

**Meeting Agenda for the 2012-2013 Faculty Senate  
Madison ROOM of the DSU  
February, 8, 2013  
3:00PM-6:00PM**

Present Puaca, Adamitis, Martin, Manning, Depretis, Weiss, Redick, Bardwell, Connell, Wang, Selim, Barnello, Keeling

Absent: Hunter, Zestos (excused Sabbatical),

Guests: Jennifer Asselin, Vice Provost Laura Deiulio

**1. Call to Order 3:04**

**2. Welcome to Guests: Jennifer Asselin, Virginia Humanities Conference/John Hoaglund Undergraduate Conference**

President Bardwell introduced Jennifer Asselin, a student who was invited to inform the Senate about the upcoming Undergraduate Research Conference, named in honor of Professor John Hoaglund, which will be held on CNU Campus along with the Virginia Humanities Conference. Ms. Asselin is working with CNU faculty to organize the conference which will be occurring beginning on 15 March 2013. Ms. Asselin is also President of Phi Sigma Tao and has presented her research at the Virginia Humanities Conference before. She has been accepted to Graduate School at The Ohio State University and will begin her work there in the fall 2013 semester after her graduation. President Bardwell and the Faculty Senate thanked Ms. Asselin for her updates and congratulated her on her successes. She left the meeting at 3:07.

President Bardwell then made an announcement out of order to say that she had also invited Dean Kevin Hughes to address concerns raised by the SEC regarding Handbook Change #12

**3. Approval of Minutes January**

President Bardwell then moved the meeting to affirm the January minutes approved electronically by the Senate. Senator Weiss called for a vote, seconded by Senator Redick. There was no discussion.

**VOTE:**

In favor: Martin, Depretis, Weiss, Redick, Bardwell, Connell, Wang, Selim, Barnello, Keeling

Opposed: None

Abstentions: Manning, Adamitis, Puaca

**4. Senate President's Update/Report**

President Bardwell then gave her report to the senate.

She began with an update on her conversations with the Provost. In the works, according to the President, the Provost has developed a plan to begin to address the issue of Salary Compression at the University that has become an increasing problem in the past five years when there have been no raises for faculty. Salary compression occurs when faculty salary remain stagnant for continuing faculty and thus fall relative to the salaries of those recently hired whose compensation is set by the market. President Bardwell reported that in March the Provost hopes to announce to the faculty the plan which she said was separate from the anticipated raise promised by the Governor and which may be approved by the General Assembly that will be allocated to faculty in July. President Bardwell also said that in her

conversation with President Tribble regarding faculty compensation that he expressed concern about the Affordable Care Act and its potential to add uncertainty to State budgeting in ways that may limit the ability of the General Assembly to act to increase salaries. There is also concern that the Senate go forward with its plan to survey the faculty on the ways in which the potential raise might be allocated to at least provide a faculty perspective in the administrative decision process. Senator Martin and his subcommittee have developed a survey and will continue make a decision as to when or even whether they plan to administer it to faculty.

President Bardwell then reported the SEC had met twice in advance of this meeting to discuss various issues with the Provost and to go through the Handbook changes that will be considered in this meeting.

President Bardwell has no report for the Faculty Senate of Virginia

President Bardwell did report on the Faculty Senate budget and stated that our bottom line is still healthy, but observed that at the most recent meeting in the Brower room with the Provost and President, the Senate paid for the catering. We anticipate another meeting with the Provost and President and will plan to host that as well and provide the catering. President Bardwell also suggested inviting faculty to attend the meeting with the President and Provost in recognition of the increasing size of the faculty, some of whom might not be familiar to the President.

