

Minutes for CNU Faculty Senate Meeting
Friday, March 14, 2014
Harrison Room of the David Student Union

Senators present: Redick, Martin, Keeling, Connell, Selim; Barnello, Busch, Hasbrouck, Holland, Manning, Puaca, Winder.

Guest: Vice Provost Deiulio

Senator Thompson arrived at 3:08. Senator Hunter arrived at 3:39.

1. Call to Order at 3:04.

2. President's Report

President Redick noted that the agenda had changed from its publicized version, because Carol Safko had realized that the Senate did not need to confirm the Logical Reasoning Foundation courses. He informed the Senate that Provost Doughty has asked for a change in practice in dossier reviews next year: dossiers will be held in his office until after the Board of Visitors votes on tenure and promotion cases. He also noted that the Provost's office had made three changes to forms they use. The EVAL-3YR-CONV form was created to make a standardized form for the process of converting a faculty member on a one-year contract to a three-year term or to a probationary position. The EVAL-AR provides two new blanks for teaching load and merit percentages, so that reviewers have that information clearly in front of them when conducting the review. The Provost's office plans to add this to the EVAL6 as well.

Several senators questioned the new form's relationship to the Senate's previous discussions on criteria for annual reviews and the problems in weighting differing teaching loads. Senators inquired if the Provost had responded to the request for annual review criteria; President Redick said that the Provost had made an oral response that the criteria were in the handbook and on the EVAL 4. President Redick noted that he had not yet found the criteria there, however. Other senators asked who would fill in the top portion that defined the teaching load and the varying weights; they had concerns that faculty might not know the appropriate percentages for their teaching load. One Senator read the section on AR reviews in the Handbook, on p. 99, Section 12, that "The University EVAL-4 provides a list of activities to be considered in this review." Senators repeated their concerns from earlier meetings that the EVAL-4 was an inappropriate instrument for deans and chairs to be using for ARs, particularly for evaluating non-tenure-stream faculty, reiterating their concerns that the list of activities in the EVAL-4 is too vague, and more importantly that no amount of percentage weighting will erase the difference between the restricted and tenure-stream faculty when they are hired with different language for scholarly expectations but then judged by the same criteria. One senator pointed out that in his department restricted faculty were expected to do research; another rejoined that that was not the case in all departments and that institutionally CNU hasn't figured out if restricted faculty should have a research agenda. He argued that it is not just a matter of weights, but of what is the expected level of accomplishment in each category. Another senator observed that restricted faculty might, for example, be expected to maintain expertise thru conference attendance, but that is not in the EVAL-4 as a valued activity. When another senator pointed out that conferences might not work for some restricted faculty, such as music faculty, the senators discussed the need for each department to have its own set of criteria as options for professional

development. President Redick said he would put the issue of revising the EVAL-4 on the agenda for the next Senate meeting. He recalled that when the EVAL-4 was being derived that his department tried to come up with one, but was told by the administration that a departmental EVAL-4 didn't matter. He noted that recent candidates speaking in the Provost search had suggested that disciplinary requirements were best selected at the department level, however, by the experts in that discipline, and that the most important evaluation should occur at the department level rather than the university level. He suggested that senators talk to colleagues and get feedback, so that the Senate could discuss the role of the departmental EVAL 4 at the next meeting.

