

Faculty Council Meeting  
Wednesday, March 13, 2 pm  
SB 107

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

A quorum was reached at 2:05pm and the meeting began.

Agenda

1. The secretary announced that the minutes for the January 16 meeting were unavailable due to a technology failure.

2. Upcoming election: candidates needed for Council & committees

Kilbride announced that there will be an election at end of the semester and that there are a number of empty seats on FC and many committees. The initiative to shrink the size of FC won't happen this year. It's not something that can be done quickly or on our own--it will need to be approved by a full faculty vote. Brossmann also noted that the Core committee will need an ISJ coordinator which is now an open seat.

3. Academic Strategy Partners (ASP) & the new strategic plan

Kilbride noted that at the February 28 USPG meeting Pres. Johnson introduced a plan for the new strategic plan as well as plans to bring in a consulting firm (ASP) which specializes in the prioritization of academic programs. His plan was to bring them in before we start on the strategic plan. His plan was to have a committee of 12 people (4 Board members, 4 from the Senior Leadership Team, and 4 from USPG) to be chaired by Kate Malone—the government affairs liaison. Kilbride noted that many concerns were raised at USPG—especially where are the faculty on this? As presented, this committee would have at most only 2 faculty. He also questioned why Kate Malone was chairing it. Finally, he voiced concerns about ASP because prioritization is nearly always a euphemism for elimination. It had been suggested to him that that Johnson be invited to the next faculty meeting.

Kugler highlighted some of the critical issues: what is the interaction between this group and faculty governance? She had received the answer that it was the Board's purview. She also questioned the plan for communication and the relationship between the strategic plan and program prioritization. She noted there were also concerns about the membership of the committee and noted that was also a lot to expect of board. Also, we've done a lot of planning about programs—where is the intersection between this and what has already been done? Dyck added that this had been discussed at the recent Chairs meeting. He concurred with the concerns about how this is a good example of shared governance and noted that apparently

the Deans found out about this at the USPG meeting. This will happen in April (Kilbride noted that is before the new provost comes). Some questions from the Chairs meeting included: is this the beginning of a process? how should FC convey the concern of faculty to the president? questions about timing: because so much is supposed to happen during the summer, when faculty aren't here. What is the role of faculty—in this process, in the formation of the committee, in the work that we've already done? How to assert a faculty voice—especially through FC? He stated that faculty reps for any of this should be elected, not just drawn from USPG. Finally, Kilbride noted that we need to be more proactive but not unnecessarily provocative.

Brossmann stated that we need to cultivate an idea of what we want to be; what is our vision of ourselves? The faculty need to figure out what we want before we enter those discussions. Krukones noted that the matter of representation is still up in the air, as of recent developments. He stated that there had been a conversation with ASP and a point the president wanted to convey was that they leave more up to faculty than may be apparent.

Webinger noted that this seems like program elimination, but her understanding was that after the voluntary retirement program that we were on more stable footing; she wondered whether this was a signal that things are worse than they're saying. Weinstein responded that from what he knew as rep for the Committee on Resource Allocation—the fiscal statements will show a small loss this year, but the place is cash flow positive. The projections for the next 3-4 years will get us out of showing any loss. But it remains to be seen whether that will happen. Krukones noted further that the hope is to get the discount rate down this year.

Brossmann asked whether the president had said that he had used that firm previously. Krukones replied that Dickeson's book was used in the planning under Santili here in the past.

Kilbride asked whether the president should come to a council meeting as well as a general faculty meeting. Dyck wondered what the timeline was. Greci suggested asking the president for communication about the intentions behind this. Setter suggested that Council could present a document to the president suggesting what he should address. Brossmann and Setter noted that one issue that needed to be addressed was how the Jesuit nature and mission of the school fit into the plan.

#### 4. Additional business: commencements

Weinstein noted that there had not been a formal announcement that there will be 2 commencements and that some faculty are concerned about having to come both days. He noted that the Faculty Handbook says that our responsibility is to attend commencements (plural). Webinger wondered if there was a policy. Brossmann stated that there was a brief conversation earlier and the general assumption was that if you mostly teach grad students you'd go to that one, and if you teach mostly undergrads you'd go to that one. Weinstein had figured it was for the pomp. Greci though it was not that great of a burden to be required to go to both.

Sheil noted that it'll be really tough to get people to go to the grad ceremony. Krukones admitted that there's been a bit of uncertainty about this. Weinstein said that time is getting to be of the essence—if it's going to be a requirement, people will need to know this soon.

## Committee updates

### 1. CAP issues

Sheil presented a list of what CAP has been working on. Active proposals include:

TRS proposal for Certificate in Theology Education: CAP considers this to be a modification to an existing program. They aren't substantial changes, but a repackaging. CAP recommended that it doesn't need to go to full faculty, but it did need to go to FC first. **Setter moved to approve**

**CAP's recommendation, the motion was seconded. The motion was unanimously approved.**

UCEP Academic Sanctions policy: this defines GPA benchmarks better, and explains how many semesters a student can be on probation. CAP recommended to send it FC and open it up for general review for 30 days and then go to gen fac. **Brossmann moved to approve CAP's recommendation, the motion was seconded. The motion was unanimously approved.**

Next Sheil addressed how CAP receives and reviews proposals. When he began as chair, he noted that he had been unclear about which documents had gone through which process. There are two documents that deal with CAP processes; one had been voted on, and it suggested that it should be reviewed regularly. The other document shows a workflow and suggests deadlines, i.e. proposals should come at the beginning of the semester. The second document was a procedural document and never went through the full faculty. CAP is revisiting these documents to see if they can reshape the policy to make it more efficient. One issue from a long time ago (October 2014) was whether FC can vote online to send proposals to CAP, or whether it has to happen as part of an actual meeting. Sheil suggested that FC should consider online voting. Kilbride thought that the initial step for changes to academic programs should go immediately to CAP. Sheil noted that there are 2 types of proposals that CAP deals with. Kilbride suggested that CAP could bring a proposal about this to the next meeting to vote on it.

### 2. RTP update: college/university tenure committee

Dyck stated that they been doing research on peer schools about what they do. Every single one *\*does\** have this sort of committee. RTP are going to send out a preview to figure out how to get faculty informed and get feedback. They have a rationale and research on this. They are setting up discussions on Canvas and the committee will talk to deans and departments to determine if it is understood that faculty think that we should do this.

### 3. Finance, Compensation & Work-Related Policies

Weinstein said they have been looking at faculty evaluation form. McGinn had forwarded one form—less input, some things could be prefilled. She suggested doing it once every 3 years but that is a handbook issue, since the Faculty Handbook says we need to do it annually. The proposed form includes a question that connects to mission. The idea would be to put it out there and have hearings. He noted that there are two issues: the form and extending the period

to three years, but that the form can be changed without the handbook. Sheil asked whether this would be a rolling schedule or if would everyone go at once. Weinstein noted that he didn't know what this would do with raises, or what would happen with raises in years where you weren't filling out an evaluation. Kilbride noted that this is something to put up on the Canvas discussion board. Sheil thought that the community is ready for conversations about this and it would be have to some forms to evaluate.

Dyck noted that in the chairs meeting, there was an announcement that there will be a 2% raise across board. And that JCU's HR has contracted with Sibson consulting for a compensation study to figure out what they're paying staff.

Other business:

Brossmann announced the changes to be made in the RecPlex. Namely, \$2.5 mill of renovations in the RecPlex happening in the summer.

It was also noted that the theatre program is moving to the English department.

Finally, a new restaurant (middle eastern) will be going into the Sweet Melissa's spot.

The meeting adjourned at 3:17