

General Faculty Meeting  
February 20, 2019  
Donahue 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), Mike Setter, Christopher Sheil, Colin Swearingen, Mark Waner, Mariah Webinger, Gerald Weinstein. Absent: Sokchea Lim, Bo Liu, Elena Manilich, Zeki Saritoprak.

Minutes

Quorum was reached at 2:03 pm.

Chair's announcements:

1. Minutes of the last meeting (Jan. 23, 2019):

<http://faculty.jcu.edu/facultycouncil/files/2019/02/GFM-minutes-23-jan-19.pdf> were approved by acclamation.

2. Fitness center/student center renovations:

Kilbride noted that there will be some substantial renovations in the student center and rec facilities as part of a student-led initiative (the Student Union went to the president with their proposal and he agreed). Renovations will be done using discretionary money in the president's budget. Changes include improved/expansion of weight room; renovation of fitness and yoga rooms, renovation of bookstore and atrium. The bookstore has a big space and something will be done to that space, maybe a restaurant or a coffeeshop (a Saxbys?). The mailbox area may also be renovated. Students wanted more patio space. There are also preliminary plans to have food service in Dolan. Renovations will occur over the summer.

Question from a faculty member: is there a dollar figure for this? Answer: no, because it's not quite clear what's going to be done.

3. Cybersecurity awareness training:

Kilbride announced that faculty need to finish this training.

Jim Burke noted that 47% have completed the 2-factor authentication and 25% have done training. People will be reminded on a daily basis to do it until you do. There will be drop in sessions outside of Einsteins for people who want help. He noted that the training can be

paused and completed at a later time if you don't have time to complete the half-hour training in one session.

#### 4. Dean evaluations.

Kilbride urged the faculty to fill out the dean evaluations.

#### 5. Jim Krukones on advising

Krukones thanked the faculty for their work on advising—both 1st year and major advising. He noted that last fall, academic advising had made a number of recommendations based on the external review team's advice. The president has determined that we should not engage in structural changes in academic advising at this time, until we have a provost in place. He noted that structurally, this means that what we've had in place for the past few years will remain in place for the next year. In the remaining few months of the semester, they want to share the proposals from Advising Office, esp. with respect to professional advisors. This way there will be some feedback in hand that can be shared with the new provost immediately. A mitigating factor: resources offered to CAS faculty for pre-major advising and workshops to create links between faculty advisors and offices on campus to ease the burden and facilitate advising. Office of Advising will be in touch with depts about advising in the fall. Krukones ended by thanking the faculty for their patience and input and Maryclaire Moroney and Dean Farrar for their work.

Question from a faculty member: will we see the recommendations or will they roll out as proposals? Answer: we want to be as focused as possible. it was always intended that the report would be shared with the faculty.

Items for discussion:

#### 1. Handbook amendment ballot forthcoming

Kilbride noted that a ballot with the five proposed amendments to the Faculty Handbook will be coming out soon. There's been a discussion open on Canvas discussion the issues. He urged everyone to vote and urged everyone to GOTV. The ballot is being prepared and will be released in the next couple days. It will be open for a week.

#### 2. CAP: Incomplete grade proposal

Christopher Sheil highlighted what the changes in the policy would mean for faculty. He noted that it defines what an incomplete means and entails and it outlines the requirements. The policy is intended for students who have completed work throughout the semester and run into problems after the withdrawal deadline. It establishes clear deadlines and a procedure for completing the work. Sheil noted that many of the comments that came up during discussions

have dealt with experiential classes; there is another policy that's coming up that is being developed for those cases, i.e. for classes with immersion trips beyond the last day of classes. Hessinger explained further that this applies to study abroad trips that are part of regular classes abroad in which the trip extends beyond the end of a course. For students to be eligible for financial aid for those credit hours that work needs to be completed within two weeks of the term. Sheil added that this policy isn't just about financial aid works for individual students, this is for how financial aid works for the whole university.

Question from a faculty member: it's still within an instructor's authority whether to grant an incomplete or not, right? Answer: yes.

Catherine Sherman noted that the new procedure is partly due to HIPPA. The policy lets the student provide doctor notes to advising without having to give confidential information to professors. Also, part-time instructors have asked for more protection—PT faculty often feel pressured to give incompletes.

Question from a faculty member: How do you reconcile if a student meets the standard of the policy and an instructor says no? Sherman answered: this would be a time where a faculty member might talk with a dean. This doesn't just let a student have more time to get work done, it defines that a student has been doing passing work up until a point after the withdrawal deadline. What this is saying is when a student comes well before the withdrawal deadline and asks for an incomplete, maybe what they really need is a withdrawal. And often students will ask for multiple incompletes, which should be a flag in the system.

Sherman also noted that under this new system, faculty can't just give a student an incomplete—the student has to initiate the request through the petition system (i.e. if they miss the final paper). But there's nothing stopping the faculty member from prompting the student to file an incomplete.

Comment from a faculty member: I appreciate the clarity of this.

Question from a faculty member: do instructors still need to add the I grade? Answer: yes. And faculty will still need to see the petition through OnBase. Education on this will be key.

Berg called the motion to send the proposal to a vote by the full faculty, the motion was seconded. The motion passed with 41 votes for the motion; none opposed.

The meeting adjourned at 2:46pm.