

**Faculty Senate Meeting**  
**Friday, April 30, 2004**  
**SC 214, 3:00 p.m.**

- - - - -

Senators Present: Virginia Purtle, Quentin Kidd, Kelly Cartwright, Cathy Doyle, Harold Grau, Tracey Schwarze, Gary Whiting, Robert Winder, Rebecca Wheeler, Don Hicks, Peter Knipp, Dave Doughty, Lori Underwood, and Tom Berry.

Visitors Present: Tim Marshall and Christina Eggenberger

The meeting was called to order by President Purtle at 3:04 p.m.

- I. Minutes of the March 19, 2004 meeting were approved by voice vote.
- II. President's Report
  - Welcome to our new senator Walter Wymer from the School of Business. Special thank you to Bob Winder and Bob Gray who are rotating off of the Senate. You have both been thoughtful and productive senators who have carried your share and more of the workload of the Senate. We will miss you.
  - Thank you also to the other members of the executive committee: Lori Underwood, Quentin Kidd, Robert Winder, Peter Knipp, and past president Tim Marshall. You have all been a great help and have done much to make this year a pleasant and rewarding experience for me and I trust for the other senators as well.
  - Thank you also to the remaining senators. It has been a great year and I thank each of you for your many contributions. I do not think anyone has said no when you have been asked to take on an additional responsibility. This has been a very productive year in terms of resolutions and deliberations. I personally think that the Senate has continued to make much headway towards being a body that initiates actions rather than a body that only reacts to the actions of others. We have reacted when we have needed to and most of those reactions have been productive. Faculty members, faculty committees, or senators have initiated most of the actions of the Senate. This is a major change from a few years ago. I think this is a very healthy change for CNU faculty governance. My hope is that the Senate and other aspects of faculty governance will continue to strengthen as we move to the future.
  - I have a few items to report since the last meeting of the Senate:
    - i. The recommendations of the Senate for the Task Force curriculum proposal have been sent back to the Task Force for further consideration.
    - ii. The Board of Visitors will be meeting Saturday, May 7. Their agenda is full. Committees will meet on Thursday afternoon at 3:00 and 4:30.
    - iii. The Budget Committee is on call for when we receive our budget from the state. We have been working with hypothetical numbers to get estimates for the budget. All of the vice-

presidents have submitted their priorities to the budget committee.

- iv. All the committee elections have been held. Thank you again to the members of the nominations/elections committees.

### III. Committee Reports

- Elections Committee: Senator Grau briefed the Senate on how the plans for membership to the new technology committee were developing. Nothing has been finalized but the Elections Committee is trying to make sure that all parties are represented on the committee.
- Building Access and Security Ad Hoc Committee – Tim Marshall reported on the work on this committee. A resolution from this committee will be considered under New Business.
- University Ranking Committee – Senator Doughty gave the senate a Power Point presentation on the work of this committee. Senator Doughty reported that the committee has learned a great deal about how university ranking are put together and had identified one area (class sizes) where CNU could impact the ranking almost immediately. The committee will continue it work over the summer. Senator Doughty also reported to the Senate on a pilot study that will be conducted in the fall related to learning communities in one of the residence halls.
- The Nominations/Elections Committee reported a slate of officers for the next senate. The slate includes: Purtle (president), Underwood (vice-president), Schwarze (secretary), Hicks & Grau (at large). The election will take place under New Business.

### IV. Old Business

**Textbook Royalties (2003-2004: 11)** (second reading) – Senator Grau noted that despite the flood of commentary on campus e-mail about this resolution he is still supportive of it because he feels there are still valid reasons for it.

Senator Kidd reports having received petitions opposing the resolution with 47 faculty signatures on them.

Several senators spoke against the resolutions, noting either problems with enforcement, precedents it sets in a self-policing community of scholars, problems with compelling people to do something, or factual conflict in the resolution itself. A few senators spoke for the resolution.

Senator Doughty moved to send it back to committee to work on it some more. Senator Doyle seconded the motion. Several senators object to sending it back to committee preferring instead to vote it up or down. The motion to send it back to committee carried by a vote of 7-6.

**Mandatory Class Attendance on First Day of Classes (2003-2004: 16)** (second reading) – Senator Kidd moved to table the resolution, seconded by Senator Knipp. The motion failed 2-11.

