Friday, April 30, 2004 SC 214, 3:00 p.m.

- I. Call to Order: President Virginia Purtle
- II. Welcome Visitors
- III. Approval of Minutes from the March 19, 2004 meeting
- IV. President's Report
- V. Committee Reports
 - a. Elections Committee
 - b. Building Access and Security Ad Hoc Committee
 - c. University Rankings Ad Hoc Committee
 - d. Nominating Committee
- VI. Old Business
 - a. Textbook Royalties (second reading of 2003-2004: 11)
 - b. Mandatory Class Attendance on First Day of Classes (second reading of 2003-2004: 16)
 - c. Faculty Awards for Teaching, Scholarship, and Service (second reading of 2003-2004: 17)
 - d. Recommendations from the Undergraduate Academic Status Committee (first reading)
 - e. Handbook changes regarding process for making changes to the General Education requirements (second reading of 2003-2004: 20) (second reading)
 - f. Concentration in Indic Studies from Philosophy and Religious Studies (second reading)

VII. New Business

- a. Carl Colonna Emeritus Status (2003-2004: 22)
- b. Faculty Development Grants (vote on whether or not to recommend applications).
- c. Election of 2004-2005 Faculty Senator Officers

VIII. Other Items

IX. Adjournment

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.

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.

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.

MEMORANDUM



DATE: February 26, 2004

TO: Faculty Senate

FROM: Robert Colvin, Chair

2003-2004 Undergraduate Academic Status

Committee

SUBJECT: Recommended policy changes for 2004-2005

The 2003-2004 Undergraduate Academic Status Committee (UASC) recommends the following policy changes for the 2004-2005 academic year.

Recommendation #1:

- Modify the undergraduate **Table of Continuance** changing the *Credit Hours Attempted* from 12-30 to 1-30 credit hours attempted.
- Under the section headed Academic Probation, delete this first sentence: "Any student who has attempted fewer than 12 credit hours will not be subject to probation or suspension rules."

Rationale: This change will extend the hours attempted from the current 12-30 hours to a more inclusive 1-30 hours. Currently, a student could attempt 16 hours, withdraw from 6 hours, and earn an F in the other 10 hours without triggering the probation status. The intent of the change is to initiate earlier intervention.

Recommendation #2

- Change the Minimum Good Standing to 2.0 cumulative gpa (**Table of Continuance**,) regardless of hours attempted.
- Change the title of the column *Eligible for Probation* to only *Probation* and make the threshold "less than 2.0" cumulative gpa regardless of hours attempted.

Rationale: These two changes link ongoing performance to the graduation requirement of 2.0 and will result in earlier intervention to correct difficulties.

Recommendation #3

 Change the title of the column Eligible for Suspension to only Suspension, keep the same cumulative gpa thresholds in the current suspension column, and adopt the policy that suspension results from the cumulative gpa dropping to the threshold "while the student is on probation. A student must be on probation immediately prior to being placed on suspension." Rationale: This change will avoid situations where a student's cumulative gpa suddenly drops into the suspension range but previously had not been on probation. The committee believes that fundamental fairness requires a probationary semester.

Please let me know if the UASC can provide the Senate with clarification or additional information. A draft resolution is provided below.

Thank you.

Christopher Newport University Faculty Senate Resolution 2003-2004: 23

Whereas, the central premise of the Academic Continuance Policy is to provide student support and encouragement to attain their potential for individual intellectual and personal growth while at the University, and

Whereas, the requirement for timely progress and for a minimum grade point average should serve as an incentive in the quest for realization of personal potential, and

Whereas, students need to have a clear understanding of the minimum level of performance necessary to graduate, and

Whereas, immediate intervention with students who are performing below the minimum standard for graduation as been shown to enhance students' academic performance and probability of timely graduation,

Therefore, Be It Resolved that the Academic Continuance Table and Suspension policies be revised as follows:

- In the **Table of Continuance** change the *Credit Hours Attempted* to 1-30 credit hours attempted.
- The minimum standard for good academic standing will be a 2.0 cumulative gpa regardless of hours attempted.
- Change the title of the column Eligible for Probation to only Probation
- Academic probation shall be imposed when the cumulative grade point average is less than a 2.00.
- Change the title of the column *Eligible for Suspension* to only *Suspension*, keep the same cumulative gpa thresholds in the current suspension column,
- Suspension results from the cgpa dropping below the threshold while the student is on probation. A student must be on probation immediately prior to being placed on suspension.

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

WHEREAS the <u>University Handbook</u> 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 <u>University Handbook</u>, to be sent immediately to the Provost and included in next year's <u>University Handbook</u> 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)