

CNU Faculty Senate Minutes

2 September 2011

Boardroom, David Student Union

Present: Pollard, Connell, Carpenter, Barnello, Von Burg, Puaca, Adamitis, Weiss, Selim, Martin, Hall (left 3:39), Bardwell, Wang, Zestos (arrived 3:14)

Guest: Jessie Hutchenson (3:04-3:11)

Absent: Redick (excused, sabbatical release)

1. Call To Order (3:04 pm)

The meeting, originally scheduled for 26 August, was postponed until today due to the school closure occasioned by Hurricane Irene.

2. 2011-12 Faculty Senate Photograph

The Senate adjourned immediately following the call to order to the area just outside the Boardroom for a group photograph. The Senate returned to order at 3:11.

3. Affirmation of minutes from 8.15.2011 approved electronically.

The minutes from 15 August 2011 were approved electronically by 12 Senators. The motion to affirm given made by Senator Bardwell and seconded by Senator Adamitis. The vote to affirm was unanimous.

4. The President's of the Senate provided a written report, which is [here](#).

The President commented upon the utility of the 17 August All-Faculty Meeting noting the high attendance and useful information which emerged. The Senate discussed at length the issues raised in that meeting and incorporated them into the goals of the senate for the year.

Professor Josipa Roksa, who co-authored the work *Academically Adrift* with Professor Richard Arum, has agreed to speak to CNU faculty on 11 October. The faculty development opportunity is sponsored by the Senate and generously funded by the Deans of the three colleges. The President suggested that the Senate might, after reviewing the response to this first event, look to offer additional similar faculty development opportunities this academic year and next.

The President also commented upon the issue of Deceased Students' grade reporting. Background: This issue was raised at the All-Faculty Meeting 17 August. Some faculty were apparently asked in the last academic year to report grades of a student who had passed away during the term. These faculty voiced concern about the ethical and FERPA issues and asked if there was an official policy. The University Registrar reported that none exists and circumstances are handled flexibly on a case-by-case basis.

The President also raised concerns that emerged from the faculty regarding the amendments to the Fall 2011 academic calendar.

In discussion some senators expressed concern over apparent communication breakdowns – faculty were notified well after a decision had been made and communicated to students. Other concerns included a lack of faculty consultation in the process of amending the calendar. While many agreed that the solutions reached were acceptable, many questioned the manner of notification and lack of the inclusion of faculty representatives in the process.

This line of discussion led naturally into broader concerns over the campus notification system. Senators voiced the apparent general confusion over the in-class notification system particularly in reference to the 23 August 2011 earthquake and the decision not to use the campus notification system. Some senators advocated suggesting a procedural change to include earthquakes as rising to the level of notification via the in class telephone alert system, particularly in light of the rarity of seismic events in our region.

The president reported on the Provost's memo to request a handbook change which was sent on 24 August 2011.

Background: the restructuring is, according to the memo, modular and thus moves the responsibility for teaching geography out of the Government Department and into the Department of Sociology, Social Work, and Anthropology effective 2012-13. Both faculty of the departments involved and the Director of the M. A. T. program were consulted and advised the Provost to recommend this restructuring.

5. Old Business

a. Deactivate Priority Advisory Committee (PAC)

The President offered the motion to deactivate, effective immediately, with the caveat that it might be reactivated should the need arise, the PAC, Senator Von Burg seconded the motion.

Background: in the previous meeting the President made the suggestion that the PAC was redundant. Senators overwhelmingly agreed that the Senate Executive Committee (SEC) already did the work of the PAC. Many senators felt that the possibility existed that the Senate may in times of exigency need to prioritize its work with such a committee. The Senate, therefore, concluded that the deactivation be limited with some language which provided for a reactivation should the need arise. Other senators wondered if the Senate needed to vote at all on the issue as it is not in the handbook as a standing committee, but rather a Senate subcommittee. The Senate, despite this objection, voted to approve the motion:

In-favor: Pollard, Connell, Carpenter, Barnello, Von Burg, Puaca, Adamitis, Weiss, Selim, Martin, Bardwell, Wang, Zestos

Opposed: None

Abstentions: Hall

b. University Committee on Faculty Development

The Senate president requested the body to table any action on this item. It was discussed later in the meeting out of order at length focusing on the need for a committee to articulate its structure and responsibilities before moving forward.

c. Review

i. Faculty Senate Philosophy

The Senate retained in full the statement entitled "Philosophy of the Faculty Senate" on the Budget Advisory Committee (BAC) memo. The senate then proceeded out of order to consider the BAC memo in advance of the Goals, at 3:32

ii. Faculty Senate Goals 2011-2012

The president engaged the Senate in a discussion of the current goals and philosophy of the senate and offered some updates and changes to the memo. The new memo will be approved at the next senate meeting. A summation of the changes and discussion is below. This discussion occurred out of order and began at 3:49.