President Redick then returned to his report and the third of the form changes, in the EVAL-8. He noted that Provost Doughty was concerned that FRC votes are sometimes split on candidates, that the percentage of the split is forwarded to the Provost but not to the candidate, who only is told the overall result of the vote for the candidacy or against. Provost Doughty does not believe that it is fair to the candidates for the Provost to have information that they do not and wants transparency, thus the creation of a place on the form to record the FRC vote, though who voted how will still remain anonymous. One senator asked if the Provost had discussed this with the FRC; Vice Provost Deiulio said no, but reiterated the Provost's belief that in the name of fairness candidates should have access to full information. Several senators noted that candidates can't challenge or respond to FRC decisions if they don't know how the vote went; Vice Provost Deiulio agreed, and noted that if the FRC had significant reservations (such as a 5/4 vote in favor of the candidacy) that unsuccessful candidates would better understand reasons behind the Provost's final decision. Other senators observed that the DRC records its vote by name and that for the past three years the FRC has been required to explain why if its judgment differs from the DRC. One senator questioned what recording the split added, arguing that FRC members might vote unanimously yes, but each not feel strongly about it, or that the vote might be split with very strong feelings among the committee. Senators debated the question of whether requiring the tally of the vote might lead to lawsuits; others argued that given the momentous effect of tenure decisions on candidates' careers that transparency was more important. Vice Provost Deiulio agreed, noting that the Provost's office is arguing for transparency; that if the Provost can have that information then the candidate should have it, but that the FRC doesn't want to record its vote. Senators questioned the FRC's reasoning, noting that other levels offer this information and that a reason for the FRC being different was unclear. President Redick noted that the FRC is a faculty committee, so the Senate should tell them what it wants and expects. He suggested that the Senate put its opinion on record via a motion, and invite the FRC to respond at the next meeting. Senators then discussed whether the FRC should circle yes/no and sign their names, as the members of the DRC do. One senator who is on the FRC reported that the FRC had discussed this question and its members were aware that if they had a large minority dissent, then the provost can use that split vote to override the majority vote. Others counter argued that the Provost gets that information anyway, so the candidates should be privy to it too. Senators discussed the general purpose of the FRC, to assess the candidate at the university level, to check for red flags and make sure no violation occurred at the lower levels, and to ensure the DRC report and candidate fit within university wide expectations, as a counter to possible inflation on the departmental level. President Redick called for the Senate to make a motion if it wished to pursue the matter further for the next meeting. Senators debated whether, given that the FRC decision is frequently not unanimous, the committee should provide written feedback through the EVAL-8 form for their reasoning when the decision is not unanimous.

Motion 3/14/14.1 All FRC comments written, oral, electronic, or otherwise, shared with the provost must be shared with the candidate. Moved Bill Connell. Seconded Laurie Hunter. On table.

President Redick returned to his President's Report. He noted that we were going to bring Jill Kern in to discuss assessment, but too much was on the table for the one meeting. He also informed the Senate that Provost Doughty had chosen Blackboard over Canvas, for the reasons that Blackboard cut its price to be competitive with Canvas and that of those faculty who had piloted Canvas too few had bought into it as a superior system to justify the difficulty of shifting into a new system for the campus. He thanked Vice Provost Deulio for sending email to the faculty adjusting the dates for the teaching, scholarship, and service awards. He noted that the Provost search was well underway, and the positive effects of having invigorating ideas from outside candidates. He noted that the final candidate would be on campus the next week.

Old Business

3. Approval of the February Senate meeting minutes

3:45

Motion 3/14/14.2 Motion to approve the minutes from the February 7, 2014 meeting of the Senate electronically. Brian Puaca moved. Bill Connell seconded. Pass unanimously.

4. Vote on Provost's proposal to move dossier reviews to spring term

3:50

Senators discussed the proposal in detail. One senator reported that he had talked with his department, including all the junior faculty, and they were unanimously in favor of moving the review to spring term. He noted that he had initially been in favor of leaving, but had decided he believed that CNU should design the system to give candidates the best chance to get tenure, or best chance to find a position if they do not, and that shifting the review to spring would allow candidates the opportunity to take better advantage of last summer before their candidacy, to get scholarship accepted and get feedback on it. He argued that leaving the review date in the fall assumes the faculty members are not doing anything productive that summer beyond getting work under review, because if they submit the dossier right after the summer they can't get reviews for any work produced during the summer to include in the dossier. He believed that a spring term due date would allow faculty members to submit a stronger dossier because they would have more time to produce work toward tenure. Other senators countered the argument, saying that their junior faculty had said the extra semester would not be an advantage and feared that an extra summer might increase the already heavy expectations for scholarship. The fourth year review generally provides marching orders on what research is needed, and adding another summer's worth of work may in fact not help because the review process takes such a long time, sometimes up to a year. Therefore submitting scholarship in the summer before the candidacy doesn't necessarily help in terms of acceptances even for a spring dossier review, plus unsuccessful candidates lose their opportunity at the first job cycle. Other senators cited the difficulty of reworking the EVAL-6 and putting the final version of the dossier together over the ever-shortening winter break. Still others mentioned that a change this momentous should wait until a permanent provost was announced.

Motion 3/14/14.3 Motion to move tenure reviews from fall to spring term. Yes: Nathan Busch. No: Bill Connell, Robert Hasbrouck, Rachel Holland, Laurie Hunter, Kara Keeling, Linda Manning, Jamie Martin, Brian Puaca, Kip Redick, Raouf Selim, Jessica Thompson, Robert Winder. Abstain: Michelle Barnello. The motion failed.

