculty member: Is this actually a reduction in benefits? the HB seems to guarantee that we can travel for university business and the u will cover that.
- Comment from a faculty member: I don't think this is an HB issue: this is a matter of reimbursement, not benefits. We need to decide what hills we want to die on, and this is not one. We already submit budgets. (this point was reiterated multiple times)
- Comment from a faculty member: Not all faculty have a p-card. It really surprised me was that they assumed everyone had p-cards—there are a lot of people who don't have p-cards. HR should make depts know that this is the case
- Comment from a faculty member: If it does become a HB issue, it is set up to die—we can barely get basic HB amendments to pass. I'd be very careful about making this a HB issue.
- Comment from a faculty member: I want to say that I also work for another non-profit, and everything they're proposing is exactly the same as the other entity.
- Comment from a faculty member: What frustrated me was that the Dean's office has come up with travel policies, and now this is a whole different level of policy. I'd like to see them work together to make that work.
- Comment from a faculty member: My take away was that your chair or dean had final say. In my department we've been working under this for a while.
- Comment from a faculty member: It's not meant to trump what you've already been approved for, it's meant to keep things under a reasonable set of guidelines.
- Comment from a faculty member: If we already have limits, what are we projected to save under these new guidelines?
- Comment from a faculty member: It's not just faculty, there are a lot of depts who travel. this just sets some norms so if someone does something egregious, like buy a first class plane ticket, they can say, wait.
- Comment from a faculty member: I would say we already have norms—this is a lot of micro-management [this was noted repeatedly]. I think it's a way to pass the cost onto employees. There are no standards and nothing that says that they'll look at those numbers again. The policy runs on exceptions. It should be set to standards that go up automatically.
- Comment from a faculty member: My annoyance is that we had very little notice or comment time and that there hasn't been a cost-benefit analysis.
- Comment from a faculty member: There are clearly some small issues—i.e. the issue that it gets reviewed regularly is important—but they seem easily fixed.

- Comment from a faculty member: We get a lot of HR policies to review. And after the review period expires, we rarely ever hear anything again. I think that when there are policies that generate a lot of discussion, like this one—I think that we should get to see it again before it goes to the SLT.
- Comment from a faculty member: Do we know what Staff Council thinks about this policy?
- Comment from a faculty member: Do we know why this is a concern? I didn't ask what the root of the policy was. But she said that this sort of policy is the expectation at all institutions like ours, and that it would save money down the line.
- Comment from a faculty member: So this applies to the SLT too when they travel?
- I think this is a good example of shared governance. I think we should ask HR to see the revision before it goes to the SLT. It was agreed that this was the good next step and Kilbride agreed to do it.

2. Presidential address: the faculty and the 2020-25 strategic plan (note: pp. 6, 12 especially important: https://canvas.jcu.edu/courses/4458/files/1074757?module_item_id=415758)

Kilbride noted that he wanted to start a discussion about how the faculty wants to insist on a central place in the next Strategic Plan. The president seems to think of the next plan is an operational plan and I want to make sure that faculty have a significant place at the table.

- Comment from a faculty member: the president's talk looked trends and that there needed to be a broader discussion of long term vs short year trends. If we make long term decisions on short term trends, we are in for a big mistake.
- Comment from a faculty member: trends are based in the past, but we also need to look to the future. What's this situation in Ohio? We can't only look at trends.
- Comment from a faculty member: I think we know that we're struggling with IMC—the new website is a year away; the new branding is 2 years. I'm worried that if we're not getting the word out there, are we getting a return on our current investments? We could be doing better by doing a better job of selling ourselves—esp beyond NEO. it's important to have a good public face.
- Comment from a faculty member: to me the bottom line is what to we want to be? who are we? and yes, this needs to be informed by the past and the future, but what is that? I can say what I'm doing, but as a collective, we're not doing that. And if we don't sit down and do this, it's going to be done for us. The president has made it clear that he's going to do this as strategy-based. Right now we don't have a body that makes a vision.
- Comment from a faculty member: Whatever we do about a vision, we know that we have some strengths (STEM, business). What troubled me was when he looked numbers, he then said they would inform but not drive the decisions. As long as we're at the table, advocating as we need to, we can make sure that assumptions aren't made without scrutiny.