The 2010-2011 memo includes three objectives for the faculty senate.

Objective 1, “Enhancing faculty life in ways that will facilitate the hiring and retention of faculty who serve the needs of the University's academic programs and students” was retained as written. The six strategies, 1 A-F, were adjusted moderately.

Strategy 1A. Continue transition to differential teaching load assignments (4-4, 4-3, 3-3) tailored to faculty career goals.

Strategy 1B. In conjunction with Strategy 1A, monitor class student numbers each semester to assure fairness across colleges and departments.

Strategy 1C. Examine the usage of the Digital Measures (DM) electronic program for Annual Reviews and consider the utility of expanding the DM program to the 2-4-6 year reviews and the promotion process.

Strategy 1D. Determine what documentation is necessary in faculty dossiers to facilitate faculty assessment and consider the feasibility of merging this with the Digital Measures program.

Strategy 1E. Continue the development of standards for the Annual Review process (Eval6).

Strategy 1F. Assess the Faculty Mentorship Program that was started in 2008-09 and formalized with the creation of a University Standing Committee in 2010-2011

1A-E will be modified by the SEC to reflect the general discussion and the integration of ideas generated from the discussion of the 17 August all-faculty meeting. Strategy 1F, however, will be eliminated from the goals statement as this has been accomplished.

Objective 2, “Improve and sustain core aspects of faculty life at CNU, including exemplary teaching and learning, significant scholarship, and meaningful service” was also retained as written. The four strategies (2 A-D) will be modified in similar ways to the strategies in Objective 1. They appear below as written in the 2010-2011 statement.

Strategy 2A. Expand the development of the virtual center for innovative teaching excellence.

Strategy 2B. Assess the effectiveness of Senate representation of faculty by way of the annual survey of all faculty in the spring.

Strategy 2C. Continue to work closely with senior administration leaders to negotiate challenges of state-wide budget restrictions.

Strategy 2D. Develop new means of recognizing exemplary faculty performance in teaching and service.

Discussion focused on how the new push to expand the ranks of restricted faculty on contingent contracts, full-time appointments at the rank of Lecturer or Instructor with either year-to-year contracts or 3-year renewable appointments. The Senate returned to the discussion in other business at the end of the meeting. In terms of the extant strategies listed. The Senate discussed Strategy 2A, at length. Some senators made the case that a 'virtual' center has traditionally not been an effective means for promoting teaching excellence. The president spoke with support staff, including Shannon Philips, regarding the creation of such a virtual center. It was communicated that such centers rarely served well the goals for which they are intended. The Senate felt this might be better served as a function of the Committee for Faculty Development. The creation of such a committee might well obviate the need for strategy 2A.

Strategy 2B

The Senate discussed the results of the survey conducted last year as part of the five-year review which revealed some issues with representation – specifically, smaller departments sometimes have less direct representation. Discussion also turned to the newly implemented Getting Started Week meeting of all-faculty with the Senate. Because many of the same kinds of ideas emerged from the meeting and the survey, the Senate discussed the possibility of continuing to collect annual data by means of a faculty survey conducted in the early Spring semester, but also institutionalizing the All-Faculty meeting/workshop that took place during Getting Started Week this year on 17 August.

Strategy 2C

Was left without revision.

Strategy 2D

The Senate, last year, proposed a new tier of faculty awards for teaching, service, and scholarship which would offer annual recognition and a monetary award to faculty with one given in each area. For a detailed information on that proposal, please see the faculty senate website, minutes for 15 April 2011, under strategy 2D. With administrative approval, the Senate appears to have accomplished this goal.

Objective 3, : “Monitor and enhance standards and practices necessary for effective and productive lives of faculty and students at Christopher Newport University”

Strategies 3 A-E appeared as follows in 2010-2011

Strategy 3A. Assess and explore improvements to the revised Core Advising Program.

Strategy 3B. Finalize a commemorative recognition of retired faculty.

Strategy 3C. Continue to identify and publicize options for faculty child care near campus.