An issue regarding the University Policy regarding the Family Medical Leave Act, which allows for University Employees to ask for time off in the event of a medical crisis or the birth of a child, has been raised by faculty to members of the Senate. Apparently, some faculty who anticipate having children in the coming years have observed that the policy does not apply uniformly and is instead applied on a case by case basis. Senators expressed their desire to see a uniform policy that would allow faculty to know what they might expect from the university when they ask about family and medical leave. Other Senators observed that FMLA only requires 12 weeks of unpaid leave and guarantees that an employer cannot dismiss an employee after this period of unpaid leave without some other cause. The University policy generally provides paid leave for up to a semester and in some instances has spread the leave over a whole year with course reductions in each term. The policy, therefore, seemed generous as it is and that the possibility exists that if the University were to put a policy in place in the handbook it might draw the scrutiny of those who might see it as an overly generous benefit. Other Senators, however, wanted some kind of policy that promoted equity (for morale) and also enabled faculty at all levels to understand what they might expect. Senators also observed that the policy was in the handbook as recently as 2007 under Provost Summerville, but apparently the language of that policy was removed. President Bardwell then read from the Handbook (Section xii, 6, b. 1-2, pp. 105-6) which simply explains the obligation and purpose of the FMLA, but leave it up to the University to decide how to apply the policy. Because of this flexibility, the University has the option to not provide any accommodation for events that happen over the summer when faculty are not under contract. According to the Provost, who reported this to the SEC the previous Monday, the University is only obligated to provide for six weeks of leave (paid or unpaid) if the event occurs when faculty are not under contract. This means it only complicates matters provided that the event occurs late in the summer. Senators observed that this kind of policy

would disadvantage many who have family to care for or who have recently become parents simply because of the accident of timing. Senators also asked if the FMLA would allow faculty to negotiate terms of the leave with the Provost. Such a possibility would disadvantage some faculty who are less inclined to negotiate and give advantage unfairly to those more inclined to negotiate. If the issue is equity, then some Senators argued we should have a policy that indicates how faculty might approach asking for leave. Some Senators also observed that the FMLA forms are difficult to find and should be more accessible on the University website.

Vice Provost Deiulio was present at the meeting and was asked by Senators to communicate to the Provost the desire for clarification even if it did not go into the handbook and for additional guidance on policy so that faculty who require leave can know more about the process and what they might expect. The Vice Provost said that the Provost is interested in equity and fairness and will work to clarify the policy and to post on his website additional information. Senators also asked that administrators know more about the policy of the university so that faculty anticipating leave might be able to discuss their options with their Dean or the office of the Provost.

Senators also raised the issue that FMLA policies are important concerns for new faculty who may weigh their options to choose to come to the University or to stay based upon these policies. If we are interested in attracting the best faculty then these kinds of policies are fundamental in establishing the quality of academic life that faculty who are competitive on the job market that we want to attract will consider.

At 4:00, Dean Kevin Hughes arrived and out of consideration for his time, the Senate ceased this discussion and moved out of order to consider Handbook Changes 11 and 12 with the Dean of Students.

Dean Hughes addressed Senate concerns about the two handbook changes that update the University Policy on Student Discipline. These are complex changes and alter substantially the way that the university judicial process works. According to Dean Hughes, the goal is to make the Honor councils more student centered and to place in the hands of the students who serve on panels additional responsibility to uphold community standards of conduct. Specifically these conduct standards intersect with faculty most directly in the cases where students cheat or plagiarize in the classroom and are sanctioned by faculty and by the university honor system.

Senators first raised the question in handbook change where it reads that in the event of a student dispute of a grade, the University will hold the assessed grade in abeyance while the CHECs process is completed. Faculty speaking to the issue of 11 and 12 – the language is off in 12 the point is not to hold the grade in abeyance. The text itself reads, *“Any academic remedy issued by the faculty member will be held in abeyance, pending resolution of the case. Should the allegations of misconduct occur at the conclusion of a course or academic period, a grade of incomplete will be issued to the student pending a resolution.”* Faculty object in principle to the suggestion that University process overseen by Student Affairs that might impinge upon the Academic Affairs side of the University by changing a grade assessed by a faculty member. Senators argued that if a faculty finds plagiarism or academic misconduct, it is his or her right to apply a sanction. If that sanction is in dispute or if an appeal is to be made, it should emanate from the academic affairs part of the university in the form of an appeal to the Department Chair, an academic dean or the Provost or even take the form of a grade appeal. Dean Hughes agreed in principle to the arguments offered by faculty and explained that the intent was to keep the Academic Sanctions separate from the University sanctions with the understanding that only the Academic part of the University has the right to alter grades even if the Student Affairs part of the University does not agree that a violation has occurred. Some Senators wondered if a