5. Equity

3:56

Senators discussed the problem with the system that uses as a stated goal that the annual review scores for the university average out to a 3.0. The Senate discussed the reasons the Provost has stated lie behind this goal: to be able to reward those working hardest, because the higher the average, the less distinction can be made for those working hard. However, senators also discussed the problems behind achieving the goal in this way. One senator made the analogy that the system as it stands operates on the same principle as a seesaw. For any faculty member who gets a 4 and deserves it, the chair has to rate others lower simply because of the outlier—someone must be punished with a low score to reward another with a high score to balance the seesaw. He argued that the system needs a rubric to define what each number means for teaching, scholarship, and service. He also argued that statistically, there is little likelihood of every department having the same mean. He concluded that it is not a good system because someone must pay for someone else doing well. Other senators discussed the problems and effects of the current system. One noted that a small department with a high percentage of faculty working at a high level will have great difficulty trying to make the average work, though he also observed that perhaps at the college level, with a bigger unit, normalization might make more sense. Another senator rejoined that even large departments are not that big and could run into the same problem. Another senator noted that the system is very hard on new faculty members, who take time to get up to speed, get bruised by hard reviews whose low numbers are needed to make the average, and find it hard to bounce back. He made an analogy that if we transferred the system of evaluating faculty to evaluating students, we would be telling them that if a C average is required, then for one student to get an A another must get an F. Other senators agreed, noting that even in teaching two sections of the same class, faculty frequently notice substantial differences in overall performance. Senators then discussed what might be a better way to make distinctions, recognizing that distinctions are needed to divide the money for merit increases. Ideas included setting a rubric, evaluating performances, and figuring out money awards based on average that accrues from the rubric rather than artificially setting an average ahead of time; measuring in smaller increments to find the true mean; and ranking faculty. Senators also recalled that the system was put in place as a trial during the years when no merit pay was available, and that it deserved examination now that it has been used for a while. The Senate resolved to continue examining the matter next year.

New Business

6. Elections to Standing Committees

4:35

Vice President Martin went through the needs for the upcoming elections to standing committees.

- College of NBS committee nominations needed
 - One for Faculty Senate from any department (MUST BE TENURED)
 - One for University Curriculum Committee from any department (UCC) (may not be on LLC or UDC or FRC)
 - Two for Undergraduate Degrees Committee from any department (UDC) (may not be on

LLC or UCC or FRC)

- College of Arts and Humanities nominations needed
Four for Faculty Senate from any department (One restricted seat available – no more than one from the department of Music and no more than two from any other department)
Two for Faculty Grievance Committee (FGC) (MUST BE TENURED may not be on FHC or FRC)
One for Faculty Hearing Committee (FHC) (MUST BE TENURED may not be on FGC or FRC)
One for Faculty Review Committee (FRC) (MUST BE TENURED may not be on FGC or FHC or LLC or UCC or UDC)
One for Undergraduate Academic Status Committee (UASC)
One for Undergraduate Admissions Committee (UAC)
- College of Social Sciences nominations needed
One for Academic Technology Advisory Committee (ATAC)
Two for Faculty Grievance Committee (FGC) (MUST BE TENURED may not be on FHC or FRC)
One for Faculty Hearing Committee (FHC) (MUST BE TENURED may not be on FGC or FRC)
One for Undergraduate Academic Status Committee (UASC)
One for Undergraduate Curriculum Committee (UCC) (may not be on LLC or UDC or FRC)

Vice President Martin noted the need for someone from each college to gather nominations.

The Senate took a break at 4:43 and returned to session at 4:53.

7. Handbook changes

4:53

Senator Selim guided the Senate through the handbook changes, noting that each change in the Senate's copies of the proposals had its justification listed at the top of its page.

1. Change # 1-2. Vice Provost Deiulio noted that the writing task force has been headed by Mary Wright in her capacity as the University Writing Program Director. For assessment, it makes sense for the Writing Director to review Writing Intensive courses, not on their content but on their approach to writing. The University Writing Program committee will now become a standing committee, to screen courses before UCC and make recommendations to them. Senator Winder questioned why it should be a committee; Vice Provost Deiulio responded that it has been a committee, that it's job is too big for one person to do particularly now that it is taking on the assessment component that has not been done in the past and needs to be. **Moved Kara Keeling. Seconded Rachel Holland. Motion passed with Robert Winder abstaining.**
2. Change # 2-2. This change clarifies certification, responsibilities, management of grants and reallocates indirect funds. The reallocation will provide a small amount of funds directly to the PI for research and developmental-research activities. Raouf Selim noted that this proposal mostly has small wording changes but that the changes