Strategy 3D. Support the reestablishment of an Office of International Study Abroad to provide program oversight and coordination on campus, as well as critical liaison for faculty and students during overseas programs.

Strategy 3E. Review the process of adjudication of honor code violations.

Discussion focused on the need to keep or expand the objectives from last year. For 3 A and B, the Senate continued to see need in monitoring the Core Advisor Program and to continue to promote the faculty recognition site. Senator Puaca has expended great energies working with the University's administration and staff and past president Carlson and the current president have continued to negotiate with President Tribble on the location of the site.

Strategy 3c evoked significant discussion from the Senate. Background: The Senate has pursued the goal of expanding child care options for faculty for many years and in the past, at least according to the last 2 five-year reports by the Senate, this issue has been a perennial one for faculty who rely upon childcare options afforded by the community currently. At the all-faculty meeting on 17 August, this issue reemerged from those in attendance. Some discussion occurred of the possibility of creating a child care center on campus. Some in the all-faculty meeting remembered the existence of such a center on campus in the past. The director of the M.A. T. program offered the possibility of recruiting a Montessori school on campus. Others suggested the possibility of using the space that will be vacated in the CNU Sun Trust building when the Business and Leadership building is completed.

A spirited discussion ensued in the Senate. Some advocated that real need exists and that other universities have such centers. Others raised the possibility that faculty recruitment might improved were such facilities part of the campus. Others saw the potential for student employment, particularly those interested in early childhood education and psychology. Some discussed that there would have to be hiring of additional full-time staff for such a center. There was also some concerns over feasibility (both legal and economic) and that it might be worth revising or eliminating. Senators resolved that this goal will now be "Devise a plan to Create an on-campus day care center".

Strategy 3D can be eliminated because the university now has a director for overseas programs and study.

Strategy 3E is an important one the Senate agreed universally and should be kept as it currently exists.

Some discussion occurred regarding the creation of new strategies under this objective. Perhaps the creation of the Faculty Life Director or directorate as was one of the suggestions in the All-Faculty meeting.

Further discussion focused on the implementation this semester of near universal electronic IDEA. Some suggested that working with the

director of assessment to “implement electronic IDEA in a way that is appropriate” and to provide faculty with training in understanding and communicating the statistical relevance of electronic IDEA data. These strategies, however, may fit more directly under Objective 2. The discussion also revealed that the Senate might suggest new strategies to evaluate teaching that take us beyond the apparent overreliance upon student survey data.

The issue of tuition remission for university faculty, the Senate concluded, should also be a strategy under objective 3.

iii. BAC Memo

The new BAC memo will be update by the SEC and proposed to the Senate at its next meeting. The Senate discussed changes that included the following. The year for philosophy will change to reflect the current Senate.

Background: The BAC memo is submitted each year to the Budget Advisory Committee of the University which makes recommendations to the administration regarding budget priorities important to the instructional faculty to assist the BAC as it advises the president on, as the University Handbook reads, “matters pertaining to the operating budget of the University” (*University Handbook 2011-2012*, Sec. XVIII, 3.c.1. pp. 166-167).

The Senate priorities the AY 2011-12 include. Revising the 2008-2011 statement to include the new date range. It also needs to be emphasized the continued lack of salary increases which has become far too normal over the past 4 years.

The current language of the BAC Memo should be preserved, even as we move toward a 3/3 in practice for much of the faculty over the next two years, the goal remains the same to make the normal teaching load a 3/3 where it is now a 4/3 and will continue to be so for the coming biennium.

Some discussion ensued regarding the nature of the transition to the 3/3 which seems to involve increasing the required scholarly production for all faculty in exchange for the reduced load with only modest accommodation for those who have traditionally succeeded based on their teaching and service. Some senators felt that current faculty should have the option to keep a higher teaching load with the expectation that their duties would remain focused on teaching. More discussion on this took place at the end of the meeting. The obvious need for a more open discussion of the implications of an adjusted teaching load were made plain as the Senate discussed the matter.

A permanent version of these changes for both the BAC memo and the Goals Memo will be completed and voted on at the 16 September Meeting of the Senate.

