

**Faculty Council Meeting  
March 2, 2022**

Faculty Council Members in Attendance:

Medora Barnes	Sebastian Brockhaus	Brent Brossmann	Chrystal Bruce	Angie Canda	Mina Chercourt	Gwen Compton-Engle
✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
Deniz Durmus	Vacant	Joanna Garcia	Karen Gygli	Brad Hull O/L	Danielle Kara	Anne Kugler
		✓	✓		✓	✓
Desmond Kwan	Sokchea Lim	Marc Lynn	Malia McAndrew	Tamba Nlandu	Tom Pace	Yi Shang
✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
Earl Spurgin	Kristen Tobey	Mark Waner				
✓	✓	✓				

I. Approval of minutes of 2/2/2022: Approved by acclamation

II. Announcements (Mark Waner):

A. Searches:

1. CFO search: a third candidate has been invited (one dropped out; one applied late but was promising). There's an open session tomorrow.
2. No further updates on VP for Diversity Equity and Inclusion search.
3. Boler Dean on-campus interviews started. Had four on-campus candidates; one withdrew; two on-campus this week.

B. Staff Council: Mark met with Adam Nichols, Chair of Staff Council; interested in working on addressing issues of perceived faculty/staff divide and talked a lot about the field house issue. The plan is to meet as a group with chairs, plus a few other representatives from faculty and from staff councils to talk about addressing issues.

III. The Care Team and the Temporary Remote Learning Draft Policy (Emily Sherwood, Director of Community Standards):

A. The Care Team: Residence Life, SAS, Student Success, Associate Deans, et al meet biweekly to identify and intervene with at-risk students on matters of wellbeing, academic issues, financial problems, death of family member or friend for instance.

1. The point is to share information centrally and coordinate followup. It's overwhelming to the student if all of those areas are contacting a student separately.
2. Emily oversees conduct--so for instance a student written up for alcohol, but in discussion with the Care Team it turns out the student is self-medicating for depression .....
3. Care Team addresses issues that include:
  - a) academic (not performing well, or performance has changed significantly);
  - b) not able to pay for school and/or housing; food insecurity; significant financial need;
  - c) mental health concern if they disclose; recent loss of family member or friend (big increase this year)
  - d) significant behavioral changes like not going to activities, change in appearance or demeanor, difficulty handling everyday stressors
  - e) medical concerns: broken legs, cancer, concussions
  - f) none of the above, but coordinated support is needed
4. Emily is the clearinghouse--she receives issues and distributes them to appropriate offices.
  - a) Concerns should be reported when they are having or will likely have a large impact on the student or on their academic performance.
  - b) Concerns will be probably be shared with the Care Team. Emergency concerns (harm of self or others) need to go to JCU PD.
5. If there is an issue that relates to Title IX as mandated reporter, faculty can assume Title IX will deal with it, but faculty can send the issue to the Care Team, too. CARE form is already there in our courses "Learner Support tab."  
Medora Barnes: maybe put link on Canvas faculty sensitive business, and on part-time faculty Canvas page?

B. Temporary Virtual Learning (see proposed policy): The reason it came about was that last semester there were four or five students who could have benefited from remote learning but didn't fall under SAS or under COVID remote policies.

1. An example: a student with a parent in hospice care, where the student needs to be out of state for a couple weeks. Academic Success had to say either miss class or leave of absence. Virtual learning could be a great option and the student could still graduate with their peers. Other examples: a student who just had a baby; a student being threatened by an off campus boyfriend. The idea is to help a student avoid having to make a tough decision to not be in the semester
- 2) Process: A student submits the form; Academic Success reviews documentation (or absence thereof such as a sister critically injured). Duration no

more than two weeks. Professors make the final decision as to whether class could be virtual This makes it so that the reasons are verified.

3) Questions:

a) Earl Spurgin: Synchronously or asynchronously? There is a huge difference between one student comes to class on zoom, vs teaching class twice, once asynchronously.

Emily: Either; professor would know best. Probably won't be able to accommodate labs

b) Gwen Compton-Engle: What does ten class days mean?; Two calendar weeks, not MWF, MWF, MWF, M, for instance. So business days?

Better term? Earl: call it: "two weeks of the term."

c) Angie Canda: what about exams? Do we wait on those?

