

Faculty Council Meeting,  
December 5, 2018  
SB 107

Minutes

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

Quorum at 2:01.

1. Minutes of last meeting were approved by acclamation, pending a minor change.

2. Kilbride noted that Jim Burke had been delayed but would be coming to the meeting to talk about a number of issues.

- Paperless proposal. Brossmann noted that this was probably not a good plan economically, but there's a strong desire to use tech more effectively, if not to get rid of paper entirely.
- Canvas committee. Burke wants a committee dominated by faculty to investigate keeping Canvas or finding a new vendor. Our license is up in the summer.
- Potential for the demise of scantron scoring. Setter noted that scantron costs a lot of money; they're looking at 2 different companies that use the departmental scanner to grade tests, instead of walking forms over to Rodman.
- Required Phishing training—they'll be doing regular "phishing trips." They did a preliminary round and found that 30% of employees opened the scam email and provided info (i.e. "were caught").
- Need for faculty in future classroom tech discussions and creation of a committee. Brossmann noted that we have a wide variety of needs for tech in classrooms and in offices—do we need to include as much tech in every classroom? Can we create rooms that are high, mid and low tech and get faculty into those rooms that they're comfortable in. (And will the registrar be comfortable with that?). If we have faculty who only want chalkboards, there should be some with only chalkboards. Webinger suggested that rooms that are set up for discussion rather than podium-lecture would be good.

Saritoprak asked about online vs printed syllabi and whether there would be an official policy on that. Brossmann noted that it is mostly online and available as printable word docs. Also, boilerplate language could be a separate side link on every Canvas page. Students become fearful when they see a 14-page syllabus.

3. Review of faculty council constitution.

Kilbride noted that this job has been on our plate for over a year, so his plan was to cut the AVP out of the process. He noted that the academic subcommittee of the Board wanted this project to get this done. He listed the following issues as the primary concerns of the review:

- a. Legal compliance—he noted that he was not sure how many issues are here, but he will talk with Colleen Trembl to have her highlight potential problems.
- b. Size of council, faculty divisions: overall, the faculty is 12% smaller now than we were; Discussions here should include whether Council should be proportionally smaller as well or if we have four divisions rather than five.
- c. Committee charges: he noted that he wasn't sure whether this has been looked at since 2006, but, for example, he wondered whether tech was in the right place, since it's currently under CAP.
- d. Stipends: he noted that the chair of CAP is always going to be busy. But the workloads of other committee chairs vary, e.g. compensation; and sometimes it's hard to see who's going to have more work.
- e. Elections, voting, empty seats: finally, he noted that we need to figure out what to do with all the empty seats—one option is to consider allowing at-large elections if some divisions don't fill. Weinstein thought that reducing the overall number of seats is a good idea and suggested allowing the chair to appoint people to open spots. Webinger noted that a lot of work had already been done on the divisions already. Gallo suggested reconsidering the size of committees itself; e.g. should the elections committee even exist, or should it just be one person. Webinger noted that a lot of committees said similar things, although other committees wanted more members. Kilbride concluded by noting the urgency of completing the review.

#### 4. CAP report.

Christopher Sheil reported on the work of CAP so far. The Midterm grades policy was discussed at last general faculty meeting.

Incomplete grade policy: Sheil stated that CAP recommends that that this is ready to go to be considered by the general faculty. His understanding was that this went through open hearings in last spring and then came back to Council. CAP discussed it further, sent it to UCEP, they sent it back, and now they're bringing it back to Council. The new policy gives incompletes a firmer timeline. It's still up to the faculty member to decide whether the incomplete is allowed, but the student has to file a petition, for a reason like incapacitating illness, accident, death. Incompletes can only be used for students who have a passing grade up to a certain point in the semester and past the withdrawal deadline. Then, there is a 30-day window after the end of finals to complete the work; if there's an extenuating circumstance that requires work longer than that it can be dealt with. Brossmann asked what the data was on students who don't finish incompletes; Sheil said it was significant. Brossmann noted that it seems like very few students would be going to meet these parameters. Weinstein asked whether he would be prohibited from giving an incomplete to a student who doesn't fit in these. e.g. for a fall semester class that has a January trip. Sheil noted that there was another policy coming from UCEP that deals with classes with extended deadlines; but for classes that have work 2 weeks before or after a class,