There was general discussion both for and against the resolution.

Senator Schwarze called the question and Senator Underwood seconded the call. The resolution passed 11-2.

**Faculty Awards for Teaching, Scholarship, and Service (2003-2004: 17)** (second reading) – Senator Underwood moved and Senator Doyle seconded the resolution. The resolution was approved without discussion, 13-0.

**Process For Making Changes to General Education Requirements (2003-2004: 20)** (second reading) – Senator Doyle moved and Senator Kidd seconded the resolution. The resolution was approved without discussion, 13-0.

**Concentration in Indic Studies from Philosophy and Religious Studies Department** (second reading) – Senator Underwood moved and Senator Schwarze seconded the proposal. The proposal was approved without discussion, 13-0.

## VII. New Business

**Emeritus Status for Dr. Carl Colonna (2003-2004: 22)** – Senator Winder moved and Senator Underwood seconded the resolution. The resolution was approved without discussion, 13-0.

**Building Access and Security Ad Hoc Committee** – Tim Marshall presented a list of recommendations. The senate discussed the report for several minutes and noted concerns related to who would be responsible for buildings after hours and who would control master keys and lists of people allowed in to buildings after hours. Senator Underwood moved to send the report back to committee to ask them to clarify these concerns. Senator Cartwright seconded the motion and it carried, 13-0.

**Faculty Development Grant Applications (Spring 2004 Round)** – Senator Underwood moved to close the session and the motion seconded by Senator Cartwright. The motion carried and in closed session the Senate voted to recommend to the Provost a list of Faculty Development Grant awards for the Spring 2004 round. Senator Kidd moved to open the meeting, and the motion was seconded by Senator Cartwright and approved by voice vote.

**Election of Officers for 2004-2005 Academic Year** – The Senate elected the following officers for the 2004-2005 academic year:  
President: Virginia Purtle  
Vice-President: Peter Knipp  
Secretary: Tracey Schwarze  
At Large #1: Bob Hicks  
At Large #2: Lori Underwood

VIII. Other Items

**Rank in Time for Promotion from Associate to Full Professor -**

Senator Wheeler spoke about the industry standards for time in rank for promotion from associate professor to full professor. She plans to submit a resolution relating to this during the next academic year.

**Policy Guidelines for Outside Consulting** – Senators Wheeler, Winder, and Underwood plan to propose a policy regulating outside consulting during the next academic year.

**Policy Guidelines for Courses Involving Travel** – Senator Kidd asked the Senate to consider creating a committee to propose policy guidelines for courses involving travel. Currently the university has no such guidelines and as course-related travel increases a policy in place will reduce potential problems related to FTE allocations for such courses.

President Purtle thanked all senators for their service to the university during the academic year and adjourned the meeting at 5:10 p.m.

**Christopher Newport University**  
**Faculty Senate**  
**Resolution 2003-2004: 11**

**Whereas** the best interests of the University are served by reducing the appearance of conflicts of interest, and

**Whereas** the assignment of works authored that are sold for profit by an instructor for one or more of his/her classes presents a possible conflict of interest, and

**Whereas** a prohibition of receipt of any royalties or profits by such an instructor for sales generated from classes taught at Christopher Newport University would remove the conflict of interest, and

**Whereas** such prohibition would not preclude that instructor from receiving profits or royalties from sales to any and all other classes,

**Therefore Be It Resolved** that the University institute a policy whereby any instructor's net profits or royalties generated by the assignment of self-authored works to classes taught at Christopher Newport University be assigned to some third party designee that is fiscally independent of said instructor.

**Christopher Newport University**  
**Faculty Senate**  
**Resolution 2003-2004: 16**

**Whereas** it is the responsibility of students to attend all of their classes, including the first class meeting, and

**Whereas** many classes at CNU often have a number of students wanting to enroll in a class that exceeds the maximum enrollment limit (i.e., "waiting lists" are generated for many courses), and

\*[**Whereas** many students who intend to drop a class often do so at the end of the drop-add period, after a week of instruction has passed and thus in a practical sense it is too late for that student to be "replaced",] - \*this part may be unnecessary

**THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED** that CNU adopt a policy whereby any student who does not attend the first class meeting of the semester, and who has not previously notified the instructor about such absence, may (and should) be removed from the class roster by that instructor.