- on f) (4) are significant, in giving 10% of the grant overhead to faculty, subtracting 5% each from Grant Administration and Departmental Research was noteworthy. Vice Provost Deiulio noted that this is intended to incentivize faculty. Senators agreed that it is beneficial that some of the money now benefits person who wrote grant. **Moved Kara Keeling. Seconded Jessica Thompson. Passed unanimously.**
3. Change # 3. The University Counsel has advised that she is not permitted to serve on a university committee since her role is to provide counsel and, possibly, legal defense. **Moved Kara Keeling. Seconded Bill Connell. Passed unanimously.**
 4. Change #4. The following change further specifies when IDEA surveys should be administered. Two changes were proposed: 1) administering the IDEA during one week rather than two, and 2) administering it during last the last two weeks of the semester. Raouf Selim suggested that the Senate could and might want to vote on the two issues separately. Vice Provost Deiulio noted that the change was proposed by the College of Social Science chairs, and that the Provost office's position was against the changes, preferring to set them aside for further study. She noted that a survey on the subject had split results, and that the Senate could choose to do nothing, or could choose a compromise, with a warning that if the changes were passed they could be protested. Several senators thought introducing this as a handbook change was an odd backwards way of proposing such a significant change in procedure. Senators debated the effectiveness of reducing the period of administration to a single week, with one noting that many students wait until the last minute to fill out the form anyway. One senator noted that faculty feel they can't give grades during the evaluation period, and a single week to administer it would not hamper them so much in giving grades.
 - **Motion to vote on the two changes separately. Moved Linda Manning. Seconded Michelle Barnello. Passed unanimously.**
 - **Senators voted on administering the IDEA during last two weeks: those in favor of the language of the change: Bob Winder. Those opposed: Michelle Barnello, Nathan Busch, Bill Connell, Rachel Holland, Laurie Hunter, Linda Manning, Jamie Martin, Brian Puaca, Kip Redick, Raouf Selim, Jessica Thompson. Abstain: Robert Hasbrouck and Kara Keeling.** The Senate thus rejected the change, with one in favor, ten against, two abstaining.
 - **Senators voted on the proposal to administer the IDEA for only one week. In favor of language to change to one week: Michelle Barnello, Nathan Busch, Bill Connell, Rachel Holland, Laurie Hunter, Kara Keeling, Linda Manning, Jamie Martin, Raouf Selim, Jessica Thompson, Jamie Martin, Bob Winder. Those opposed to the language to change to one week: Kip Redick, Brian Puaca. Abstaining: Bob Hasbrouck.** The Senate thus voted for the change, with twelve senators in favor of it, two against, and one abstaining.
- Vice Provost Deiulio noted that the Handbook goes to a lot of people, and the Senate acknowledged their vote as a recommendation. Senator Winder called for a point of order, checking that the last two weeks would not include exam week, and was assured that the such a change would exclude exam week.

The SEC informed the Senate that they agreed with changes #5-9, and the Senate agreed to vote on them as a block.

5. Change #5. The revisions to the description of the UAEC's charge reflect the changes that the new provost, the vice provost and the director of assessment are putting in place to strengthen the University's assessment system. The UAEC has not in the past conducted assessments of administrative units so the number of administrative members is being reduced to reflect this practice. The provost has asked the deans and assessment director to take responsibility for reviewing academic units' assessment records, so such review will no longer be a task of the UAEC. Rather, the committee will be tasked with an overall review of the University's assessment activities, such as the skills and knowledge that all graduating seniors, regardless of major, are to demonstrate.
6. Change #6. The first-year seminar and the common reading no longer exist, so the description of the LLC should reflect actual practice.
7. Change #7-2. This set of changes is intended to update and clarify language: a change to a correct URL, to identify the dean of enrollment services as the proper dean for FERPA questions, the addition of Third Week grades, the correct titles for the director of academic success and the faculty director of student success. One senator noted that the rationale on Third Week grades wasn't provided; Vice Provost Deulio noted that it should say Third Week Freshman Grades, and only for fall. President Redick asked if the Senate should recommend that it say Third Week Freshman Grades, and the Vice Provost said that change had been sent to Roark Mulligan but was not present in this version.
8. Change #8. The change is intended to clarify the language that stipulates that members of the Faculty Review Committee (FRC) "shall not participate in any review of a member of their own academic departments or of any faculty members on whose DRC peer evaluation group they have served during that academic year. FRC members are obliged not to participate in any review in which they have a conflict of interest." For clarity and convenience, the rule will now appear in steps 4 and 10 of the peer review process so that as faculty members consult the description of the peer review process they will have complete information at their fingertips.
9. Change #9. In the event of an Undergraduate Academic Degree Program being initiated or eliminated, the Dean will also submit a completed "Substantive Change Checklist" form (available: <http://provost.cnu.edu/accreditation.html>) to the Associate Provost. Vice Provost Deulio noted that this is a SACS requirement with which CNU is complying.