student panel had the expertise or disinterest to adjudicate a plagiarism or other academic misconduct allegation? Some Senators also wondered if it was proper to allow a student panel to overturn a professor's allegation of plagiarism or academic misconduct. Dean Hughes argued that the faculty have advocated a student run system, and this is an inevitable challenge when students are empowered to make judgments that creep into the Academic Affairs hierarchy of the University. Dean Hughes pointed out that the panels do not overturn a faculty decision, but instead offer a university sanction when it is warranted. University sanctions are given according to a different standard than academic sanctions which are usually discipline specific and may vary.

Senators pointed out as well that the language that empowered CHECs and Student Affairs to hold grades in abeyance existed before the revisions to the handbook being offered. This was a surprise to everyone in the room that Student Affairs had the power to overturn or hold in abeyance a grade given by a faculty member. Senator strongly advocated that this language be stripped from the handbook entirely. Dean Hughes agreed to remove the language from the handbook.

Senators pointed out that if a CHECs panel found that a student had not committed academic misconduct that was alleged by a faculty member and for which an academic sanction had been applied this would be evidence used in a grade appeal process and might end up changing the grade. Senators wondered how faculty might respond to a system where a student panel could effectively tell them that their judgment was not correct in the assessment of academic misconduct. In other words, there should be some criteria in place that will force panels to articulate to some standard their reason for finding no fault in academic misconduct cases. There also needs to be clarification on who makes the final decision in an appeal case and who has the right to appeal the process and when that process ends. Again, Den Hughes said that the panels do not say plagiarism or academic misconduct did not occur. They only are able to apply a university sanction if they determine a university violation has occurred.

Some Senators pointed out that the grade appeal process already gives the administration the ability to overturn a grade. Others suggest, however, that that would be proper and is a necessary part of an imperfect process.

Dean Hughes pointed out as well that honor councils have to be unanimous to find a University Honor Code violation which is a high standard.

Some Senators pointed out that grammatically there were many problems with the handbook changes 11 and 12 and hoped that a cleaner version would make the final handbook.

President Bardwell raised the issue from Change 11 that the legal language of standards of proof was proper where it was written standards of evidence. President Bardwell agreed to send proper language and legal terminology to correct the deficiencies.

Dean Hughes made the final statement that in a student run system, students should only have purview over the Student Affairs side of the University and that the Academic Affairs should be separate and adjudicated using the proper academic hierarchy of Chair, Dean, and Provost when questions emerge regarding challenges to grades.

Senator Bardwell asked the SEC and Senator Puaca who served on the committee to amend the discipline system in AY 2011/12, to meet with the Deans, the Provost, and Dean Hughes to offer updates and to work on the substance of changes 11 and 12.

Dean Hughes left at 4:19 and the Senate returned to order at 4:20

## **5. Faculty Senate Issue/Ad Hoc Standing Committee Reports**

### **a. Administration Evaluation Assessment**

The Senate returned to order at 4:20. There is not further discussion of this issue yet, but President Bardwell reported that the SEC continues to formulate a plan and will have a clear direction by the March meeting

### **b. Child Care**

The Child Care initiatives are currently being processed by the committee. In addition, the FMLA items discussed above are also relevant to child care.

### **c. Elections**

#### **i. Update on progress**

Senator Depretis reported that in the College of Social Science there have been challenges in soliciting nominations for service. She reported that Communications, Sociology and Social Work have offered many to serve, but that it has been difficult to encourage others and she has had difficulty finding candidates for all positions. Senator Depretis has asked department chairs to speak with their faculty in order to identify those who might need service but be unaware.

NBS and AH Election Committee members, Senators Hunter and Connell have had less difficulty finding willing servants to run for election.

