

General Faculty Meeting  
April 24, 2019, 2:00pm  
Dolan Auditorium

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

Minutes

Kilbride opened the meeting at 2:04pm.

1. Academic Strategy Partners

President Johnson introduced Robert Dickeson and Kyle Carter from ASP. He noted it was an informative couple days. Following his introduction, he left the auditorium.

Dickeson introduced themselves and presented a Powerpoint. He noted that they were here to assess the readiness of JCU for a planning process—i.e. leadership, data available, issue of courage and the willingness to act. He listed off their credentials: Carter is out of psych, regarded as a young Turk. Came to Dickeson concerned about the quality of programs; became Dean, provost, chancellor; joined ASP 4 years ago. Dickeson is from poli sci—favorite course was team taught course on the Renaissance, listed off his achievements: he was dean, president, on Spellings committee; worked with schools of different sizes, including faith-based, including Creighton.

Onto the powerpoint: Why prioritize? 1. financial—balance the budget (2-10% savings). Other reasons: 2. to inform future budget decisions (i.e. no cuts, just to think about the future; he quoted U of NE-Lincoln; Guelph); 3. to improve overall efficiency; for accreditation—i.e. schools trying to do too much with what they had; 4. to dovetail prioritization with strategic planning—sense he has here is to do it simultaneously; 5. in response to demands from Boards—Board members tend to come out of business backgrounds and want to treat schools in the same way as business; 6. to achieve strategic initiatives; 7. to tackle specific shortfalls—i.e. deferred maintenance (which is a significant shortfall throughout the country); 8. reinvest in new programs/initiatives to strengthen school's future—education is a fickle market (quotes study of what incoming majors say they want to study—variable.); 9. to create a contingency fund; 10. to create a database for the future. Dickeson asked what areas people saw need for at JCU. One audience member suggested 2,3,5,9.

**Comment from faculty member:** I'd like to hear a definition of "efficiency" (e.g. fertilizers on plants could be called an efficiency because they lead to faster growth but they also lead

to the algae blooms in Erie)—how are we thinking about what that word means? **Answer:** it's an economics term about how much is put into something.

**Comment from faculty member:** it's clear that some of this makes sense—but does it make sense to be doing this when we have so much turnover with administration now? **Answer:** we've been called in here to strengthen academic and administrative programs; to establish sound programs.

Dickeson returned to the Powerpoint. According to Moody's there are various pressures on higher ed: overall net tuition is down; economy effects families' willingness to pay; federal budget pressures on fin aid and research grants—government money is a guessing game; online education; things ed needs to invest in: capital, ITS, faculty comp, program renewal. Other problems: There's also an increase in competition for students—biggest competition coming from for-profits. Accreditation—there's pressure on accrediting agencies too—the Department of Education is pressuring agencies now too to show assessment in all programs, linking strategic planning to outcomes and planning for facilities; also specialized accreditation of specific programs. He continued by saying that schools need to operationalize the mission; confront the real issues; integrate resources; quit doing some things.

Dickeson stated “We don't do prioritization.” Rather, they help with the process; they give criteria for making decisions. They have a lot of experience in a lot of places on what to do and how to do it. No decisions have been made yet. Program prioritization—analysis focused on pre-selected criteria concentration on resource development. He noted that this was the first step of 7 or 8. He stated it would be a bottom-up: from project management team to program information: forms, depts, divisions, directors to a task force to the president and board for decision. Next steps include announcing criteria and weights, providing data to support criteria. Finally, he said values: mission, strategic objectives, fair, open and transparent; all programs would be reviewed based on evidence.

#### Questions

**Question from a faculty member:** you mention evidence and data. No one has said what kind of data we're going to be looking at, so what kinds of data? **Answer:** all of the above, depends on criteria chosen For example, looking at external demands: anyone who has ever advised a student knows that students frequently change their mind. Whereas internal demand might mean not just number of majors, but there are programs here that are essential to the mission; many departments exist as part of the core, even without having many majors.

**Question from a faculty member:** what is the data on the effectiveness of your consulting services—can you provide aggregated and comprehensive data on your work. You only give case studies in your book. **Answer:** no, we don't have data—we haven't collected it. Every campus that we've consulted on this process has not failed. there have been many campuses that we haven't consulted with that have had unmitigated disasters. Carter noted that this is the 7<sup>th</sup> campus he has been on; for the 6 campus that I've worked with (Carroll

College, LaSalle, University of Sciences, Ohio Northern), each campus has completed it successfully. In every case the greatest sense of angst was that we would give the president a list of programs to eliminate—that is not the case. Each time you go through a lot of anxiety in the process but the institution is stronger at the end.

**Question from a faculty member:** about mission—you mentioned that many universities have sprawling mission statements. What do you think about ours? **Answer:** I think it's very meaningful, it's a little general and vague. It would be easy for any department on campus to say they are part of the mission. I'd recommend to operationalize the mission. At Creighton the president wrote to the faculty that the university should focus on the programs that god calls us to focus on.