6. New Business

a. BOV Meetings

The dates for BOV meetings are as follows

30 September 2011

2 December 2011
24 February 2012
4 May 2012
22 June 2012

Discussion regarding the BOV followed. The SEC attends the BOV meetings and attends certain subcommittee meetings as well. They offer reports to the whole Senate following each meeting. For faculty, the February meeting is usually the most consequential as it deals with promotion and tenure issues for faculty. The Senate also noted that if there are instances where a department might see the need to comment upon or raise objection to a tenure or promotion decision, the timeline between notification and the BOV vote is quite short. In other words, any resolution to an appeal would need to take place in advance of the February BOV meeting. Considerations regarding the availability of faculty and administrative staff over the semester recess also create problems for the review.

b. Legislative Master plan for 2011-12

Background: the Senate objectives discussed above were reintroduced in the context of the discussion of the Legislative Master Plan, available [here](#). The master plan was compiled by the SEC based on recommendations from the faculty both those generated in the meeting of 17 August and those offered subsequently by those unable to attend. The goal of the Senate is to integrate faculty concerns derived first from the five-year review and then from the 17 August meeting to attune the Senate's objectives with faculty concerns.

1. The Senate first considered the representational issues that speak to structure and composition. The idea of expanding the size of the Faculty Senate to include one representative from each department instead of the current model which calls for 5 representatives from each of the three colleges for a total of 15 Senators. Additional discussion focused on the problems expansion of the Senate might create. Some senators questioned the assumption that in general faculty are dissatisfied with the current model where departments that do not have a representative have a liaison. Other suggested that expanding the Senate may place additional service burden on smaller departments. Some pointed out that that although most departments are quite stable, in recent years departments have been subdivided, reorganized, and even moved around in ways that might alter the representation on the Senate and invalidate elections of the faculty by having departments subsumed by others. Expanding the Senate further also creates a less familiar body that may be less effective.

The issue of representation, particularly of restricted or contingent faculty, emerged from the discussion as well and also presents the possibility of an expansion of the size of the Senate. The All-Faculty Meeting raised contingent faculty representation as a faculty concern and the Senate is in agreement that if upwards of 25% of the faculty are to be contingent, they must be represented in some capacity. Some Senators proposed one contingent representative be elected to the Senate. Others thought electing three, one from each college, would be best. Making such a move, however, would require a constitutional change. Some

discussion raised several important cautions to consider. All contingent faculty now have one-year contracts which makes problematic the appointment of such faculty to multi-year terms. Restricting future possibilities to faculty on three-year contracts seems overly restrictive and difficult to manage in an election.

2. The all faculty meeting raised several pertinent issues regarding assessment and evaluation. Some pointed out that there are three different standards – the *University Handbook*, the University Eval-4, and the Department Eval-4. There are also a collection of Annual Review (AR) statements, DRC statements, assessments by the FRC, DRC, Deans, Provost, and President. The question remains what standard do all the review committees use to assess faculty and what weight do individual assessments have in the retention, tenure, and promotion process?

To handle these issue, the senate discussed a number of remedies that might help faculty in all stages of their careers manage a process that can be intimidating and threatening when it ought to be developmental. The first step, it seems, is the creation of a University Standing Committee on Faculty Development that can be used by the faculty and administration to nurture faculty at various stages so that the talented few who make it through the hiring process can be given every opportunity to succeed. The faculty Senate also proposed focusing some of its goals for the year on the review process and has asked the SEC to update Objectives 1 and 2 to focus on developmental issues. The Faculty Senate will vote on these issues before the next meeting and will send the Goals memo to the faculty at large.

Further discussion focused on enhancing communication among faculty on the review process at all levels. Effectively this continues practices that are currently underway, e.g. workshops for faculty on finding success at CNU. The mentoring of incoming faculty also provides a key element in the expansion of communication to help new faculty succeed. Expanding these opportunities and creating additional ones – e.g. a centralized place where faculty can seek, or be directed to find by their chairs, advice and assistance on teaching, scholarship, and service opportunities is necessary. This body might also create more opportunities for faculty to interact, e.g. a faculty social hours, and finding a space on campus to hold faculty social events.

3. The initiatives on faculty life were focused on three areas. The first was to create a Faculty Life Coordinator or Directorate to pursue full-time faculty-life issues. The Senate formed an ad-hoc committee consisting of Senators Bardwell and Carpenter to pursue the formation of the committee. The faculty life director might be responsible for many of the issues now pursued by the subcommittee of the Senate on faculty life. These include pursuing day care options for faculty children most pressing. The Senate also discussed again the idea of pursuing some kind of day care/pre-school on campus. The Senate will take this to the administration on 9 September to open the discussion.