The Senate proceeded out of order at 4:22 to consider a proposal to create a new standing committee. Some background – the Senate last year proposed the creation of a Faculty Development and Evaluation Committee and offered it as a handbook change that would have gone into effect in AY 2012/13. The committee did not make it through the full handbook process and as a result, this year the senate has revised the proposal. Senator Connell read the proposal for the Faculty Teaching Development University Committee, the text of the proposal is as follows:

“Rationale: To establish a Faculty Teaching Development University Committee

The University committee on Faculty Teaching Development will serve as a resource for faculty in developing their teaching and will provide support in the form of observation, feedback on teaching, and resources. It will also promote the professional development of CNU faculty. It will

Be a resource for faculty who request assistance in teaching by finding appropriate peer observers to provide developmental feedback for these faculty that will not be part of the Annual Review or Promotion Review process.

Function as a resource for faculty, sponsoring regularly-scheduled seminars throughout the year on teaching development issues, or sponsoring workshops to assist faculty teaching.

Serve to aide department chairs assist faculty who they feel would benefit from peer review or some other classroom intervention designed to improve teaching and develop classroom skills.

Membership:

- 2 tenured, and 1 probationary or 1 restricted faculty member from each college (elected)
- Senate Liaison, *ex officio*”

The Senate discussed the proposal briefly and made the point that such a committee could be a powerful body to assist faculty in the classroom and with other kinds of development. It could provide formative assessment when needed and might serve as a resource for Deans and Department Chairs who identify faculty that need such formative assessments to improve teaching or other kinds of development.

The Senate offered two grammatical changes – replacing the periods with semicolons and correcting the singular/plural issues with faculty.

With those changes Senator Puaca called for a vote it was seconded by Senator Depretis.  
VOTE: Unanimous in Support  
The motion passes.

The Senate returned to order at 4:33.

#### **d. Faculty Pay Recommendation for Salary Increase- Survey**

The senate subcommittee headed by Senator Martin has produced a survey to assess how faculty would like to have pay allocated in the event of salary increases authorized by the State and Board of Visitors. The senate has delayed this survey, however, in deference to the administration which has requested that we wait until there is more certainty regarding the size and nature of the money allocated to the university to pay for raises. The provost has a plan in process but will wait until he has been able to present it to the Board of Visitors. The Senate survey, it seems should be held in anticipation of word from the Provost on the nature of these compensation issues.

President Bardwell suggested that since Senator Martin had invested energy in the creation of a survey that it should be left up to his committee to determine if the survey is distributed and when. Some senators expressed concern that with the election for university standing committees going on in February that it might not be an opportune time to do another senate survey. Others suggested that we might exercise some discretion in waiting to determine the nature of the raises should they come. It might, some argued, be premature to try to insert ourselves into the process at this early stage.

The Senate came to consensus that the survey should be held until at least March. .

#### **e. IDEA**

- i. Update on IDEA Taskforce and FDEC
- ii. Peer Evaluation Panel

President Bardwell reported on the panel that was held on the previous Thursday and that the panel discussed with faculty the prospect of creating an additional system of evaluation based on peer evaluation of teaching. This would involve having teaching observed periodically by peer faculty who would then write an assessment of teaching. Senator Bardwell and other senators suggested that this might best be developed as a concept by the committee just proposed by the Senate for Faculty Teaching Development.

#### **f. LLC to LLAC**

President Bardwell began her statement by making the senate aware she had invited Dr. Sharon Rowley to come to this meeting but it seemed to work out better to have her come in March. In discussions over the LLC transition prompted by the election in February, Dr. Rowley suggested that the LLC might be transformed in ways that would make the ordinary election process less useful. In her mind, the assessment focus of the LLC should make it necessary to enlist those with assessment expertise and to put Dr. Geoffrey Klein into the position of Chair of the LLAC as he is the University Assessment leader.

Senators discussed some issues including how the LLAC might be composed. Including should it be restricted to tenured faculty only, should they be elected from the general faculty or appointed for their expertise? What should be done with the department representation model that is currently the way that the LLC is structured. Because these issues hang upon the outcome of work conducted by the curriculum committees, it seems appropriate to table them until we have a chance to learn what those committees decide and also to hear directly from Dr. Rowley.

