

General Faculty Meeting  
March 20, 2019  
Donahue Auditorium

Faculty Council members in attendance: 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, Elena Manilich, Zeki Saritoprak Mike Setter, Christopher Sheil, Colin Swearingen, Mark Waner, Mariah Webinger, Gerald Weinstein. Absent: Brent Brossmann (Vice Chair), Bo Liu.

Minutes

Quorum was reached at 2pm.

Announcements

1. Minutes of the February 20 meeting were approved by acclamation.

2. Jim Burke: IT issues

Burke announced the dates for LMS demos: D2L: March 22, 2-3 pm; Donahue Auditorium - D2L Brightspace; Blackboard: March 29, 2-3 pm, AD 226; Canvas: April 5, 2-3 pm, Donahue Auditorium.

Burke also thanked faculty for completing the cybersecurity training; follow up email forthcoming. 90% completion rate. He noted that there had been a breach of Slate (the admissions software many schools, including JCU, use) at 3 schools (including Oberlin)—the hackers guessed people's security questions from their social media.

Finally he noted that Margaret, Brent Brossmann, and Anne Kugler would be holding training sessions on accessibility issues for online courses.

3. Interim AVP announcements: Commencement

Krukones noted that the president announced a revamped commencement plan in December. Changes had been decided through committee—partly due to problems last May. In order to have a shorter ceremony they divided it—with a graduate student ceremony on Saturday at 1pm and the undergraduate ceremony on Sunday as usual. He urged that this be taken as an experiment—it may have mistakes but it's well intentioned. He noted that he had undertaken some benchmarking with other AJCU AVPs—he found that at other schools that have multiple ceremonies they allow faculty a choice about which one to attend. He noted the concern about what the faculty obligation is in this situation and stated that every faculty member is required to attend a commencement. Faculty who mostly teach grad students should go to Saturday; others will attend Sunday. But he also appealed to great good will of/exhorted faculty to go to both. Finally, he noted that there had been more concern about attendance on Saturday so that the crowd doesn't seem too small.

#### 4. Update from RTP: college/university tenure committee

Dyck reviewed the work of the RTP committee toward developing a faculty-led university tenure and promotion committee. He provided rationales for moving forward on creating a committee, noting that tenure is important not only to individual faculty members but to the entire institution; that having a committee increases the number and diversity of faculty who weigh into the decision; that it ensures excellence, fair and timely process, and consistency. He noted that research and site visits have shown that committees are standard practice. Hessinger also noted that faculty don't only serve their own departments, but across the university, e.g. core. Dyck noted that the committee is urging faculty to engage in pointed discussion questions, asking them to discuss this at their departmental meetings; then they hoped to hear from chairs; additionally, there will be a discussion posted on Canvas; and anyone can provide direct feedback to RTP members. He then provided an overview of different models, noting that the committee will make a proposal based on feedback; the models he showed are based on what other institutions do. They also have links to what other schools do.

- Comment from a faculty member: I think it's important that faculty know that we're doing because Faculty Council charged us to do it.
- Question from a faculty member: will this be a university committee or college committees? Answer: that is still up in the air. We're looking for feedback
- Question from a faculty member: will this apply to current TT faculty? Answer: no. There would be grandfathering. This would need to be in place at the time of hire to apply to a new hire.
- Question from a faculty member: is this just for final decision or would this apply to 3<sup>rd</sup> year review. Answer: that is also up in the air.
- Question from a faculty member: would this include promotion to full? Answer: maybe—that has been discussed; at many places these committees handle both.

#### Items for discussion

##### 1. Strategic plan, 2020-2025 phase two: Academic Prioritization and Academic Strategy Partners (see attachments) and the CAS dean situation

Kilbride noted that we are in the early planning stages of strategic plan. We're in Phase II, as announced at last USPG meeting. The president has retained a firm, ASP, owned by Dickeson. A number of questions came up at that meeting, and we didn't have a chance to ask them all. This is coming up fast—the firm will be here April 23-24. I have not seen any schedules. The liaison committee is a 12-member group consisting of 4 members of the Board of Directors, 4 members of the Senior Leadership Team, and 4 USPG members. He noted the lack of faculty in the composition of the committee. He also stated that prioritization is a euphemism for the elimination of programs. Prioritizing programs means that you take from others. He also noted that the chair of the liaison team is Kate Malone in advancement, the govt liaison and wondered why she was chosen for this position. Kilbride displayed his list of questions, some of

which came up at the CAS chairs meeting and noted that the Faculty Council was given an appointment with the president on April 9. Questions and comments from the floor follow. Motions and votes are **in bold**.

