

General Faculty Meeting
November 28, 2018
Donahue Auditorium

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, Richard Greci, Gerald Guest, Brad Hull, Dan Kilbride (chair), Bo Liu, Mike Setter, Christopher Sheil, Kristen Tobey, Mark Waner, Mariah Webinger, Gerald Weinstein. Absent: Sokchea Lim, Elena Manilich, Zeki Saritoprak.

I. Announcements:

1. Minutes of October 17, 2018 meeting were approved by acclamation.
<http://faculty.jcu.edu/facultycouncil/files/2018/11/GFM-minutes-17-oct-18.pdf>

2. Kilbride announced that the HR changes to travel procedures had been approved by senior leadership and so are now in place. Some adjustments were made in response to faculty/staff comments: there is an annual review protocol; they increased mileage for personal vehicles; there was also an increase in meal amounts. It is still the case that faculty must use P-Cards whenever possible: all faculty must obtain and use P-Cards.

Question from faculty member: If I go to a meeting and spend an extra day, do I put that on my p-card? Various people at the meeting answered this question, pointing out that hotels will usually let you charge your own portion, or you can use the card and pay back the university.

3. Board committee meetings will be held next week. Representatives are looking for suggestions—email him with priorities that the board should hear.

4. The Annual Holiday Party, will be Thursday, December 13, 3:30 pm, in the Dolan atrium.

II. Items for discussion:

1. Faculty Handbook amendments.

Jeff Johansen, Chair of the Handbook Committee, introduced the amendments which are posted on Canvas under Discussions. They are all from Section 5 of the Handbook, which deals with amending/revising the Faculty Handbook.

- The first amendment is about the majority affirmative vote of faculty eligible to vote. This means that the affirmative votes must exceed the number of “no” votes,

abstentions, and non-voters. It is the most controversial of these amendments; it adds a quorum requirement from the previous proposal.

- The second amendment would allow faculty to keep their vote while on leave, because we can vote online now. Faculty on leave for up to two semesters are voting members.
- The third amendment deals with the problem of how proposals come to the Handbook committee late in the process and can't be changed once proposed by the committee. It allows for a review period for proposals of 30 days after which proposers can make changes and after which the proposal goes to the Handbook committee. Then there's another 30-day review and then a vote. This might lead to better proposals, that are better thought out and more complete.
- The fourth amendment allows for the electronic distribution of the Handbook.
- The fifth amendment makes the online version the official version of the Handbook.

The committee is introducing these in a different way—a frequent comment from survey was that people wanted more time to read over proposals. So, these are not formal proposals yet—you can comment on these and propose changes. We hope to have actual proposals next semester.

Question from a faculty member: did you discuss the possibility of a 2/3 majority? Why 60%? Answer: this was discussed last year—we chose 60% as a majority that was well above 50%. This still makes it a challenge to approve an amendment—we want it to be conservative. With the addition of a 60% quorum, that seems to be a strong majority of for votes.

Comment from a faculty member: #3 is one of the most significant amendments that you're making, because last year there were parts of amendments that were good, but we couldn't come to an agreement on the whole thing.

2. CAP: midterm grade proposal from UCEP

Catherine Sherman noted that right now, midterm grades are required to be given to first year students, transfer students, etc. But with Banner 9, midterm grades must be given to all students.

Comment from faculty member: I agree that all students should be given midterm grades. But I want to object to the idea that IT glitches should drive academic policy. We lost waitlists because of how Banner worked for a while. I think this policy is great; but it is unacceptable to make policy because the software doesn't work. Academics should drive IT not the other way around. (At this point, there was much nodding of agreement around the auditorium and much expression of frustration.)

Question from a faculty member: can we make another grade—no grade needed (grade x). Answer: you have to enter the grade as the course was constructed.

Question from a faculty member: what happened this semester? Answer: we were still on Banner 8 this semester.

Comment from a faculty member: in UCEP we spent a lot of time talking about the pedagogical utility of this. This is sort of a happy accident that we have to do this, to give students a useful tool to know their standing in the middle of the semester.

Question from a faculty member: does this affect the Early Warning? Answer: part of the proposal is disbanding the Early Warning system.

Question from a faculty member: I'm not confident that the grades that I have at midterm are accurate—could they be reported later? Answer: I worry that the later we push that, the harder it is for a student to turn their performance around.