President Bardwell also observed that high-demand committees such as the PRC and the UAEC are both appointed by the Provost. These committees require significant effort on the parts of those entrusted to perform the work. President Bardwell also speculated that these committees might benefit from the addition of professional staff in addition to faculty such as the college deans.

Senator Adamitis pointed out that in discussion between the SEC and the Provost, the senior administration has remained focused on the assessment problem posed by the Core Curriculum. The concern has to do with the upcoming accreditation review that will be done by SACS. Senators discussed the changing nature of the LLC that might result, in which the UCC would take over the curricular management and the LLC would be a body that effectively engaged the assessment tasks.

Senators continued to express reservations about the changes to the Core Curriculum proposed by the Provost in the 7 September 2012 memo. Senators argued that a reevaluation of the current Areas of Inquiry and a recertification of the courses currently in those areas might take us a long way towards creating assessable outcomes, particularly after the review done in academic year 2011/12.

#### **g. Faculty Staff Honor Roll- Venue and Permanent location on Campus**

President Bardwell informed the Senate that she is working with the senior administration on this project and it continues to move forward.

#### **h. Religious Tolerance and Diversity**

The name has been changed to the Religious Dialogue and Diversity committee and this will be reflected in all future minutes and agenda. The Senate, however, needed to vote to authorize this change. Senator Redick proposed the vote to change the name, seconded by Senator Bardwell.

VOTE: Unanimous

### **6. Curriculum Changes**

#### **i. Update on ENVS**

The Senate observed that there is no major progress that has been reported on the status of the Environmental Studies minor. Apparently the curriculum committees have identified a number of problems in the minor and are holding its passage until those are addressed to the satisfaction of the members of those committees.

**ii. UCC Course Changes from the Provost**

There are not any to consider at this meeting

**7. Old Business**

**a. Faculty Teaching Development Committee (formerly Faculty Development and Evaluation Committee)**

The Senate considered this out of order above.

The Senate took a short recess at 5:11 and returned to order 5:20

**b. EVAL-AR possibly move to the Spring**

Dean Breese made available to the Senate a set of his notes and thoughts that he emailed to the Secretary of the Senate after reading the agenda. The SEC has discussed the possibility of moving the AR process earlier in the year with the Provost and appreciated very much Dean Breese's thoughts which informed us further about the nature of the discussion at the college level. It should be noted that there is nothing that will likely happen in this current academic year – but the process of changing the timeline is under discussion. The rationale for the change is this: in the fall, the review cycle for major term reviews for probationary faculty at 2, 4, and Tenure and for tenured faculty seeking promotion occur in the fall and draw significant energies from Chairs and the Deans. The annual reviews, when added to the fall major term reviews, increase significantly the workload. Furthermore, faculty benefit from the formative assessment in the AR, but when they learn about their reviews midway through the fall term, there is nothing that can be done, especially in the area of teaching, if the AR identifies a problem, the nature of which the faculty member was not aware. Moving the AR to either January or May would make it possible to put the Annual Reviews on the calendar at a time when Chairs and Deans had more time and it would also deliver the results at a time when faculty would be able to use the information optimally.

Senators felt that a May review would be ideal as most faculty already prepare some kind of abbreviated progress report for their Chair to aid in the writing of the annual reports. The January idea which would enable the review to take place in the Spring was less appealing because Senators argued that it would be more useful to have the reviews for contract years which run from August to May and wondered if this was possible with a January review that would presumably evaluate a spring and fall cycle and thus assess part of two separate academic years.

Senators wondered if it was possible that IDEA scores might not be ready for a may submission, especially considering that faculty are only contracted through commencement in the spring. It might happen, as it did in January 2013, that IDEA scores for would be delayed.



