

**General Faculty Meeting
November 10, 2021**

Faculty Council Members in Attendance:

Medora Barnes	Sebastian Brockhaus	Brent Brossmann	Chrystal Bruce	Angie Canda	Mina Chercourt	Gwen Compton-Engle
✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
Deniz Durmus		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. Minutes

Jim Bretske wants his point of order in the October minutes.
Minutes approved by acclamation.

II. Announcements:

A. Update on searches:

- 1) Mariah Webinger is the faculty representative for the Finance VP search.
- 2) Nominations are open until November 12 for positions on the DEI VP search
- 3) Representatives on the Assistant Provost for Student Success search are Andy Intagliata and Lindsay Calkins; they're wrapping up that search.
- 4) Boler College of Business dean search faculty representatives are Joanna Garcia, Simran Kahai, Bob Giacalone, Julia Karolle-Berg.
Dean Gunzenhauser is co-chair with Scott Allen; she reports that they're starting the process. For staff and MBA student representation, the committee has Gabriela Wanless, plus economics/Spanish major Christine Besenfelder. Be on the lookout for input on position description; they anticipate arranging some zoom listening sessions after Thanksgiving. They will give updates every month at faculty meeting; feel free to contact them.

B. Listening session with the Provost: Friday, November 12, 3:00 AD 26

C. University Lounge (former Faculty Lounge): Refitted space; it's meant to be a good place for social interactions. Open houses: this Thursday afternoon 3:30-5 and Friday morning 8-9:30 with coffee, tea, snacks.

II. Chrystal Bruce reporting on CAP's work on charge from Faculty Council to develop a proposal for a University Curriculum Committee (UCC):

A. In the FC constitution, CAP's purview included curriculum changes and policy review but the original charge has migrated to other constituent parts of the institution (Core committee, departments, policy review in UCEP), so that now CAP is essentially the new programs committee only.

B. Over the summer, with lots of consultation CAP mapped out what a UCC might look like as the umbrella committee with the following subcommittees (CAS subcommittee would need to be created; the others already exist):

- 1) Boler curriculum committee
- 2) CAS Curriculum committee
- 3) Core committee
- 4) Academic Policy Committee (previously known as UCEP)

C. Envisioned improvements to current system:

- 1) Clearer communication (advising and student success; among depts when things are changed--not that there would be UCC veto power)
- 2) Clearer oversight of curriculum, including sunseting
- 3) Improved, clarified, simplified processes: reduction of duplicated work, better workflow for core and new program approval. Coursedog now has a curriculum component, so we could use that (rather than OnBase) for approvals and manage it from Registrar's office. One-stop shop for new courses, programs, etc.

D. CAP is mapping right now; this not a proposal per se. Also CAP is working on aligning process with faculty handbook as far as purview of faculty over curriculum. They will post a proposal early spring semester on Canvas and survey for feedback.

E. Questions:

1) Earl Spurgin: Membership of UCC is all subcommittee members? That would be a big committee!

No; working on how to get an optimally-sized committee. And optimal-sized subcommittees. This would put everything in the Provost's Office because Core is university-wide. Also need to work out what's the threshold for what gets voted on by full faculty and other issues.

2) Amy Wainwright: How does the Assistant Provost for Student Success fit in? On UCEP?

Certainly somewhere, since her presence would be important; still things to work, such as alignment with Handbook on voting/non-voting.

III. Peter Kvidera reporting on Core Committee discussions as to how to strengthen, make Core more efficient:

A. Effectiveness of Faculty Learning Committees? Faculty teaching EGC courses need to be part of an FLC but they haven't been meeting, not sure they are doing what we need to do in ensuring integration of disciplines.

1) Faculty teaching EGC courses work independently yet bring in integration by using their own interdisciplinary training, talking to other faculty members, inviting guest speakers.

2) So the Core Committee doesn't want to eliminate FLCs, but remove the requirement to participate in them to teach an EGC.

3) In part of a larger revamp of applications for Core courses (not the Coursedog one), would also ask for more information re: reading lists, other methodologies and how they're being integrated.

4) Vote was unanimous on Core Committee in favor of dropping the FLC requirement but is this a substantial enough change to warrant a vote of the full faculty?

Earl Spurgin: not substantial enough to be faculty vote; responding to what is in fact the case.

Rodney Hessinger: one of the learning goals for EGC courses is that they be integrative. The goal remains. Better to ask question of individual applicant if they are integrating and how. FLC was mechanism for achieving integration; it's not working, but EGC still asking for integration.

