Faculty Council Meeting
November 7, 2018
SB 107

Minutes

Faculty Council members present: Brent Brossmann (vice-chair), Angie Canda, Gwen Compton-Engle, Gregory DiLisi, Jeff Dyck, Kristen Ehrhardt (secretary), Marcus Gallo, Richard Grenci, Gerald Guest, Brad Hull, Dan Kilbride (chair), Sokchea Lim, Bo Liu, Elena Manilich, Zeki Saritoprak, Mike Setter, Christopher Sheil, Kristen Tobey, Mark Waner, Mariah Webinger, Gerald Weinstein. Absent: Mina Chercourt.

A quorum was reached at 2:03pm and the meeting began.

I. Announcements:

1. The minutes from Oct. 3 2018 meeting were approved by acclamation
http://faculty.jcu.edu/facultycouncil/files/2018/11/Faculty-Council-minutes-3-October-18.pdf

2. Kilbride introduced three new FC members from the previous election: Angie Canda; Zeki Saritoprak; Mark Waner.

3. Updates on the Paperless Campus proposal:
Kilbride noted that after FC discussion earlier in the semester, we gave this to Jim Burke to discuss basic costs/benefits. So far, not much action has been taken on that, although Burke has indicated that he didn't think it was going to work. The proposal would be a voluntary thing. I don't think much is happening and I don't think much is going to happen. He asked whether we need to do anything else?

Setter noted that if it has the potential if it's going to save money, and might make our students more marketable, it might be worth looking at. Webinger said that she sent him an email and said she'd be willing to work with that, and he hasn't replied since an initial note. Brossmann stated that it's clearly not something Burke wants to do, but we need to have ITS and their support to do it. Kilbride suggested that we could put this on the agenda for the next faculty meeting since he goes to those meetings; perhaps if there's a lot of support for it, maybe he'd hear that and start moving on it. Waner suggested that the sustainability group might be interested in picking it up. Gallo suggested that Hareza might be interested

in crunching the numbers, if this actually would save us money. Sheil noted that the sustainability group does a whole carbon footprint calculation on campus. Tobey noted that sending it to the next step, e.g. asking sustainability to do a study, is putting a level of approval on this proposal that I'm not ready to approve. Brossmann noted that he could bring it up at the Board, since he's the representative on the IT Board committee, since we are using a lot of paper (3 million sheets). Grencu asked whether we could ask him to find other schools who have done this and see what it cost them? Weinstein pointed out that a basic calculation of 3 million sheets of paper would not equal a lot of iPads. He added further that don't know if anyone has done any huge analysis, but that he thought that we're already saving a lot of paper on campus and there are still a lot of unanswered questions about the plan; e.g. are iPads better for the environment? Sheil noted that it's not just paper but also printers, which aren't cheap. Compton-Engle asked whether there are there guidelines about how programs/faculty should be reducing their paper use; i.e. without going full-iPad, could the sustainability committee draw up a list of recommendations. Setter noted that he could talk to the chair of that committee.

4. Updates on Travel policies:
Kilbride reported that Jennifer Rick sent the policies to the Senior Leadership Team and they'll make the final decision. Updates include an annual review process; revisions to mileage on personal vehicles; changes to enterprise. $20 more for lunch. HR committee was inflexible on the necessity of P-card use: "the P-card is the required method of payment…" HR should probably have a sit down with department chairs. Setter noted that there's clearly some confusion, but they want them to have a P-card. Though this is something for the business office to do more than HR. Brossmann added that he had even been told to get P-cards for trusted students on the debate team. Kilbride asked whether requests for P-cards had to go through the chair; various people answered—yes. Kilbride concluded discussion on this topic by noting that he was glad to see that they made some revisions and explained why they held the line when they did. And he asked Krukones to tell him when/if SLT approves it.

II. Issues for discussion

1.December board meetings -- asking faculty for their priorities
Kilbride noted that in past we have not had the board reps ask for input for what we say to the board. I was thinking of sending out an email asking for input. Setter suggested that instead of just an email, why not a canvas discussion board? Brossmann noted that not every board member is on every committee, so when there are things that everyone needs to hear about, it's possible that many of the reps will need to tell general things at our

separate meetings. Dyck noted that previous chairs used to present their address to the Board before or after the meeting. Webinger noted that the board asked me about faculty morale and I side-stepped the issue—I'd like to know how to reply to that. Kilbride said that he told the committee (in Sept) that faculty were cautiously optimistic; that we were interested in the AVP search and that morale continues to be a problem because compensation issues; he didn't know why the board is so interested in that question. Weinstein said that he thought that faculty morale had been an issue for 30 years; he's been told that we are the crankiest Jesuit school. Grenci suggested it was perhaps becuse HLC dinged us on morale in the past.