Motion to accept changes #5-9 with a recommendation on #7. Moved Brian Puaca. Seconded Laurie Hunter. Passed unanimously.

10. Change # 10-2. These changes clarify and update the undergraduate curriculum review process.
 - a. The required proposal forms and recommendations for changes to the academic curriculum will be submitted electronically through the provost's designee and moved through the paperless approval process as required.
 - b. The addition of the dean as a separate step to review proposed changes, accompanying evidence and recommendations, who will then forward a recommendation to the Undergraduate Curriculum Committee. One senator

questioned whether this suggests that only departments can initiate new programs, and President Redick assured him that was not the case, and that later stages in the process can disagree.

- c. The proposal reflects the changes passed earlier in the year for the two new Liberal Learning Foundation in Formal and Informal Reasoning and in Economic Modeling and Analysis. The Senate noted that Step 3 should say Liberal Learning Council, not Undergraduate Curriculum Committee and that the “NOTE: For all the following curriculum review processes (3d-9)” should say (4d-9), not (3d-9).
- d. Dean’s step inserted again, as in #10b.
- e. Corrects the link for the specific criteria and objectives and proposal form for including courses within the Liberal Learning Core.
- f. 5. Cleans up language, adds in the step for deans’ review and the new University Writing Program committee.
- g. Small changes to the Procedure for Minor Changes to Existing Courses: the SEC recommends approval of these changes.
- h. This change concerns the Procedure for Deleting Courses courses. President Redick read the section, noting that a. and the second sentence in b. are additions to the Handbook: Courses are deleted from the University's curriculum:
 - a. The deletion is approved by the academic department, the appropriate academic dean, and the provost. The following committees review and may list concerns: the Liberal Learning Council (for Courses that are part of the Liberal Learning Core Curriculum), the Undergraduate Curriculum Committee or the Graduate Council (as appropriate) via the UCC. A *Change to an Existing Course Form* must be posted to the electronic curriculum tracking process for the dean and the provost to review and approve.
 - b. If a course is not offered within three consecutive calendar years and such deletion is not annulled by the dean.

President Redick noted that degrees are approved by SCHEV, but they can have different majors under them.

Motion to accept changes in #10. Moved Linda Manning. Seconded Kara Keeling. Passed unanimously.

- 11. Change #11. This section concerns changes to the election of department chairs. The proposed change specifies that “All full-time, salaried faculty holding restricted, probationary or tenured appointments in the department at the time of the election are automatic electors” rather than allowing only tenure-stream faculty to vote, as previously. In addition, the change would allow “part-time (not adjunct)” department members to vote if the majority of the faculty in the department vote for them to have that privilege. Senators debated this change, with some arguing to let departments decide whether to let restricted and part time faculty vote, and others arguing that such an approach was unequal, with some restricted faculty enfranchised and others not. The former argued that faculty members who would not be at the school in the future would get to vote for who was chair; the latter argued that was the case with tenure stream faculty already and that denying the right to vote created second-class

- faculty and gave a green light to prejudices against them. **Senators voted on the proposal to enfranchise restricted faculty across the university in the elections of department chairs. In favor of the language to enfranchise: Laurie Hunter, Kara Keeling, Linda Manning, Jamie Martin, Brian Puaca, Kip Redick, Raouf Selim, Jessica Thompson. Against: Michelle Barnello, Nathan Busch, Bill Connell, Rachel Holland, Bob Winder. Abstaining: Bob Hasbrouck. The motion carried with eight for the change, five against, and one abstaining.**
12. Change #12. The changes in this section pertain to changes in recruiting and hiring. The proposed changes were minor, mostly switching “may” to “will.” The one significant change was adding background checks of candidates into the Handbook. **Moved Kara Keeling. Seconded Linda Manning. Passed unanimously.**

The SEC recommended voting on Changes #13, 15-17 as a block, then returning to examine Change #14 individually. The Senate accepted the recommendation.