**c. Restricted Faculty Service on Tenure-track search committees**

Senators received some questions from faculty regarding the formation of search committees and the inclusion, in tenure-track searches restricted faculty. Traditionally at CNU Senators suggested, faculty have been open to including restricted faculty in all elements of faculty life and professional faculty service available to tenured and restricted faculty apart from instances when it is inappropriate, e.g. on Grievance, Review Committees, and other personnel related service. The question then here becomes is service on a tenure-track search committee one of those kinds of service that we should restrict to probationary and tenured faculty as a matter of policy? The Senate was divided on this, with some very strongly stating that tenure-track searches should be the responsibility of those who are vested in the University for the long term and thus would have the interests of the University in mind as they deliberated. Others suggested that it might not be accurate to assume that restricted faculty would not take the job as seriously because of their status and that traditionally the University had been open to allowing restricted faculty to serve.

Senators will consider this again at the March meeting.

**d. Teaching load adjustments 4/3 from 3/3**

President Bardwell reported that she had faculty speak to her from her college who had been moved from a 3/3 teaching load to a 4/3. The issue is one that the Senate has considered before last year apparently. Faculty who are on a research emphasis teaching load, the 3/3, who do not show significant progress on their research agenda, may be reassigned. The problem, identified here is that faculty assumed that those on the research-emphasis teaching assignments have a 3 year period in which their research progress is evaluated. As a result, those with a research agenda are assessed, it seems, every three years to determine if they are making significant progress. Senators observed that no one has been on a 3/3 for 3 years in the University because the mechanism to adjust loads for faculty is not that old. Senators wondered if this meant that the administration saw fit to adjust teaching loads during the term of the triennium. President Bardwell spoke directly to Dean Colvin on this issue who pointed out that although the triennium is not in the handbook, on the University website the terms of the triennium teaching adjustment are such that faculty who do not perform to the promised standard are returned to a normal teaching load at 4/3.

Senators wondered if the teaching load could be adjusted in this manner by a Deans or the Provost or both, then why could faculty not opt for a teaching emphasis as was requested by the Senate in 2011/12.

Senators also discussed the probationary faculty who are hired at a 3/3 and who continue in that until they are tenured provided they progress successfully. Senators discussed these issues for some time, focusing on the nature of faculty work and generally in support of the continued use of the 3/3 as an incentive to hire probationary faculty and to encourage publication and professional development for more senior faculty. Senators also seemed to support the idea that there should be some accommodation for faculty who want to emphasize teaching, whether at the end of their careers or at some time between projects to lessen the pressure to publish.

**8. New Business**

**a. Handbook Changes 1-12**

The Senate then turned to the handbook changes presented to the senate for consideration by the Handbook committee. The Handbook subcommittee consisting of the chairperson Senator Adamitis and Senator Connell walked the senate through the changes.

Handbook change 1 provoked no controversy as it focused on defining the credit hour and revising inconsistencies in the Handbook.

Handbook Change 2 provided a global change to take the 's' out of admission uniformly across the entirety of the handbook.

Handbook Change 3 corrects the handbook to reflect the current practices of the Associate Provost who has for the past several years overseen research proposals dealing with Animal subjects.

Handbook Change 4 updates the Handbook to alter the Graduate Program Council to the Graduate Council and takes the University Counsel out of the IACUC panels as a voting member.

As the changes 1-4 produced no significant discussion or controversy – the Senate, as is customary, voted on all four together.

President Bardwell called for the vote seconded by Senator Puaca

VOTE: Unanimous in favor

Handbook Change 5

Updates the section of the University Handbook that covers the new misconduct in research policy adopted by the university in July 2012. The handbook now includes a website reference with a URL to direct any who would like to see the full policy. The senate argued that the full policy should be in print in the handbook and should not be placed on a website. Senators argued that in the handbook, the policy would be subject to Senate and other oversight should any changes be made to the document. On a website it is unclear if the document could be altered without oversight. Senators therefore agreed to approve Handbook Change 5 only if the entire policy were printed in the handbook itself.