2. Faculty participation in 2020-25 strategic plan
Kilbride said that they thought about putting the people on the committee (Dan Kilbride, Barb D'Ambrosia, Cici Brennan) in front of everyone to take suggestions, wondered whether they should also include Hessinger and Kugler, since they're technically deans? will they prioritize for the faculty? Brossmann stated that he thought it is important for your group (3 or 5) to sit with the faculty as a whole just to talk and to hear the views.

3. Update on Social Innovation Fellows Program
Kilbride noted that the big questions about this for FC were whether it needed CAP review and was it a new academic program? People said it was like Arrupe, and Arrupe didn't need faculty review… Except that, digging through the old Faculty Forum archives, Arrupe DID go through the faculty review process. But, the train has left the station, and when he looked at the proposal, he didn't think it needed to go through CAP. One difference between the two is that Arrupe had new courses associated with it; while the new program is through the Entrepreneurship minor and that's already been approved.

Brossmann said that we should figure out what we need to have to require it to go through the CAP process. If we had a set of standards, we wouldn't have needed to compare it to Arrupe. Kilbride noted that there is a set of criteria, but there's a random "et cetera" and it was unclear what that means. Canda noted that she had run into similar questions when she took over Honors and changed things and there wasn't a clear path that showed her how to do that. Grenci noted that the same question arises with 3-2 programs. It's doubtful that they went through CAP, but were engineered and ushered through the process. Sheil noted that there was an idea to have a review process for programs like that last year. Brossmann stated that we can't rely on the institutional memory of individuals. Canda suggested that it should start in the Provost's office, because there are all sorts of programs that are intercollegial and don't just report to one dean or another. Kilbride pointed out that the only reason we know about this is that one dean told us about it. But this could also

be a reason that we don't get told about it. He wondered further whether it went through UCEP? Krukones said no. Krukones continued that about Arrupe, Finucane said it didn't go through CAP, but it did go through some sort of review process. But to make matters worse, the Leadership minor went through review (but that was a minor). Sheil noted that when CAP looked at it, the committee really thought that this was just a scholarship decision. Brossmann noted that his concern is what happens when we get other things and don't have a set of criteria. Setter asked how do we resolve this? Kilbride said that we need to make sure that we are informed of new programs, and I guess we're at the mercy of the deans, and in this case, Miciak did tell us. Brossmann thought that CAP should take a look at the criteria and Krukones added that he was happy to cooperate and encouraged a more precise definition of "et cetera". Grenci asked whether there was any set of procedures where a department and school need to vote on a new program. Kilbride said no, it goes to CAP then to a vote of the faculty and on up. Shiel noted that to increase awareness of the process, we should have a dedicated CAP folder in the fac-sensitive Canvas site that shows what's in process and where it is in the process.

4. Faculty Council constitution review: where is this going?
Kilbride said that Krukones had asked where they were, that Webinger had shared the drive, and that's as much as has happened. He thought it's going to be important to shrink some committees and look at the divisional structure. Webinger noted that they divvied it up but haven't gotten back together; but there's no chair, and we're down two members. Kilbride will join committee to try to get something happening with it.

5. Faculty handbook committee survey on voting & elections
Brossmann reported that they'll be sending the results of the survey to the Elections committee. Most of the information was about why people do or do not vote at all, not about handbook elections specifically. It had 49 responses. They will not be going around to different departments to collect input. Some sort of proposal will be coming out to change the handbook voting procedures. They may still visit departments to GOTV. Anyone eligible to vote who doesn't vote is voting no. Dyck asked when they'll have a proposal; Brossmann said this year.

III. Committee reports

1. Gender & Diversity: Tobey reported that they are in process of drafting a response to the Carroll News issue. Any feedback on faculty response should be sent to her.

2. CAP: Sheil reported that the proposals that CAP, which meets every other Wednesday, is considering/has considered this semester include: a new MS in Entrepreneurship in Boler; cohort advising is on hold; a review of new proposal protocol (and how often should that be reviewed); social innovation fellows is taken care of; and the proposal for 4-day finals schedule—after last meeting with registrar, our conversation convinced them that a 4 day schedule is not ideal. So they're sticking with 5 days of finals, though he was not sure what they're doing with standard times for exams. More issues: UCEP incomplete grades and midterm grading—CAP voted to move them forward, and to have them be sent back to FC for the next step of consideration. Finally, they're also dealing with constraints with Banner 9, that either all students get midterm grades or no students get them—this is across ALL courses. Weinstein suggested that these grades were used in the past for parents. Sheil noted that we do report early alert grades to catch students and that students like to know where they're at with their grades. He thought that we do have an obligation to let our students to know their grades at midterm. Grenci thought that the early alert is too early while the goal with midterm grades is to be proactive. Is UCEP asking us to approve it, or is this a thing they are going to do? Kilbride said that if we send this to a faculty meeting we could have Catherine Sherman introduce it. Dyck moves to send to next faculty meeting for discussion, but no open hearings, Webinger seconds. Motion passed by acclamation. It was also noted that this may be an issue of open communication rather than requiring a vote.

The meeting adjourned at 3:21pm.