**Christopher Newport University  
Faculty Senate  
Resolution 2003-2004: 17**

**WHEREAS** Christopher Newport University's "primary focus is excellence in teaching, inspired by sound scholarship," and "As a state university we are committed to service that shapes the economic, civic, and cultural life of our community and Commonwealth" (2003-2004 Catalog, p. 8); and

**WHEREAS** ". . . the major responsibility of each faculty member is teaching, and while it is expected that those faculty members who serve at the rank of Instructor and Assistant Professor will regard teaching as their overriding primary responsibility, promotion . . . suggests not only sustained excellence in teaching, but also increased involvement in the faculty member's academic discipline, department, college, the University, and the community" (2003-2004 University Handbook, p. 73); and

**WHEREAS** the University does not currently have a reward system for faculty who are excellent teachers, have sound research, and/or outstanding service; and

**WHEREAS** faculty nominated for the SCHEV Outstanding Teaching Award are at a distinct disadvantage when they compete with faculty from institutions that have such awards;

**THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED** that the Faculty Senate at Christopher Newport University establish an ad hoc committee to study the need for and best way to administer an award system for faculty.

**Christopher Newport University**  
**Faculty Senate**  
**Resolution 2003-2004: 20**

**WHEREAS** the University Handbook is silent on how changes to general education or core curriculum requirements are to be made, and

**WHEREAS** the University Handbook fails to specify that both academic deans should be involved in general education or core curriculum changes, and

**WHEREAS** the University Handbook language does not clearly reflect the actual committees involved in reviewing curriculum changes,

**THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED** That the Senate, with the concurrence of the Undergraduate Curriculum Committee (3/24/04), recommends the following clarifications to the University Handbook, to be sent immediately to the Provost and included in next year's University Handbook review process.

**Suggested changes in bold**

Section IV Academic Regulations and Information

1. Roles
2. Criteria for Establishment of Academic Programs (Major Changes)
3. Criteria for the Reorganization and Discontinuance of Academic Programs (Major Changes)
4. Procedure for Major Changes to Academic Programs **and Changes to the General Education or Core Curriculum. All changes other than those listed in Section IV(5) are considered major changes.**

Timeliness of action is required of all participants to ensure that external deadlines and the needs of the University are met. In the absence of timely recommendations, the process continues. The review procedure cannot be terminated by a level preceding the one which initiated the process. For proposed changes in the undergraduate program, a department may petition the Undergraduate Curriculum Committee or the Faculty Senate to call for recommendations on a proposed changes which has been initiated at a lower level; for proposed changes in the graduate program, the petition must go to the Graduate Faculty Council.

Changes in the University's academic programs, **including general education or core curriculum changes**, initiated from within the University are effected after this procedure is followed, or a deviation therefrom is approved by the Provost. The Provost may prescribe reasonable timetables for the procedure in order to ensure timeliness of action.



- a. Step 1. Department Level. If a proposed change is initiated at the department level or involves an expansion or curtailment of the department's academic programs **or a change to its general education/core curriculum offerings**, the department reviews the change and forwards its recommendations and supporting evidence to the dean. **In the case of general education/core curriculum changes, the proposal should be sent to all academic deans (CLAS and School of Business).**
  - b. Step 2. College/**School** Level. Either upon receipt of the department's recommendation, a request from the Provost or at the Provost's own initiative, the dean refers the proposed change and department recommendation to the college faculty as a whole, or, if applicable, to an appropriate ad hoc interdepartmental body, **usually the CLAS Chairs and the School of Business Curriculum Committee**, for the purpose of reviewing the change and formulating its recommendation to the Dean. The Dean forwards **the recommendation of the interdepartmental body or the faculty as a whole, along with his or her** recommendation with accompanying evidence to either the Undergraduate Curriculum Committee or the Graduate Curriculum Committee, as appropriate.
  - c. Step 3. Curriculum Committee Level
  - d. Step 4. Faculty Level
  - e. Step 5. Provost Level
  - f. Step 6. President Level.
5. Procedure for Other than Major Changes to Academic Programs (Adding and Deleting Courses, Designating and Recertifying Writing Intensive Courses, Establishing Minors, and Making Internal Adjustments to Degree Programs)