Senator Adamitis called for the vote seconded by Senator Martin

VOTE: Unanimous in favor

Handbook Change 6-2 a revised version of change 6, alters the Faculty Incentive Grant program significantly by limiting funding exclusively to travel to secure a grant. It removes any possibility of funding faculty who are putting grant proposals together. This change provoked significant discussion among senators who argued that there did not seem to be a reason to include these restrictions on the incentive grants because by their very nature the changes seemed to remove the incentive part of the name by taking away any support the University once provided to induce faculty to apply for grants. Senators suggested were this the case, the FIG section might just as well be deleted from the handbook rather than revised in this fashion. Senators also wondered why the administration would bother changing the language of these

grants if the intent was to preserve them in some fashion when economic times improved to such an extent that they might be reintroduced? Senators agreed that the administration should clarify the following

1. If faculty are already allowed to apply for grants, then what does this change really do?
2. Why would someone need this information if they are removing the University funding the support for grant proposing?
3. How does the negotiation process work with the sponsored programs?
4. Should the University change the name of this if there is no support as FIG implies?

The Senate Table its discussion for the next meeting so that the administration could clarify these issues.

Senator Adamitis moved to vote that it be tabled for the next senate meeting seconded by Senator Redick

VOTE: unanimous

#### Handbook Change 7

The change makes what is currently an ad hoc task force focused on IDEA into university standing committee. Senators did not oppose any element of this committee but some wondered if it would not better with the IDEA brand taken out of the description and title which is now "IDEA Support Committee".

Other senators did not agree that the brand was important and argued that a simple handbook change would easy enough to change the name of the committee. Others suggested that any teaching evaluation committee should focus on more than student surveys. Others suggested that the Teaching Development Committee proposed by the Senate at this meeting would serve for other kinds of formative commentary on teaching and thus should be a nice complement to the IDEA Support Committee.

One issue why does this use the brand name IDEA – should we suggest replacing this with teaching evaluation

Senator Puaca offered a motion to approve seconded by Keeling.

VOTE : Unanimous

#### Handbook Change 8

The change updates the website addresses (URL) where one might find the University Eval-4 and also removes antiquated language, as the Deans no longer submit departmental Eval-4s to the Provost.

Senators made the point that the URL appears twice and yet is only updated once and suggested this should be fixed. Some Senators made the point that including URLs in the handbook is not particularly good practice because they change quite often and eventually become dead links that must be consistently updated to be useful.

Senators also raised the question about the University Eval-4 and its relationship to Departmental Eval-4s. Senators observed that it seems that the UE-4 is the pertinent document for faculty to know and that having a Departmental Eval-4 creates confusion regarding the standard for evaluation. This is a discussion the Senate has had over the past several years at least since the creation of the UE-4. What we appear to have learned is that Departments have reasons for continuing to maintain their own Eval-4, but that the provost when he considers faculty coming up for major term reviews, relies on the UE-4.

Senators also noted that the change referenced the Handbook from 2011/12 rather than the current handbook. While one senator looked up the proper pagination and current language, the Senate moved on to consider subsequent changes in the interest of time.

The senate went out of order at 6:11

Returned to this order at 6:14

Senators proposed to update the change to reflect currently language in the current handbook, University Handbook 2012-13, p. 108, and to include the change to the URL in paragraph one.

Senator Keeling Called for the vote seconded by Depretis.

VOTE:

In favor: Adamitis, Martin, Manning, Depretis, Weiss, Redick, Connell, Wang, Selim, Barnello, Keeling

Opposed: Puaca

Abstain: Bardwell

Handbook Change 9

The Senate considered this change out of order at 6:11

This change has already been approved by the Senate as it is our updates to the constitution. There was no debate or discussion. Senator Martin called for the Vote and it was seconded by Senator Manning

VOTE: Unanimous

Handbook Change 10

This change updates the handbook to reflect current practice removing the Dean of Students from the process of questions regarding FERPA and leaving them in the hands of the University Registrar and Dean of Enrollment Services.

As there was no controversy or discussion, Senator Redick called for the vote and it was seconded by Senator Keeling

VOTE : Unanimous

Handbook Change 11 was discussed at length above but was further discussed here.