Question from a faculty member: the only thing I like about early warning is that it gets sent to advisors, but midterm grades don't. Is there a way to get that flagged and sent out to advisors? Answer: it's under advisee grade summary.

Comment from a faculty member: the other nice thing about early warning is that it showed you attendance warnings.

Question from a faculty member: who gets to decide—is it a university policy that everyone must do or can an individual instructor decide? Answer: this applies to everyone.

3. Rank, Tenure, Promotion: University tenure/promotion committee -- Jeff Dyck.

Jeff Dyck stated that RTP was charged by Faculty Council to explore the development of a university committee on tenure and promotion. This would introduce a new layer in the tenure and promotion process. So far, they've had discussions with the deans, former provost (Santili), Handbook committee; they've collected data from peer schools; reading on best practices. Now they're developing a preliminary rationale and questions to prompt discussion. Next semester they'll bring it to the faculty for more discussion in department meetings.

Question from a faculty member: Are they hoping to have that ready for the spring?

Answer: That would be faster.

Question from a faculty member: what about people on tenure track. Answer: first this has to be amended by the handbook. Dean Farrar spoke up, adding that it's usually bad practice to change things mid-stream.

Question from a faculty member: why add this? Again, Dean Farrar addressed the question, noting that the system we have is utterly unique and not in a good way. When people come for APRs, external evaluators ask about how tenure and promotion work here, and their jaws drop.

4. Academic advising program review

Maryclaire Moroney stated that many faculty participated in the Advising APR. They invited us to consider our office's work and institutional ideas about advising and student support. The report will be posted on the Institutional Effectiveness website. The reviewers praised us for our commitment to undergraduates. They also noted some concerns that we've noticed—there are inequities in faculty workload in advising: e.g. heavy loads in STEM, lighter loads elsewhere. Some recommendations in the report include:

- consider a pre-major advising model—either make it credit bearing or eliminate it.
- recognize and assess advising so it's an acknowledged part of our workload that fits into our jobs in a meaningful way
- make pre-major advising/expectations consistent across schools (not different between Boler and CAS)
- possibility of shortening pre-major status to one, rather than two years.

- consider adding professional staff advisors for 1st year students across the university, to be consistent and to help faculty workload. Here, we'd want to continue to imagine how faculty continue to mentor.

The recommendations largely echo faculty recommendations last year, i.e. non-discipline specific/basic liberal arts advising. None of this is shocking, but it takes budget and consideration and decision-making to get us to move along. She noted that USPG is putting together a budget for next year; we'd like to hope that advising for 1st or 2nd years be put into the budget. Or incentives for advising. Although we need time to discuss this, it should not take decades to make a decision about it.

Question from a faculty member: primary role advisors—would that be for pre-major students? would this help or hinder depts with large numbers of majors?

Question from a faculty member: the people who made these recommendations, do they have any evidence that professional advisors help in retention? Answer: they can do outreach for students (earlier interventions). The big benefits are consistent and accurate information; this is all those people are doing. it doesn't mean that faculty aren't mentoring.

Comment from a faculty member: the early declaration thing sounds like something you'd like to do as a both-and: students declare earlier and there's a professional advising staff.

Question from a faculty member: what happens now with cohort advising? Answer: more conversations with provost and deans and more conversations about what we do with the money. Now, we need to advocate strongly to get this into the budget.

Comment from a faculty member: Boler is really happy with the way that their prof advising is working. Other comments from faculty members: in Boler it's not that Laurel Schneck does all the advising, she just does the enrollment for first two years and logistical stuff; but when students have questions about classes, they still come to us.

Some of us in Boler have noticed that students are also learning how to read the bulletin and they know the classes they need to take in a way they didn't before.

Dean Farrar spoke up again, noting that she was happy to talk about professional advising, but this would mean a trade off in faculty resources going somewhere they wouldn't go otherwise. Is the reduction in work or redistribution of work a thing will that offset the hiring of one or two professional advisors? This is about choices. This means adding more administrators.

Comment from a faculty member: we need to find ways to help students think about the core—there's still some bad advice going to students about Core.

5. AVP search update

Brossmann noted that the committee met with the search firm and there is a slate of semi-finalists, with airport interviews scheduled in December. Finalists will be on campus in January. If you have questions talk to the committee members: Emily Butler, Brent Brossmann, Christopher Sheil, and Bill Elliott. If there are questions the search committee should ask, tell them. They signed non-disclosure forms so can't say much but faculty can tell them to say things.

The meeting adjourned at 3:08.