- Comment from a faculty member: I feel like we're in a wait-and-see situation. We can't do anything until.. provost... IMC gets its act together... advancement. I feel like we can't figure things out because we're always waiting.
- Comment from a faculty member: I am loathe to create more committees. but my experience with USPG is that we have 4 big committees, but things like figuring out a vision is that those big ideas don't come up through the big 4. If we want to be taken seriously, we need be able craft a vision for ourselves. We need to say as a body "here are some things we think as a body." It's not enough to just have people at the table on USPG.
- Comment from a faculty member: On the provost search committee—we're not looking for a person who has a vision for us, we need to have a vision for ourselves.
- Comment from a faculty member: Department chairs have been talking about the CAS strategic plan and there's been some awkwardness about how that dovetails with the next university strategic plan.
- Kilbride asked whether the Council as a body needs to take this up for discussion? Maybe an ad hoc committee? Maybe with how the chairs are working with the deans. Even when we have someone in the room, the person is probably only at the table is **me**. Brossmann noted that, as a faculty rep on a board committee, he does his best to represent the faculty, but sometimes things come up and we've never talked about it as a whole. It's also important to figure out how to communicate what happens on committees back out to the whole body. For example, we have a group that talks with the provost each month, but the content would be better if we knew what to talk about.

3. LGBT issues re: Carroll News editorial. <https://medium.com/the-carroll-news/drag-queens-and-jesuits-aa961ad9652a>

Kilbride opened discussion by asking what, if anything, should the faculty's position be on this? The discussion

- Comment from a faculty member: I don't think is something that FC should be involved in—this should just go through the Carroll News.
- Comment from a faculty member: CSDI is having an open hearing on Monday
- Comment from a faculty member: I think we do need to have a response, ideally from the president. I think this is becoming an issue because it is giving JCU a bad name. I think there needs to be a response from FC and the humanities.
- Comment from a faculty member: I think as much as possible as faculty, we need to talk about with our students. Staying silent means that we support these words that are hateful and can hurt people's lives.
- Comment from a faculty member: Some of his other articles are even more inflammatory. I've had some students who come by who are initiation conversations about it.
- Comment from a faculty member: Regarding the president's office's role—he explicitly calls out the president.

- Comment from a faculty member: We believe in having a public sphere, and other voices need to speak out, to drown out and not to censor. and obvs the president should have weight.
- Comment from a faculty member: The silence from admin is deafening.
- Comment from a faculty member: These things do go well beyond campus. Anything on campus that becomes controversial should be addressed.
- Comment from a faculty member: The president did say at his address that he was going to write a response.

At this point the following proposal was made by Jim Lissemore and seconded by Brossmann: the faculty strongly urge the president to respond ASAP to the recent controversy about the op-ed pieces published in the Carroll News. The faculty wishes to emphasize our principles and core values as an institution about inclusion and diversity.

41 votes for; 2 abstentions.

After the vote, the discussion continued:

- Comment from a faculty member: encourage him to talk about the catholic intellectual tradition.
- Comment from a faculty member: the important thing is that he gets it done NOW.
- Comment from a faculty member: There is a student circulating a letter asking for faculty support. Another faculty member noted that they had heard about this letter, but staff are scared to sign it.
- Comment from a faculty member: This is a student, and students come from all different areas. He did it through the op-ed. I don't think that his voice sounds like he's trying to enter into dialogue, but his act is.
- Comment from a faculty member: Our job is to make clearly where we stand as a community. This is narcissism.
- Comment from a faculty member: This is a student, but it has moved beyond campus.

The meeting adjourned at 3:19