The SEC recommended that the language update which takes the Dean of Students out of FERPA decisions (see Handbook Change 10) should be amended on p. 44 to make the same change to replace Dean of Students with Dean of Enrollment Services.

The Senate also raised the objection again to the language in change 11 which says that when the Student Handbook and the University Handbook are in conflict the most recently updated handbook is the policy of the University. Because the Senate has no real oversight over the Student Handbook, this policy creates a means to get around the proper governance structure of the university. Senators argued it should be struck and that the University Handbook should supersede any other handbook.

The Senate did not vote on this change and will in the March meeting.

#### Handbook Change 12

The Senate provided commentary from Dean Colvin and Dean Doughty which the Senate examined. Because there are significant lingering issues with change 12, the Senate has imposed a deadline of the Friday 2/15 to provide new language that it can support and bring this to the provost, deans, and Dean of Students.

The Senate took no action on Handbook Change 12 but will at the March meeting

#### **b. Distinguished Professor EVAL-1-D approval**

The senate considered this out of order at 5:45. The Secretary presented all Senators with the Eval 1-d which it is charged with approving annually. Senators expressed no reservations and Seantor Adamitis called for a vote seconded by Puaca

VOTE: Unanimous

#### **c. Proposal for NEW STANDING Committee- Faculty Teaching Development**

This was Accomplished out of order above.

#### **d. March 15<sup>th</sup>/April 12<sup>th</sup> Invite to – President Tribble for Social Senate Meeting[ Either the March or April Date will be selected- SHb will confirm at Meeting]**

President Bardwell announced plans to hold a regular meeting with the President and Provost.

#### **e. 300-Level courses in the Areas of Inquiry**

The Senate discussed this out of order at 4:52.

The proposal was brought to the attention of the Senate that in the process of curricular revision, the suggestion had been made that all 300-level courses be removed from the Areas of Inquiry. The rationale stems from the elimination of the Liberal Learning Emphasis obviating the need for 300-level AofIs. Senators heard from departments that rejected this logic, making the case that many 300-level courses are used by departments to attract majors and that undecided students or students in other majors might take a 300-level course and change their

major as a result. Because these are recruiting tools, department saw no reason to carte-blanche remove from the Areas of Inquiry 300-level courses. The suggestion was made that perhaps these courses could be renumbered to 200-level, but such number tricks imply there is not substantive distinction between 200 and 300 level classes. Renumbering also would make some of these courses not useful for majors and clutter departmental offerings.

According to some senators the Deans were concerned that 300-level Area of Inquiry courses were not well subscribed, but without actual data to support such an assertion it seems only anecdotal. Furthermore, Senators argued that students double majoring or seeking a minor might benefit from having 300-level courses count towards the Areas of Inquiry.

Senators felt strongly that there should be no rash decisions about limiting the Areas of Inquiry to 100 and 200-level classes.

Some Senators wondered if this was part of the Assessment issue raised by the 7 September memo from the Provost. Arguably, this solution seems to provide few viable means to address the assessment problem.

After some discussion around the assesement issues, the senate returned to order at 5:10

## **9. Department Reports**

There were no department reports offered.

## **10. Liaison Reports**

President Bardwell said that she would create a survey monkey survey to solicit liason reports from each of the University Standing Committees. Senators asked why would we need a liaison if this was a regular feature. President Bardwell suggested that one time a year the Chairs of each committee should provide a detailed written report to the senate and that she would like to begin this process and have it codified as standard Senate practice.

Senator Weiss offered a report from IACUC stating that they were hard at work creating new protocols for the use of Animals in Forbes Hall.

## **11. Other**

A Senator raised the issue of the arbitrary nature of the \$40,000 cutoff for grants on the University Eval-4. Where does this number come from? In some disciplines this number could not be reached in any normal kind of grant, particularly in the Humanities and Social Sciences where grants in excess of \$40,000 are extremely rare. Yet, grants below \$40,000 are prestigious in themselves.

No other business was offered. Senator Puaca offered a motion to adjourn seconded by Senator Keeling.

The Senate Adjourned at 6:37.