

Present: Medora Barnes, Cecile Brennan, Rebecca Drenovsky, Jeffrey Dyck, Tina Facca-Meiss, Margaret Farrar, Peggy Finucane, Penny Harris, Matthew Johnson, Daniel Kilbride, Anne Kugler, Graciela Lacueva, Kathy Lee, Kathleen Manning, Maria Marsilli, Pam Mason, Sheila McGinn, Phil Metres, Keiko Nakano, Mike Nichols, Tamba Nlandu, Mindy Peden, Martha Pereszlenyi-Pinter, Cathy Rosemary, Debby Rosenthal, Michael Setter, Barb D'Ambrosia for Paul Shick, Andy Welki, Sheri Young

M. Pereszlenyi-Pinter – Moved to approve the minutes for the January 24, 2017 meeting,

R. Drenovsky, seconded, approved – all in favor.

1. **M. Farrar** – Welcome and introduction of Barb D'Ambrosia discussion regarding the restructuring of University Committees.
 - B. D'Ambrosia – Began with an explanation of the restructured committees proposed by the Strategic Plan. They include, Committee on the Student Learning Experience, Committee for Resource Allocation and Prioritization, Committee on Administrative Policies and Programs, and Committee on Academic Policies and Programs. The goal is to improve collaborative decision making. The committees will have representation from administration, faculty, and students. One goal for the restructure is to condense multiple committees into fewer high level committees.
 - S. McGinn – Questioned if this reorganization will affect Faculty Council committees?
 - B. D'Ambrosia – Responded that there has not been a recommendation to reorganize faculty council committees.
 - T. Nlandu – Wondered where will the time come from for additional meetings?
 - B. D'Ambrosia - Responded that better planning and arrangement, as well as work being done by current committees, will assure that there is no increase in meeting times.
 - T. Nlandu – Asked if this group is meant to replace CAP?
 - B. D'Ambrosia – Responded in the negative but there is hope that there will be a division of labor. Also, there will be members of CAP sitting on these committees and they will offer support.
 - S. McGinn – Emphasized that in terms of a restructuring, the litmus test will be to see if it is well defined because faculty will not give up control of the curriculum.
 - B. D'Ambrosia – Assured that faculty will not be asked to give up responsibility and authority over the curriculum.
 - P. Harris – What are your concerns?
 - B. D'Ambrosia – Responded that her concerns center on change and the hope that this new structure will set a good direction.
 - M. Setter – Will you be asking for volunteers?
 - M. Farrar - Yes

2. **M. Farrar** – Clinical Faculty Proposal, handout circulated: *Draft Proposal to Amend the John Carroll University Handbook to Include the non-tenurable rank of Clinical faculty among Recognized Faculty Ranks*. The results of last year's program reviews gave the following observations/recommendations to the Administration.

- A. There is an absence of a University wide Tenure and Promotion committee.
- B. There is poor access to data.
- C. There is a lack of structural support for IDP.
- D. There is a lack of coordination between Alumni.
- E. There is a lack of clinical faculty.

M. Farrar con't – Stated that these APR recommendations were presented to the university leadership and it was determined that in order to position us better, we will need to approve clinical faculty. An Ad Hoc faculty working group which includes Pam Mason, Rebecca Drenovsky, Mike Nichols, Ce Ce Brennan, Martha Pereszlenyi-Pinter, Peggy Finucane, and Walter Simmons, has been formed to work on the clinical faculty report.

C. Brennan – Stated that this is a good idea if the university wants to grow professional programs. When the need arises, it is a good plan to give the departments the ability to make the decisions. [Forbes Financial Grades](#) report gives JCU a grade B, and in order to stay competitive, we need to have the flexibility to do things differently, to think outside of the box.

R. Drenovsky – Reported that the BL positions that are designated as staff are not being evaluated properly. Indicated that she has received feedback that these staff persons feel disenfranchised.

M. Farrar – Agreed that this was absolutely true. The most common complaint was a feeling of disenfranchisement due to their role as staff/quasi faculty.

Additional concerns and questions from Chairs:

- Professional staff feel that they have no voice despite involvement in department programming and recruitment.
- Seasoned clinicians may not be interested in tenure.
- Should voting rights be granted to those who may possibly not be here for the long haul?
- Should one year contracts be offered?

S. McGinn – Noted that a proposal for clinical faculty has been brought for consideration in the past and many had supported it. Tenure guarantees academic freedom, and the current political environment does not allow free discourse. Suggested a proposal that allows for the *possibility* of tenure? Those who have different technical abilities would have difference standards for tenure.

G. Lacueva – Suggested a title of “Professor of Practice.” A proposal would need separate items with explicit duties and expectations.

A. Kugler – Added that if crafted explicitly, the proposal may yield better circumstances than tenure track.

P. Finucane – Added that there should be an expectation to stay active in their field of expertise. Reported that 3 CO concentrations are at a disadvantage for lack of practitioners.

R. Drenovsky – Recounted that when she has talked to people in these positions they often say that tenure is not important to them, feels that it is important to keep in mind not to force people to do what they do not want to do.

P. Mason – Acknowledged that the process is complicated. Clinical faculty are becoming the norm with the development of professional programs. Gonzaga University is working hard to develop rubrics to compare apples to apples. This proposal does not yet address all of the issues.

M. Farrar – Recognized that there is a benefit to being late to this process. The University is not so unique an institution that this would not work. We need to pick for our contextual system.

S. McGinn – Responded that the argument is not about clinical faculty, the argument is what is the rationale for this? Why not exclude or negotiate on tenure?

Additional comments, concerns:

- The academic freedom aspect for faculty of tenure protects faculty when they speak against the university.
- Will previous service count toward tenure? This would need to be decided in advance. Needs clarification.
- We need a more flushed out proposal. Currently has the feel of being asked to write a blank check.
- Faculty needs more input at the front end. The goal is to be collaborative.
- Offer contracts and different pathways to tenure.

M. Farrar - Stated that academic freedom is a thing that needs exploration. How would it be written contractually? Clinical Faculty option could include multi-year contracts with 3-5 yr. probation. This could give people security without tenure.

R. Drenovsky – Preferred a contract probationary period of one year with potential for a 3-year contract. Currently Clinical professionals are at will employees.

T. Nlandu – Questioned if the benefits would be the same as for staff? Would we need to move into a new category?

P. Mason – Responded that clinical faculty would have faculty benefits and faculty salaries taking into account the nature of their work. Their status would be faculty with voting rights.

M. Farrar – Requested that chairs take the draft proposal back to their departments to discuss the addition of clinical faculty.

P. Mason – Concluded that she will follow up with her group and articulate the Chairs' suggestions. The Ad Hoc faculty group will take it to the handbook committee meeting at the end of the month and hopefully have a vote by the end of term.

Meeting Adjourned: 5:01 pm