- Question from a faculty member: we just went through HLC and one question was shared governance. What is the role of shared governance here?
- Comment from a faculty member: it's a rhetorical question but I'd like to see some kind of action plan, not just grumbling. We need to express our voice that the faculty are intrinsic to this institution. We need to have a strong voice that is listened to.
- Comment from a faculty member: looking at subtracting from weak programs: we have just had so many programs made weak from retirements, e.g. Global Ed. But weak isn't the same as strategic.
- Comment from a faculty member: about the 3 phases—the way it's presented by the president implies that the three phases were already in place and that now we're going through them. I recognize phase 1, but 2 and 3—were they being discussed prior to the new president or are they new? Kilbride answered that USPG had talked about phase 2 in very general terms previously, i.e. the signature programs.
- Comment from a faculty member: the Faculty Handbook states that the curriculum is the business of the faculty. In light of that, the liaison group needs to have a majority of faculty on it. We may need to call an interpretation of the handbook on that matter. Also, not having a dean, CAS is in a weak position relative to this process. Finally, I'd also like to know how "weak" and "strong" are being defined?
- Question from a faculty member: are the two issues—prioritization and the dean—related?  
Kilbride noted that he thought there should be faculty **elected** to the committee, not faculty picked by president. As to how weak and strong are defined, he noted that in Dickeson this is mostly based on cost. Mission is not a big thing in this book—Dickeson even suggests that schools develop an interim statement that lets leaders do what they want.
- Comment from a faculty member: There's nothing here about being a Jesuit university, having a commitment to philosophy, religious studies, social justice. And there's no context. But it's pretty clear how strong is defined: it's whoever brings in the most students.
- Question from a faculty member: from my reading, Dickeson says that operating costs have a lot to do with our salary. Is the issue really faculty salary or is it health costs? If he is incorrect, should we still believe him? What are his credentials? Kilbride noted that according to the book, the academic division is the prime driver of cost and you can't address the other parts. Another faculty member noted that roughly speaking, salaries have been stagnant over last 15 years, and the drop in the number of full-time faculty (according to the numbers recorded in the annual Fact Books).
- Comments from a faculty member: I was astounded by the committee having 4 members from the Board of Directors. It is inappropriate to have Board members sit on

a committee like this. It is okay for the Board to reserve the right to approve the plan, but not to be on the committee. The board hires a president to take of this. Also, the president is unaware of what this is doing to his relationship with the faculty here. Whom is he listening to? This morning I talked with a faculty member who is usually calm and that person was LIVID about this. This is being driven by the advancement division and the Board and I don't think the faculty should stand for that. We remain willing to work with him, but... Kilbride noted that the Dickeson book said that this plan should be done with president and the board and without the faculty. Same Commenter: if that is the case, this should be addressed as a Faculty Handbook issue.

- Comment from a faculty member: at the last USPG meeting, my understanding was that this group is the steering committee for the overall strategic plan. I think that there is a role for the BoD on the strategic plan committee. But I do not think that Prioritization should be a place for the BoD.
- Question from a faculty member: how much are we paying ASP? Everyone should be aware that a similar thing happened at Hiram—the AAUP had to become involved because they were violating due process procedures. We need to make sure that the president understands what our process is. Also, does our president have a previous history with this firm?
- Comment from a faculty member: a couple things about this coming right after HLC—I don't know if others have had conversations with Pres. Johnson, but there were several occasions when I brought up faculty problems with advancement with him—it would be really good to emphasize the need to listen to faculty on issues like this.
- Comment from a faculty member: I appreciate the information provided by AAUP, and when I think about what this president is doing, I can't forget that this president was hired in a very secretive way. We also need to think about what this does for faculty governance.
- Comment from a faculty member: is this being done now to make it seem like a done deal before the new provost comes? Less than a month ago we got an email from Jim asking us to evaluate our dean and now, a month later, we don't have a dean.
- Comment from a faculty member: about the speediness—I'm really concerned about leaving here and doing something. On the last USPG slide, it says that all this stuff is to be done in winter and spring 2019. We have to do something now. April 9 is not soon enough.
- Comment from a faculty member: I am very angry. For years the board was very hands off with Father Niehoff. This is a slap in the face after all the work we did trying to get out of hot water with the HLC.
- Comment from a faculty member: the situation with Margaret Farrar leaves CAS without leadership. **I'd like to make a MOTION for a vote of confidence in Margaret Farrar as CAS dean. The motion from the floor was seconded.**
  - Commenter asked Boler colleagues to stand with CAS. It became clear that the news had not made it to Boler faculty. Kugler stated that Farrar's contract was for 4 years so she was up for reappointment and there are a number of of

questions about what took place to come to the decision. The one thing that faculty know about was the survey, but who wrote those questions and what weight was given to the survey are unknown. The short version is she was up for reappointment she was not reappointed. Hessinger stated that he thought it was fair to ask to see the results of the survey. Krukones noted that the review process may have seemed quick but the survey represented one data point in a number of data points. It was not a vote. He also noted that another matter that needs clarification is that it is not true that it was not renewed for the coming year. She chose to return to the faculty.

- Comment from a faculty member: what the Dean said yesterday was quite to the contrary. She said her contract was not renewed. Krukones stated that it is not true that her Dean appointment was not renewed for the coming year. Miciak noted that there have been many legitimate concerns and comments presented here and offered to take these messages directly to the president and SLT. He offered to attend that meeting and bring the comments there for discussion. Furthermore, he noted that this needs to be addressed sooner than later. One never knows what the outcome of the process will be. There are a lot of attributions about the president's thinking that he thought were unclear.
- **The vote on the motion from the floor was called: 124 votes for; none opposed; 7 abstentions.**
- Comment from a faculty member: There should be another resolution that censures or comments on the president. I hope that the discussion goes beyond this.

**MOTION FROM THE FLOOR: The faculty recommend that the president stop the process of engaging with ASP until there is a greater opportunity for elected faculty input and alignment with the faculty handbook. The motion was seconded.**

**This motion passed with 64 votes for; 4 votes against; 20 abstentions.**

- Comment from a faculty member: in light of the urgency of this, we need to make ad hoc committee in case he says no to our recommendation and to figure out how to react.
- Comment from a faculty member: there needs to be some insistence on meeting with FC immediately, certainly before April.
- Comment from a faculty member: my read on this is that this is that it is fast in order to avoid confronting faculty. I think we should do our own prioritization.
- Comment from a faculty member: I think that we need the president to talk with us. I also think we need a reading group about this book.
- Krukones noted that there a community forum with the president has been scheduled for April 10<sup>th</sup>.

The meeting adjourned at 3:19pm.