Emily: Faculty would take into consideration when making decision.

d) Tamba Nlandu: has a case where a paper supposed to be due in December, still not turned in. Academic Success asking to extend due date. How do we know if that student goes on Care team?

Academic Success makes that determination.

e) Anne Kugler: Does this risk expansion to ever-larger number of students? We already have two avenues (COVID task force and SAS) for semester-long online; this would add a new short-term two-weeks option.

Emily: This would be for two or three weeks; we would not publicize to students, but the option would be in the in tool kit for an emergency, most often in outpatient treatment suicide and suicide ideation. Probably there will just be a full-term SAS not COVID Task Force online option in Fall.

f) Medora: How do the SAS, COVID pathways, intersect with this new policy idea: do we start with two weeks, then move to whole semester?

Emily: this would only apply to non-SAS, temporary circumstances.

g) Malia McAndrew: it's good to work with students and make things happen, but some classes can deal with zooming-in and some classes can't. What if a class not being appropriate for zoom students means that the student is down to part-time status and that affects their financial aid?

Emily: Care Team can work with students re: summer courses, transfer, financial services, if faculty just can't have them in class virtually. At the end of the day, leave of absence is a fine option. Many students do take it. This is just another option.

4) Emily: Where do we go with this policy? Responses re: wording:

a) Earl: it took a long time into the document to state that faculty had decision-making authority.

b) Medora: what about the syllabus? Unclear how Academic Success would know what it was.

c) Gwen: definitions are broad: "crisis situation" sounds quite wide until the document listed examples. "Including but not limited to", is wide-- how about "of a similar magnitude"?

- d) Malia: It's good that these are vetted through Academic Success because faculty don't need to know individual circumstances
- e) Anne: Initially the wording is Academic Success will make determinations. There needs to be language to make it clear that Academic Success is going to do verification and gatekeeping, not decision-making.
- f) Emily: Duly noted about wording issues; will edit and send back to Faculty Council. Happy to talk with people about concerns.

5) Next steps: endorsement by Faculty Council or full faculty?

- a) Karen Gygli: Needs buy-in from faculty so full faculty meeting
- b) Sebastian Brockhaus re: timing: since wouldn't take effect until Fall, if need be, can wait to address this until the April faculty meeting. Due credit to Emily for reaching out for faculty input.
- c) Once Mark receives revisions from Emily, send out for either March or April faculty meeting. Faculty Council agrees by acclamation.

IV. RTP proposals for Faculty Handbook (Angie):

(Because of Board of Directors Handbook amendments, we are now in a quicker process. The Chair of Faculty Council can put forward amendments to Faculty Council and if we agree to it, it starts a clock of 20 days for comments.)

A. UTPC Committee staffing amendment proposal: we have quite a few unfilled seats and there is no provision in the Handbook as to how to handle that. It is proposed that Faculty Council would fill vacant seats. The reasoning is that this is clearly a faculty committee, so it would not be appropriate for the administration to fill those seats. In the event no full professors in a division are eligible or willing, we would then aim for diversifying disciplines.

1) Additionally there is a new procedural policy about how to think about diversification of academic backgrounds (it's not a Handbook amendment, so as to be more nimble). Right now, the UTPC has low representation from sciences, and no one from social sciences or Boler. So for instance in the end if the UTPC no one from Boler could or would serve, so UTPC had no Boler representation, then we would look to social sciences to fill that seat.

2) Sebastian moved to send the proposal to the full faculty; Tamba and Tom Pace seconded. Yes: 18; No: 0 Abstentions: 0

B. COAD: The proposal is that COAD's recommendation for promotion has to come from deans at or above the rank being voted on. Given that it's the deans in committee, a dean would appropriately be the person appointing (not Faculty Council). The process would be that a dean not at or above the rank being voted on would recuse. The college would be represented on COAD by an appointee at the appropriate rank. The Handbook disqualifies any person who is from the same department as the candidate, so that doesn't

need to be in this proposal. Given our history of interims, sometimes at qualifying rank and sometimes not, clarity is needed as to who should be voting and who should not.

Earl moves, Tom seconds to accept the proposal move to full faculty for discussion.

(And end of 20 days, there's a 7-day period where we can make changes to come up with final proposal.)