**Question from a faculty member:** a few months ago we were talking about this process with the president, and someone asked why did you go with ASP and he said that other presidents recommended it. What struck me as unsatisfactory is that we didn't want to know who did other presidents think were best but what did other faculty think about it? There is a reputation among faculty about ASP. I'm wondering if the success about which you speak is voiced equally by the faculty. **Answer:** I think the faculty would be mixed.

**Question II:** then why would you say that it was a success? **Answer:** my experience as a faculty member shows that not all faculty think alike. To get to the core of your question we'd have to survey everyone. Most of the negative comments about me come from people whose campuses I have not worked with. The AAUP tends to castigate any institution that undertakes prioritization whether I've worked with them. **Carter:** the definition of success varies between administration and faculty. I'm sensitive to faculty-I never want to disappoint faculty. A lot of the things that faculty may be disappointed with are the decisions that a local campus made on the basis of the process. Call your colleagues at these other schools and ask what they think.

**Question from a faculty member:** I'd like to go back to the question about why you don't follow the same process you advocate to your own clients (i.e. collecting data). The fact that you don't undermines my confidence in your process. Also, what does it mean to "use faculty differently?" **Answer:** we tend to move on to the next campuses. You'll need to ask the president what he meant by that phrase.

**Question from a faculty member:** I appreciate you talking about this as bottom up process. can you talk about the size and composition of that bottom committee. **Answer:** the project management team can be whatever you want it to be. OH Northern did it with 4 administrators. Another school in Montana did it with 12 people, mostly faculty. I think you need someone to manage it.

**Question from faculty member:** a couple questions about slide show—will it be available for review? **Answer:** I can ask it to be so.

**Question from faculty member:** can you go back to why JCU should do it? You didn't spend very much time on the one. How do you know that these are the reasons that JCU want to have you here? **Answer:** we were asked by the president. I think the president has a couple reasons. a) the strategic plan is in the final year and needs to be re-uped. I've written about integrated planning and putting academics at the center of planning. Integrated planning because schools have many plans, each written by a group of people and that these plans should incorporate all of this. b) the second article I wrote was how academic planning needs to be central to all other planning. I don't care which comes first as long as the planning is integrated. Should we use the same goals for future programs as we use for current ones? Whatever you do, think about the institution as a whole and how it positions JCU for the future. I listed these three as ones.

**Question from faculty member:** this is an academic prioritization—why did you meet with the VP of advancement? **Answer:** I didn't—I said I wanted to meet with as many people as I could meet with. I said fill us up for the two days.

Dickeson concluded: whatever happens, I wish you well. At this point, Dickeson and Carter left the meeting.

#### Other business

1. Elections—Kilbride announced that nominations close Thursday and the election would begin on Friday.
2. The ASP team would be in Dolan 202 for a meeting at 4pm for Faculty Council members.
3. Boler College Proposal for a MS in Innovation & Entrepreneurship

Kilbride noted that this proposal was submitted in August and has gone through CAP who now recommends that it be sent for a vote of the faculty.

**Comment from a faculty member:** I want to caution that a lot of this program depends on one faculty member, but faculty members can come and go, but programs stay. Walter Simmons answered that it looks like that now, but that won't be the case with this one.

**Question from a faculty member:** the program looks good, but it seems like, in comparison with the undergrad minor, that it was very business-oriented. Is there no general social entrepreneurship course? Or am I just misreading it? Simmons answered: it involves using courses from other disciplines.

**Question from a faculty member:** why make this a MS and not a post-bacc? I realize that the thrust of the proposal is programmatic. Simmons said it is market driven. Specialized

programs are trending. we already have a minor in entrepreneurship and we can feed people into the MS. A certificate program doesn't carry the same weight as a MS. Doan Winkel noted that also it involves more hours than a certificate.

**Question from a faculty member:** can I ask about the timing—if we're about to do program planning, why start this now?

**A motion was made and seconded to send this to the faculty for a vote: 55 voted for, none opposed, 3 abstentions.**

3. University Committee on Academic Policies proposal on Academic Sanctions

Kilbride noted that UCEP reviewed policy language and they clarified and strengthened the wording and gave timeframes. This policy proposal has been on Canvas for 2 months with no comments.

**A motion was made and seconded to send the proposal to the faculty for a vote: 74 votes for none opposed, no abstentions.**

Business from the floor.

**A motion was made and seconded that the administration share the information (i.e. actual data, not just the list) they have shared with ASP and the report that ASP sends to the president with the faculty: 62 votes for, none opposed, no abstentions.**

**Comment from a faculty member:** they sent a list of what they gave them. I want the actual data. The book even said that we should have access to that. Dickeson is concerned with the amount of turnover with the provost and dean's office and our nearly crippling inability to get anything done.

**Comment from a faculty member:** if this process goes forward, should we be thinking about what we need to get done next?

**Comment from a faculty member:** yesterday at the chairs' meeting, Dickeson seemed reticent about electing members.

**Comment from a faculty member:** we don't want to limit our options.

In the final moments of the meeting, **a motion was made and seconded to ask the president to not move forward with process of prioritization until classes reconvene in the fall: 50 votes for, 4 opposed, 5 abstentions.**

The meeting adjourned at 3:22.