13. Change #13. This change concerns the unscheduled review of tenured faculty. The change proposed would add submitting the two-year plan for professional growth and improvement to the dean, who will evaluate it in accordance with the expectations of the college and the University, then sign and return it to the evaluatee. The evaluatee’s peer review dossier the next year should include the plan and an explanation of how s/he is meeting their goals. Senators inquired as to what happens if the evaluatee gets back on track, and Vice Provost Deulio answered that they then return to a regular review pattern.
14. Change #14. The Senate agreed to return to this change later.
15. Change #15. The proposed changes have added a procedure by which colleagues on a 3-year contract may apply for renewal and clarified the deadlines. The faculty member may apply for a renewal of the three-year contract in the fifth semester of a three-year contract. Candidates request the renewal of a three-year contract by writing a memo (of no more than five pages) justifying the request based on the prior two years’ work. They should send the memo to the department chair and dean, copying the vice provost.
16. Change #16. Faculty have asked whether they need to seek approval even for outside professional activities of a short duration. With this policy change, the Provost’s Office seeks to establish a threshold below which faculty do not need to seek approval. The changes propose are that “Prior approval for outside compensated employment that exceeds \$1,000 per semester must be obtained from the provost. Any compensated work that would involve missing classes must also be approved by the provost.”
17. Change #17. These changes allow all faculty members to propose courses for the Honors program and better reflect the current practices in the program. Vice Provost Deulio noted that Honors Director Jay Paul sometimes has difficulties finding faculty to teach courses, and that while anyone can apply they aren’t Honors faculty until they are teaching in the program, plus the Provost’s oversight has been inconsistent. The changes put into current practices into place officially. When senators questioned the reason for cutting the UCC out of the process, she explained that the UCC doesn’t meet over summer when course approval is needed. Senators discussed the issue of whether there should be a separate process, whether it makes more sense

to use the one overseeing body of the UCC rather than having multiple bodies doing the same kind of work and the use of course shells. Some senators argued that the course shells for honors courses diverge a lot more than course shells within a discipline. Other senators responded that the Honors shells mirror the Areas of Inquiry, and that the UCC approved the Honors curriculum. A senator counter argued that such approval didn't mean all Honors courses to infinity. Another senator responded that that was a good point, but there is a consistent shortage of Honors classes, and requiring UCC approval every summer would make matters much worse.

- **The Senate voted in favor of Changes #13, 15, and 16 unanimously.**
- **The vote on Change #17: Those in favor: Michelle Barnello, Bill Connell, Bob Hasbrouck, Rachel Holland, Laurie Hunter, Linda Manning, Brian Puaca, Jessica Thompson. Those against: Nathan Busch, Jamie Martin, Kip Redick, Raouf Selim, Bob Winder. Abstention: Kara Keeling. The vote passed nine in favor, five against, one abstaining.**

Senator Manning left at 6:05 p.m.

14. Change #14. Distinguished professors may waive their annual review at their discretion. Currently, it is not clear whether they would be eligible for merit pay or how such merit pay would be calculated. The Handbook proposed the following change: "For the purpose of determining merit pay, distinguished professors who elect to waive the Annual Review will receive the merit score of their most recent AR for one year, after which they will receive the average merit score of the University." Senators observed that if distinguished professors waive their review, they get no merit score from their deans. The senators noted that the vote is not about whether distinguished professors can waive their reviews, but simply the basis on which merit reviews can be conducted. Most senators agreed that merit award cannot and should not be given without a record, so that if distinguished professors exercise their right to waive review (potentially indefinitely) then they are not entitled to merit raises. If they wish to be considered for merit awards, then they should not waive their review for the period.

The vote on Change #17: Those in favor of the proposed language changes: Bob Winder. Those against: Michelle Barnello, Nathan Busch, Bill Connell, Bob Hasbrouck, Rachel Holland, Laurie Hunter, Kara Keeling, Jamie Martin, Brian Puaca, Kip Redick, Raouf Selim, Jessica Thompson. The vote failed, with one in favor, twelve against.

President Redick proposed moving Agenda items 8-10 (Office door regulations, Board of Visitor reports, Liaison reports) to the April meeting.

8. **Motion to Adjourn. Moved Laurie Hunter. Seconded Bill Connell. Passed unanimously.** The Senate adjourned at 6:27 p.m.

Addendum: Approval of the minutes for the February 7, 2014 Faculty Senate meeting was conducted electronically on February 14-18, 2014. Passed unanimously.