Brent Brossmann: agrees it's a procedural change.

IV. Jamie Sinutko (consultant from Detroit Mercy), Jackie Zera, and Mike Martin on the Nursing proposal:

(There have been difficulties with getting comments to work on Canvas, so that forum will remain open as well)

A. As per the proposal on Canvas, this would be a 3-year program, 60 credits in Core and pre-nursing, then 60 credits in nursing. It would start with the first cohort for the year of pre-nursing happening Fall 2022, then nursing courses would begin Fall 2023. It would be housed in Dolan Science Building (A202-203 reconfiguration for clinical work; plus on East side 2nd floor).

1) Jamie is the interim nursing director; she's faculty at Detroit Mercy, has started 5 nursing programs in Michigan, and has a son at JCU. We will need to hire a permanent nursing director.

2) After initial discussion, now comments and feedback, then faculty blessing, the proposal will undergo extensive scrutiny from the state, HLC, and the nursing accreditation body (Commission on Collegiate Nursing Education).

B. Questions:

1) Sara Schiavoni: part-time faculty would be substantial for this program. How has it gone recruiting part-time faculty to teach these courses?

Jamie: Ideally all classroom teaching is by full time nursing faculty with terminal degrees, but each semester of the three years will have experiences at hospitals, under the supervision of BSN/RNs working there. These part-time faculty/working nurses are not introducing new nursing concepts. It is not difficult to find nurses who are interested in this; already they are involved in patient education, interested in moving up career ladder in workplace. Sometimes they are supervising on own home unit. Have not had issues in past finding adjuncts.

Sara: But in the proposal, intro to biochemistry, for instance--would we be stretched too thin especially with retirements to have full-time faculty teaching this? The proposal indicates would need to be hiring part-time faculty for Philosophy, too, and perhaps others.

If we have enough growth, hiring full-time faculty would be ideal, but can't promise.

Sara: Will nurses be paid on same scale as academic part-time faculty?

Jamie: Nursing part-time faculty pay has to be competitive, match what making at bedside

Sara: Will nurses be working under different contracts?

Steve: No, same contract, as JCU faculty

2) Sheila McGinn: this is not a niche program; there are six competitors nearby. Why invest, if no niche? We could invest in better mission (community health). What other options were considered? Why not make an agreement with Ursuline, or buy them? We are forgetting CAS in all this.

Jamie: There is no specialization in a BSN--it's all generalist. Increase in high school grads interested in nursing in the past year; we also know there has been an interest and deep need; important area to serve.

Mike Martin: A nursing school has to want to sell. A cooperative program with Ursuline didn't make sense on a curricular or financial level. It's a big market. Just because there are competitors doesn't mean there's not a lot of room. There's growth of jobs, demand for nurses (especially with so many quitting); there's opportunity for students who are interested in cura personalis, well trained. It's good to see alums at the Cleveland Clinic, because we know they were well educated.

3) Jim Lissemore: Questions and concerns on financial side: The cover letter says Jamie has identified the strengths and weaknesses--what are the weaknesses?

Can't tell from document what the financial risks are.

Jamie: Information from health care workshops, did do a SWOT. One challenge is the heavy lifting of starting program, getting word out that there IS a nursing program here. Jamie can get back to Jim.

4) Simon: Do we have more than anecdotal evidence that students will come to JCU?

Jamie: It is qualitative evidence, because we don't have in system the data on number of inquiries.

Mike: This is the nature of the problem for any program we start, we don't have data on demand. We do have health care study indicating students are interested in coming to JCU for nursing--we ranked 2nd or 3rd out of 8 regional schools for students would choose us as a school if we had nursing.

Jamie: Eduvantis data (Simon: that's national evidence)

Steve: Eduvantis did an additional regional study on health care and nursing

George Lewandowski: It will be a richer experience here at JCU than in community of general nursing schools. If we don't offer that first-level training we won't have credibility in market for our strengths (community nursing, cura personalis). Initially, he was against, but now thinking we need to train our own nurses to gain credibility in market.

5) Rodney: Are we packaging financial aid, discount rate, since ongoing costs, salaries of nursing faculty are high. What's the pricing point?

Jamie: The sentiment is not to do a tuition differential.

Steve: But the discount rate could be lower.

Rodney: We have to do better with nursing on enrollment because costs are higher.