Yes: 18; no: 0; abstentions: 0

V. Staff award nominations: deadline is March 18.

A. There was an Ad hoc committee last year that then brought their recommendation to Faculty Council for affirmation. We need 3-5 volunteers (these are not lengthy packets, nor are there a lot of them, so it's a one-hour meeting). Please let Mark know if you are willing to volunteer so he can distribute nominations right after March 18. Or, if you're volunteering for the committee, please do nominate.

VI. Communication problems. The Faculty Council Executive Committee has repeatedly raised the issue of the lack of communication in meetings with Steve and with Al. Both Steve and Al ask (and do so each time dismay is expressed about how a decision unfolded): how do we move forward? What should the process it look like?

A. Angie: Does it even matter what faculty say? (See the example of the mask mandate, where faculty understanding was that there would be discussion first with faculty about making masks optional in the classroom and then no such discussion ensued.)

Mark: not holding high hopes, but it's an opportunity to lay down some markers.

Certainly, the equivalent accommodations available to students re: COVID should be available to faculty.

B. Bond and field house timing as it relates to simultaneous faculty buyout:

1) Mark: we've been told "sometimes decisions have to be made quickly so there's not time to talk with everybody" but that rings hollow. Mark's putting together a timeline of benefits, retirement, bond proposal, field house dates because there are mismatches.

a) The initial vote by the Ohio Higher Education Facilities Commission on JCU's bond request was November 17, 2021. There was a public hearing November 23, and December 15 was the final vote by the Commission.

[See : December 15 2021 meeting final approval:

<https://ohefc.ohiohighered.org/sites/default/files/events/2022/02/09%20-%2011%3A36am/OHEFC%20Meet%20Mins%20signed%2012.15.21.pdf>

Notice of Public Hearing for November 23:

<https://ohefc.ohiohighered.org/sites/default/files/events/2021/11/15%20-%205%3A08pm/TEFRA%20Notice%20-%20JCU%202022.pdf>

November 17 2021 meeting preliminary approval:

<https://ohefc.ohiohighered.org/sites/default/files/events/2022/02/09%20-%2011%3A52am/OHEFC%20Nov%20Meet%20Mins%20Signed%2011.17.21.pdf>]

December 15 was also the Town Hall where Al mentioned field house as possibility, with no mention of the bond. There was also an October Town Hall with facilities on the agenda; this bond did not come up.

b) Because the November 17 meeting had to be preceded by a very specific proposal [<https://ohefc.ohiohighered.org/background-policies-and-procedures/general-procedures>] JCU had to start preparing months ahead of the November 17 meeting to have budget impact numbers. Clearly "fast" was not an issue. Faculty Executive Committee has asked for those numbers and they have not been not been shared.

c) Looks a lot more like at the same time as Steve was saying "we are trying to avoid hardship" with retirements, the administration was actively planning to take on this huge debt.

2) Gwen: Shouldn't the administration be trying to use the mechanisms in place already for communication/consultation? It is notable that in the general faculty meeting faculty were reporting that in any relevant committee where we had representatives, none of this bond and field house plan had come up.

3) Sebastian: It's blatantly obvious the bond/field house was not about fast decisions but faculty were intentionally kept in the dark. Why? If it's because of faculty pushback, why would there be pushback? Worth administration consideration. Administration *can* decide these things without communication, but is that how they want to lead? It's no surprise if there's no faculty buy-in.

4) General faculty meeting on March 23: AVP for Facilities (Jeremiah Swetel) will present the plan for the field house and other bond spending (library, dorms, etc). Steve will be there as well. Executive Committee has asked for actual numbers as to annual operating costs, depreciation, debt payments, etc. None forthcoming yet.

5) Tamba: Has the Executive Committee talked with the administration about the expense of the field house in light of the 2% salary increase?  
Mark: Yes, we talked about how it feels to have a "merit" pool that is well under COLA/inflation, plus how this bond dwarfs that expenditure, not to mention the cut in pay and yet workload of department chairs.  
Medora: The rhetoric is always about how "long term" faculty investment/salary commitments are; but the bond/field house is surely long term--and we should see the actual budget numbers for what the scale of that commitment is.

We are out of time. Please do supply additional comments and feedback on this issue.

