

JOHN CARROLL UNIVERSITY
Minutes of Faculty Forum Meeting
Thursday, November 18, 2004
LSC Conference Room

Ernie Dezolt, Chair
Paul Lauritzen, Vice Chair
Yemi Akande, Secretary

Call to Order: The Chair called the meeting to order at 12:10 p.m.

Invocation: The Chair offered insights from Gandhi's seven blunders of the world that lead to violence.
Fr. Tim Shannon (Vice President of Development and Alumni Relations) offered prayer.

Review of minutes: The minutes were approved as presented.

Announcements:

- History of Forum meeting minutes are posted on Faculty Forum website.
- The Forum will be hosting two special meetings:
 - Jon Ivec's report on November 11th from 3:00 p.m. - 4:30 p.m.
 - Vivaldi Partners (marketing firm hired by the Institution on recommendation from the Marketing committee), will be on campus on Dec. 9th, to discuss marketing plans and to solicit input from Faculty and Administration.
- Proposed Faculty Forum amendments will not be postponed until early spring given dissenting comments. The Chair will disseminate these comments before further discussion.
- JCCI Ad Hoc Committee has held its initial meeting. Francis Ryan (English) will chair; David Ewing will provide relevant information to the committee. The charge of the committee is to determine how JCCI can be handled in a more transparent manner.
- Dr. Karen Gygli (Communications) announced that a 5-person search committee would be formed to commence search for Director of Catholic Studies. Two faculty members, one from Religious studies and one at large are to be elected. Nominations are due, Friday, December 3rd, 2004

Business:

- **Faculty Tenure Presentation by Dr. Mark Treleven, Chair Rank, Tenure and Service Committee**
Dr. Mark Treleven, Chair, Rank, Tenure and Service Committee gave a presentation on matters relating to the committee charge. The Chair of the Forum

prefaced Dr. Treleven's presentation by referencing Fr. Glynn's (President) comments that a discussion on University-wide tenure committee be addressed at JCU.

Background

- Faculty concerns on the contribution a dean out his/her discipline could contribute in the evaluation process
- Father Glynn supports establishment of such a committee
- JCU the only AJCU institution without some type of faculty tenure committee above the department level
- 1½ year ago, RTS asked to study issue
- Only studying the tenure review process "above" the department level
- The decision may well be to maintain the status quo

The Process

- Tenure processes of ~2 dozen "comparative" schools reviewed
 - Selected through
 - AJCU
 - CUPA
 - Committee agreement
- RTS identified several key aspects of the process and a multitude of possible sequences of decisions

Current Status

- RTS has reached a point where we need input from the faculty as a whole
- RTS is *not* proposing any particular model at this point

Key Aspects of the Tenure Review Process

- Level at which P/T Committee is established
- Sequencing of review process steps
- Composition, selection, and role of the committee
- "Weight" that each step carries
- "Openness" of the process

Levels Under Consideration (for Committee above the Dept.)

- Committee of Academic Deans (COAD) – Current model
- University-level Tenure Committee (ULTC)
- "Division"-level Tenure Committee (DLTC) – "Division" not necessarily corresponding to our current five review process

Current Procedure

- Departmental Committee (starting point for all scenarios) → COAD
- COAD → AVP
- AVP → President
- President & Board make final decision (common to all scenarios)

Dr. Treleven then presented the following thirteen already offered for consideration.

1. DC → Dean → AVP → ULTC → Pres
2. DC → Dean → ULTC → AVP → Pres
3. DC → DLTC → Dean → AVP → Pres
4. DC → Dean → DLTC → AVP → Pres
5. DC → (Dean & DLTC) → AVP → Pres
6. DC → COAD → ULTC → AVP → Pres
7. DC → COAD → AVP → ULTC → Pres
8. DC → ULTC → COAD → AVP → Pres
9. DC → COAD → DLTC → AVP → Pres
10. DC → COAD → AVP → DLTC → Pres
11. DC → DLTC → COAD → AVP → Pres

“Bonus” Scenarios:

12. DC → DLTC → Dean → AVP → Pres
13. DC → ULTC → Dean → AVP → Pres

Remaining Steps in RTS’s Process

- *If* the faculty deems this issue worthy of future consideration, we need to:
 - Reduce the scenarios to a more manageable number and survey faculty
 - Open hearings
 - Faculty Forum discussion
 - Vote

Following Dr. Treleven’s presentation, the Chair encouraged faculty who had questions to forward comments to him. This was followed by a series of questions from faculty, staff and administrators in attendance.

Dr. Jack Soeper asked if it is possible to establish principles and priorities or if the committee can come up with rank ordering of priorities. Dr. Treleven noted that this has already been taken into consideration with the current models presented. Dr. Larry Cima reminded the Forum that a similar battle was fought in the 1980s because some were apprehensive of a faculty out of their discipline evaluating them. He stated that he felt that the Deans are more knowledgeable and decisions regarding tenure should rest with the Deans.

Dr. Brent Brossmann pointed out that part of the impetus for this review was based on the fact that Fr. Glynn (President) was criticized by the North Central Commission for not involving faculty in the tenure process review. The work of the Rank, Tenure and Salary Committee is to ensure that faculty plays a greater role in the tenure process.