Mike: The plan assumes revenue starting in the third year

Steve: IF we pay up front, not with donations.

Questions still remain, but short on time, so Canvas discussion board will still be up through at least next Monday (CAP meets Tuesday); please post or send email to Mark or Chrystal.

V. Medora Barnes and Dan Fotoples (Title IX Coordinator) on Title IX and Borrromeo resolution:

A. Mariah Webinger brought a resolution to the Gender and Diversity Committee; Faculty Council is being asked to vote on it; wanted to raise broader awareness of it among rest of faculty. At the Faculty Council discussion it was noted that Borrromeo students are our students and that many people are following the different accounts in the news. Resolution is asking that everyone receives Title IX training and is aware of reporting responsibilities. We support a full investigation into student allegations.

B. Dan Fotoples: this was brought to his attention a couple weeks ago, referencing incident 2019 reported up through to seminary administrator, and diocese (not faculty); referred priest for mental counseling, and priest has agreed to be laicized.

1) According to an agreement from the late 1980s, Borrromeo faculty are JCU adjunct faculty and students are JCU students. So Dan is working on what our relationship to Borrromeo is, and where can we go from here.

2) He intends to initiate an MOU around Title IX, and JCU's expectations re: mandatory reporting for faculty--and to probably insist on some training, so faculty at Borrromeo aware of responsibilities to our students. He's hoping it won't take too long saying that their faculty responsible for same things as ours which is what is required federally.

C. One of Mariah's reasons for drafting a resolution was to support Borrromeo students and make us aware as students from Borrromeo might be in our classes.

D. Questions and Comments:

Paul Murphy: so Dan has been in communication with Borrromeo?

Dan: not yet, because some folks out of office due to emergency, but figuring out how best to do it.

Paul: any sense that seminary was surprised that title IX applied?

Dan: will be able to answer that question next week; also, can take Faculty Council vote on resolution as evidence to Borrromeo

Mark: the resolution has been modified since Faculty Council discussion last week

Jim Lissemore: thanks to Mariah and Gender and Diversity Committee for bringing this to our attention. (Dan Fotoples agrees.)

Faculty council vote taken on resolution: 17 yes, 0 no 0 abstentions

VI. Angie Canda for Rank Tenure and Promotion Committee re: a possible motion that COAD members need to be tenured and hold rank at or above the one requested.

A. This is both a question for future years of tenure/promotion cases, and a particular question for this year because dossiers are submitted already.

B. Currently, the practice in departments is that tenure and promotion committees are composed of those at or above the rank of the applicant. Additionally requirement for the new UTPC members is that they are all full professors. So the question is do we want to make a motion to require that anyone voting on tenure/promotion be tenured at/or above the rank of the applicant.

1) Jim Lissemore strongly supports; Earl Spurgin supports, and precedent from Boler when Karen Schuele recused herself while dean while associate, so in line with past practice at university

2) Joanna Garcia (said this in Faculty Council as well): COAD members voting as deans, not as faculty, so different. Not necessarily in Boler, but at other schools, there are corporate deans.

3) Angie: this would apply to anyone on COAD whether academic or corporate. There is no explicit requirement in the Handbook that deans be full professors, but likely that's presumed. Mark: is COAD even the appropriate body to vote, if it can have a corporate dean?

4) Joanna: Can't have extra requirement, beyond job duties, that they be full professors. Barbara D'Ambrosia strongly agrees; members of COAD are acting as deans, not as faculty, and must participate in CAD; prevents them from doing the job if additional requirement exists that should be full professor.

5) Sheila McGinn: We shouldn't even have to have this conversation. It's just a sign that we're devolving into corporate. The additional requirement is fine. The dean has to represent faculty to rest of the university and represent the best of the faculty -- so should have to have met qualifications as full professor. Karen was smart to recuse herself. This is an academic appointment; so the person needs to have academic credentials to fit appointment.

6) Paul Murphy: Department custom is at rank or above (HS anyway)--so would be anomalous not to have same principle at level for COAD.

7) Rodney Hessinger: What power is actually invested in COAD at this point? Doesn't UTPC now have ultimate authority? Mark: No, COAD and UTPC both submit recommendations, as do departments, to Provost. Rodney: How consequential is this, if it's one of three recommendations, and deans get to see things the others do not? Interims do happen, churn is reality.

Mark: we need to move this discussion to Canvas since we're at the time limit of the meeting.