

General Faculty Meeting
2 pm, January 23, 2019
Dolan Auditorium

Faculty Council members in attendance: Brent Brossmann (Vice Chair), Angie Canda, Mina Chercourt, Gwen Compton-Engle, Greg DiLisi, Jeff Dyck, Kris Ehrhardt (Secretary), Richard Greci, Gerald Guest, Brad Hull, Dan Kilbride (Chair), Sokchea Lim, Bo Liu, Zeki Saritoprak, Mike Setter, Christopher Sheil, Colin Swearingen, Mark Waner, Mariah Webinger, Gerald Weinstein. Absent: Elena Manilich.

A quorum was reached at 2:01pm and the meeting began.

1. Minutes of the December 2018 General Faculty Meeting were approved by acclamation.

2. Kilbride noted that a review of the Faculty Council constitution is underway. They are reviewing the make-up of divisions--how many and how big—and the charges of FC committees. He urged anyone who wants to be part of the review to let him know.

3. Kilbride urged broad faculty participation in the AVP/Provost search for a. He noted that the larger group meeting for the second candidate is today at 3:30. Emily Butler asked that faculty submit the surveys for the candidates, available on the same page as the candidates' CVS (internal access only).

4. Kilbride announced that a number of UCEP proposals--on midterm grades, incomplete grades, experiential learning, registration and grading were posted on Canvas to solicit feedback. Two are for substantive changes—incompletes and experiential courses. The proposal on experiential learning answers some questions that have been raised by the proposed incomplete policy. FC will take that up next month.

6. IT issues: cybersecurity, Canvas

Jim Burke addressed the audience via Skype. He began by noting that ten faculty members have contacted him about serving on the committee to assess LMS options. He encouraged people dubious about Canvas to join the committee too.

Next, he noted that there will be an announcement in the next 24 hours that cybersecurity training will be required by everyone who works on campus. In December there was a really obvious phishing attempt and a faculty member managed to give them all their Banner info and a hacker was able to get into everything, even their payroll/banking information. It was fixed in 50 minutes, but it could have been much worse—and has been worse at other schools. Training begins on Monday, as a half-hour, interactive video. Everyone will have six weeks to complete it. They will also require every employee to have two-factor ID turned on in your Google

account. He noted that it's a small inconvenience but is much more secure. Another issue is people forwarding email from JCU email to other emails; with the breach that happened last month, they were able to trace everything because it was internal.

He ended by noting that he didn't want the changes to come as a surprise. He proceeded to take questions from the faculty.

- Question/observation from a faculty member: I've noticed that the way that Banner works on Chrome on a Mac seems insecure when you hit the backspace and I wanted to call that to your attention. Burke stated that they will take a look at that.
- Question from a faculty member: Regarding the dual factor ID: earlier this month I was out of state and I got asked to provide this—is it automatically on already? Burke: noted that you can turn it on yourself.
- Question from a faculty member: If they shut down our account, what do we do? Burke: if you haven't put it on already by next week, (2/11), we will prompt you to do. If you're locked out the help desk can help you.

5. HLC site visit—Second week of February: all day 2/11, morning of 2/12

Todd Bruce noted that they submitted the assurance argument and that there will be a community meeting next week Wednesday with full information about the visit. Today is faculty-only.

He mentioned that documents were on the JCU Faculty and Staff google team drive—the intro to HLC, text of Assurance Argument (with non-working links) and outline and handout (summary); a federal compliance form and supplements. Once the visit schedule is set it'll be there too. He noted that the visitors are coming to make sure that we're doing what we're supposed to be doing. They have a lot to do and not a lot of time to do it. They will decide whom they need to meet with once they read the report. The visit is subject to change—they might need to look at other things once they get here; there will be three open sessions and the team Chair will meet with the president at beginning and end of first day.

Bruce noted that Criteria 3 and 4 are especially relevant to faculty. The main take away is that the university is a substantially different place than in 2014. He offered some general advice: they're not looking for perfection, just that we're in compliance with their expectations. The visit can have serious consequences. Think about the progress we've made since 2014, especially when you need to be negative. Acknowledge your own point of view, don't claim universals, and don't monopolize the time. The visit is not a time for modesty—if we are doing a good thing, say it. It's also not a time to grind axes: it is not the case that if you tell them all our problems that they will solve it. If they catch you lying it could have terrible repercussions.

Bruce discussed Criterion 3, which ensures that degree programs are appropriate to higher education, i.e. that they're current, they have learning goals, they are consistent across sections. They'll look at College Credit Plus—other schools have a problem with this because they hire outsiders to teach the classes, but that's not a thing here. We'll need to talk about the

core, its key skills, and learning goals. We'll need to talk about faculty and staff—do we have enough faculty? Are they qualified? Are they evaluated? Do they have professional development? Office hours? One issue is that the Center for Teaching and Learning is on hiatus—but that doesn't mean that there isn't still support for faculty. One thing that's coming up in the next Strategic Plan is how to re-envision the CTL. This criterion also covers student support services and co-curricular programs (i.e. experiential learning, high-impact pedagogy, national recognition).