Dr. Val Flectner, (Biology) asked two questions, first, if a procedural audit of tasks will address if departments are following the process laid out and second, are their other tasks

that University levels committee will engage in? Dr. Trevelen noted that yes they are verifying that appropriate communication is communicated.

Dr. Marc Lynn cautioned that it is important as we engage in this process, to think carefully, in terms of the short-term ramifications. Dr. Flectner also pointed out that it is important to consider how the school of business will be impacted in the tenure process. Dr. Treleven noted this will be taken into consideration.

Dr. Bob Kolesar (History) asked if RTS committee has given any consideration to how the tenure committee would be involved in first year versus third year review. Dr. Treleven acknowledged that this will also be taken into consideration in their discussions but as of yet, no formal discussion has taken place.

The Chair thanked members of the RTS for work conducted in the past year and a half and pointed that this is an endless conversation that precedes the formal process of holding open hearings before it comes to a vote. He welcomed once again, any questions, comments or concerns related to this matter. He asked that additional comments or questions be forwarded to him via e-mail.

Marketing Update

Fr. Tim Shannon, Vice President of Development and Alumni Relations provided a status update on matters relating to the Marketing Committee. The president's charge to the committee is to "assist the University Planning Group and the entire university community in achieving strategically the goals we have set for ourselves in the University's strategic plan." Following recommendation by the Marketing Committee to the President and Vice Presidents, Vivaldi Partners, a marketing strategy company based in New York was retained to provide consulting services related to developing an integrated marketing plan for the university.

The main marketing objectives include:

- Increase number of qualified applicants for undergraduate admissions in particular with recruits from targeted areas outside Northern Ohio.
- Increase qualified local applicants to graduate programs within the Greater Cleveland market.
- Engage faculty and stakeholders in "marketing the mission" and brand to internal and external audiences.
- Increase alumni and benefactor involvement and giving.
- Expand visibility, recruitment and partnerships of John Carroll University faculty and graduates with employers, institutions and the local community.

Following the hiring for Vivaldi Partners Fr. Glynn convened a marketing steering committee to work with the firm. This committee included Dr. Akande (Communication) and Mr. Patrick Rombalski (Vice President for Student Affairs), members of the original Marketing Committee. Other members include: Dr. Mary Beadle (Dean of the Graduate School), Tom Fulton (University Web Developer), John Gladstone (Associate Academic Vice President Enrollment Services), Fr. Howard Grey (Assistant to the President for

Mission and Identity), and Mr. Michael Merriman (JCU Board of Directors, Chair, Development Committee).

The current length of engagement with Vivaldi Partners is for three months concluding on February 17th, 2005. Fr. Shannon noted that this is a discovery process that is highly collaborative that would include focus groups and phone interview with diverse constituents. He also mentioned that the Marketing Steering Committee has met with members of the original Marketing Committee to interface and help with their expertise.

Following the interviews with various constituents, Vivaldi Partners should have completed data collection by the end of the term and while we are on vacation, they will distill their findings for presentation in Spring 2005.

Following Fr. Shannon's presentation, there were questions from the floor of the Forum as to whether non-traditional students/continuing education students will be included in the interviews. He responded that there is ongoing discussion to figure out the mechanics of including other constituents. There were questions about rescheduling interview times due to conflict in schedules. Fr. Shannon asked that those who needed to reschedule should contact him via Sue Buhling. Dr. Mark Falbo (Director, Center for Community Service) asked if his office will be included in the interview process. Fr. Shannon said, yes that the piece is being broadened.

The Chair asked if Fr. Shannon had a sense of when the information collected will be shared with faculty and administrators at large. Fr. Shannon noted that there is still discussion how best to share this information but once a process is in place, the information would be shared.

The Chair thanked Fr. Shannon and encouraged faculty to e-mail question, comments and concerns to Fr. Shannon via Sue Buhling at SBuhling@jcu.edu.

Miscellaneous Issues

The Chair opened the floor for any other issues that needed to be addressed by the Forum.

Dr. Carl Spitznagel (Mathematics and Computer Science) commented on the recent zero raise for faculty, and noted that a review of the university phone book revealed a total of 711 people, of which only 254 are faculty. This suggests that administrators and staff outnumber the faculty by almost two-to-one, and that perhaps this warrants a study by the forum. The Chair asked Dr. Spitznagel to e-mail him so the Faculty Forum Executive Committee can assess this situation and decide on how to proceed.

Dr. Soeper also asked that perhaps the Forum should conduct an investigation on "head rolling" and who will be leaving JCU given the financial constraints. The Chair pointed out that the bigger issue is that we need a class of 780. Dr. LaGuardia pointed out the 780

class is not the goal for the incoming class as it is the budgeted number and it is on this number that the budget is based on.

Dr. Kolesar asked if the zero salary raise affected all staff. Dr. LaGuardia responded that it affected all staff.

Dr. Gerald Weinstein (Accountancy) brought up the issue of cell phones in the classroom and asked if it is worthwhile to develop policy about its usage. Once again, the Chair asked that he send him an e-mail and that he would bring this issue up with the Faculty Forum Executive Committee.

The Chair adjourned the meeting at 1:23 p.m.

Minutes prepared by Yemi S. Akande, Secretary Faculty Forum