they may need to figure out other things. Canda noted that this would affect Honors projects. Kilbride pointed out a tension: that they say that faculty have discretion, but there are limits on the things that faculty can do. He also wondered whether students have to submit documentation? Sheil noted they said it's up to the faculty member to decide if documentation is needed. Weinstein wondered if this was a solution without a problem—i.e. what's the reason for this? Sheil said that it can be a problem if a student carries incompletes into the next semester. Liu noted that in her time chairing CAP, they had found instances where instructors had given incompletes without the student knowing about it. Kilbride predicted there will be opposition if this goes to the general faculty since he was not sure that this grants us the ability to help students who drop the ball. Sheil opined that it doesn't seem right to let a student complete the requirements for a class that they haven't done the work for. Compton-Engle noted that it puts a burden on the instructor, and sometimes instructors aren't here again the next semester. Setter concurred, asking what about if a student gets an I and the professor becomes incapacitated. Brossmann predicted that the result of this is that there will be more withdrawals or more Fs. Waner added that this means less retention. Sheil noted that another UCEP policy on experiential education proposal may address the study abroad policy. Webinger thought that if that's the case, that one should be passed first. Sheil noted that they want to pass the incomplete grade policy to go into effect F19. Waner thought that it is the student's responsibility to know what their status is, and they should know that if they get an incomplete it might lead to a loss of financial aid; noting that some of this goes back to advising. Kilbride concluded that it would be good to work with Catherine Sherman to get the sequence of policies right.

Sheil also noted that other UCEP proposals have come to CAP that CAP hasn't brought to FC yet, including ones on the experiential learning and making academic sanctions to be more in-line with academic standards. Waner moved/Webinger seconded that those policies be considered by CAP. The motion passed unanimously.

5. By this point Jim Burke had arrived, and the floor was turned over to him. He noted that he had read the minutes from the last meeting and thought the comments were fair—the Paperless Campus proposal wasn't the highest priority item for him. He and Shannon Volpe (the new user services desk staff member) met with Desmond Kwan and Paul Challen before meeting with a large group to understand the core proposal. 800 students times 500 devices = \$400k; whereas total cost for printing (all paper printed) = \$67,000, so the proposal wouldn't save much money. It's unreasonable to add that into an aid package. However, everyone who comes here already has a device, so the question becomes how we get them to use those. He thought there would be a more educational proposal on how to use less paper. But as is, this proposal is unlikely to be cost effective. He apologized for not getting to it earlier. Kilbride asked whether all students come to college with a device; Burke replies basically, yes—and he would much rather put a dozen laptops on reserve for students who have broken devices. Webinger said this would be great, but this doesn't really happen in practice. In practice, device rental can be confusing, sometimes through the library and sometimes through IT. Another problem is that Chrome doesn't support the lockdown browser. Burke reiterated that in his opinion, making tech available to students who need it is more important than giving everyone

a device. The main part of the proposal is that students have tech available to them. His vision is to be in a position where IT isn't in charge of anyone's devices, but where the core things stream to people's own devices. This won't happen today, since streaming doesn't work that well yet, but maybe five years from now.

Burke continued by addressing the changes to scantrons: it's an old, expensive technology. The new way of administering them is to print your own test, use pens or pencils. Pilot this year in some classes. Dyck noted they've been doing this in their department already; others use a grading system on iPads.

Burke then discussed Canvas, noting that JCU got great pricing when we went into it. But everyone loves Canvas now, so we don't have much leverage to negotiate a good price. We should look around to see if there's a better product. Setter observed that the school's use of Canvas is tied to the scantron issue, since one company that we're looking at only uses Canvas. Weinstein asked about porting classes to a new LMS. Brossmann noted differences between LMS from the last time they evaluated LMSs; e.g. D2L allowed for more flexibility on the design for classes, rather than creating a similar layout for all classes. Burke asked faculty to join the committee he will be forming, promising that it wouldn't be too labor intensive—about 5 meetings in February and early March. Kilbride asked how many people do you want? Burke stated that last time there were 20.

Next, Burke announced that there will be mandatory phishing training in January. It will be short and hopefully interesting. He noted that one faculty member gave away their Banner creds within minutes in the recent phishing trip. Waner asked about the frequency of this. Burke noted that the Board subcommittee asked if it would happen multiple times a year. They'll be doing friendly phishing where, when people click through on fake sites, they're sent to education pages.

Finally, Burke addressed classroom technology: there's \$3million deferred maintenance on classroom tech. But this is where we do our business, so it's important. IT is pushing to give everyone laptops, solstice pods will let you connect from your laptop. He suggested there might be five different classroom types, but more conversation about that is needed. Weinstein asked whether there will be training on classroom tech? Burke said hopefully, yes.

#### 6. Diversity/inclusiveness statement.

Kilbride said that in the board committee meeting he attended, they commended Staff Council for their statement. Kilbride then presented a statement for faculty which he had written and which the Gender and Diversity committee revised that he wanted to send out. Compton-Engle noted that she fully supported the spirit of the statement but was concerned about the wording of the last paragraph. Some word-smithing ensued. In the interest of time, Webinger suggested that Kilbride make the changes and send out the statement to faculty himself, not as Faculty Council.

The meeting adjourned at 3:22pm.