Bruce continued by discussing Criterion 4—Quality. He noted that APRs and transfer policies fall into this area. Also assessment—learning goals and reporting, core and co-curricular assessment, and the Assessment Academy. They'll look at our changes to assessment and the widespread involvement of faculty (he noted that everyone has had to assess a class for core and have attended department assessment meetings. Retention, persistence and completion also fall under this area.

- Question from a faculty member: for the meetings, can you wander into a meeting? That is, if you have a class that meets in part of the time, can you come in late? Bruce said that would be fine.
- Question from a faculty member: for people who have been through the APR process and have made an action plan—is this a thing we can talk about? Bruce noted that although all departments may not have received a formal response yet, we can demonstrate that a lot of changes have happened. A lot of things didn't require changes from the university. Plus, the second round of APRs has already started.

7. Introduction of faculty handbook amendments.

Jeff Johansen noted that the Handbook Committee introduced these for discussion at the end of last semester. They received some suggestions that helped them modify the proposals, which they did. He noted that they postponed the formal announcements of the amendments until this meeting to give faculty a chance to have an extra 30 days to talk and think about the proposals. The proposed changes came out of the Board requirement to look at all official documents. He then proceeded to describe the proposed amendments.

Amendment 1: this is the one that has generated some controversy. It is similar to the amendment from last year but adds a quorum of at least 60% of the faculty to vote, and then it requires that at least 60% of those votes to be affirmative. There is still one committee member who has concerns, and they included those concerns as well as the majority recommendation on Canvas.

Amendment 2: changes voting rights of people on leave. In past, if you're on Gravel you lose your chance to vote, unless you request it. Given the fact that everyone sees these while on leave anyway it would make sense for all faculty to keep their vote, even when on leave. This required changes in a few places in the Handbook, since it also would change the issue of what constitutes a quorum at a General Faculty Meeting.

Amendment 3: changes the amendment process. We've seen this with past amendments, when we've presented an amendment at a GFM and then its language cannot be changed. They are adding a 30-day review process in which feedback is given to whomever is proposing the change, and after that, it'll come to the faculty at a meeting (with no possibility of change after this) and then go for a vote, unless withdrawn.

Amendment 4: again in response to problems in the past. In the past, CAS and Boler weren't able to propose amendments. So now, if a dean wants to make an amendment, they can begin the process too.

Amendment 5: this will allow for distribution through email or paper.

Amendment 6: this makes the official copy of the FHB the online version. New employees will still receive a paper copy, but the electronic version will be the official one.

Johansen noted that all six members of the Handbook Committee support amendments 2-6. He thanked the committee for their work on these for the past two years, as well as the previous members. The documents and recommendations are on Canvas. Kilbride added that there will be open hearings too.

- Question from a faculty member: there needs to be a time and date on the web handbook. According to our contracts we're under effect of that handbook at the time of the contract is written in March. What happens when there's a change between the time that contract comes out? Answer: right now we're on the Handbook from 2014.
- Question from a faculty member: regarding the issue of "on paper or email"—the current text just says "distribution." What if there's some other way of distribution in the future? Answer: we can't make changes to the amendment now. We might be able to make changes to the language afterwards.
- Question from a faculty member: why do you want to make someone who isn't a party to the contract to be able to make changes to that contract? Deans are not a party to that contract. If a Dean wants an amendment they can talk to a department. Answer: when the contingent faculty amendment failed, we found that part of the problem with the process is that the deans wanted something, got a dept to put it forward and there was a disconnect in the process. It's not a dean who can propose this—it's the College itself. Consider this among yourself and vote!
- Comment from a faculty member: one of the benefits of an electronic document is that it'll have a timestamp on it in a way that is more obvious than has been in the past, and it will be easier to see what was the case in the past. Comment from a faculty member: We need to have amendments go into effect not in 30 days but when the next handbook goes into effect. Comment from a faculty member: the handbook has to be amended, under your argument you'd never be able to change the handbook. Nothing we do by changing the handbook will change your contract. But you'll get a new contract each year. Comment from a faculty member: once the faculty vote, it goes to the board, it becomes effective once they approve it and it's been distributed. Comment from a faculty member: it seems to me that amendments that might affect contracts should be looked at by the university by legal counsel before they decide.

Johansen noted that none of these amendments will drastically change anyone's contract. And he would like to be able to make new amendments after these have passed. The next thing they will look at is the family leave act: this was voted on, the policy was in place, but it never got into the Handbook. Right now we're at the mercy of the administration. I want that in the handbook as soon as possible, not before a new contract goes into place.

The meeting adjourned at 3:13pm.