The next issue regarding parking seems to straightforward. Faculty who come to campus, both full-time and adjunct, to teach afternoon classes find that when the faculty lots open to all sticker parking they cannot find a space. The Senate will make a request to move the open-parking time to 7pm to allow faculty who teach late to conveniently and safely park in close proximity to the main campus. The subcommittee on faculty life will take on this task.

The final issue, considered out of order, is one of tuition remission for faculty children. This is an issue that must be taken on at the legislative level beyond CNU apparently, but the Senate will put this initiative into the goals for the year to pursue.

4. The all-faculty meeting raised two issues related to faculty compensation. The first, adjunct pay, and the second, pay for serving as department chair. The discussion focused on how department chairs have difficulty recruiting adjuncts to teach recognizing that the compensation is woefully inadequate for the task they are asked to perform. To retain quality and reliable adjuncts, the Senate has tasked the SEC to explore adjunct pay in the region, focusing on producing a report that will demonstrate the level of compensation provided by CNU and its standing with other peer institutions.

On the issue of chair compensation the Senate determined that we have already produced a sound proposal on this issue and will continue to pursue the implementation of that proposal.

5. The Senate continues to assess the role of faculty with the Center for Honor, Enrichment and Community Standards (CHECS). Objective 3, Strategy d already exists to monitor and review honor code procedures. The broader issue, however, still persists that was addressed last academic year – on issues relevant to the faculty of the University, the *University Handbook* was modified following changes made by the Dean of Students to the *Student Handbook* in ways that seemed to circumvent faculty governance. The Dean of Students generously offered to coordinate *Student Handbook* updates with the SEC over in Summer 2011 and the SEC willingly consented to this arrangement. The SEC, however, has not yet received these changes. The Faculty Senate will need to continue to pursue equitable ways to coordinate the updating of the *Student Handbook* with the *University Handbook*. To further the dialogue, the Senate will request that Dean Hughes join the Faculty Senate at its next meeting to discuss handbook coordination.

The Senate also considered the Faculty Review Panel. These panels can be those that consider challenges to grades issued by instructional faculty or those that regard student discipline in the classroom. The Senate discussed that it would be helpful were the constitution of these committees more clear and the voting procedures of these committees clarified. (Background: Last year the *Student Handbook* made changes that took faculty off review panels. The Senate, in its February 2011 meeting objected strongly to the change).

6. On the issues associated with teaching and advising, the Senate

resolved to inquire with the University Registrar to determine why the Finals schedule is often published near or just after the start of classes and to determine if there is a way to move that schedule back, perhaps to the time when the schedule is released to students and faculty .

The Senate also heard an idea regarding a verification system for pin numbers issued to students by advisors. The background on this issue – advisors often have to reissue pins to students after they have been released following an advising appointment. Faculty should be able, using banner, to release the pin number to students who have been advised already electronically so that students may retrieve their pin as necessary. This creates no additional access, students already have their pins following advising. In the event they misplace the paperwork issued at advising, students should have open access to the number. The pin verification system developed by the university already exists; the Senate will inquire if this might be modified to allow students who already have been given their pin for the semester to retrieve it for schedule adjustments.

The discussion then turned to Banner. The Senate asked its liaison to ATAC to inquire if it is possible to explore the possible investment in a more reliable and functional system to replace banner in the coming years.

8. The Senate took up issue 8 out of order. Faculty at the all-faculty meeting raised the important issue of catering costs pointing out that the cost of catering makes prohibitive even modest events with students. Indeed, the cost of catering lunch through the university exceeds the per-person cost allowed by the state. The Senate asked the SEC to work on the issue of catering and its cost and determine if it is possible to negotiate lower rates for student/faculty events, perhaps to put them in line with student meal plans.

The Senate also discussed the Farmer's market and the difficulties encountered by students who wished to make this a regular campus event. The Senate firmly supports the student initiative to bring the farmer market to campus regularly as it did in the spring and encourages the university to find a way to support the student effort.

7. The Senate returned to discuss item 7 out of order. The Senate will make part of its goals for the year to form a University Standing Committee on religious engagement on campus with strong support for ensuring a campus that is committed to diversity.

7. Other issues

The Senate briefly considered a series of other issues.

- a. The president introduced the handbook change sent by the Provost that moves the Geography position from Government to the Department of Sociology, Social Work, and Anthropology effective Fall 2012.
- b. The Senate was made aware of two memos published on the Provost's website entitled, "Conversion of Faculty Status from Restricted to Probationary" and "Procedure for the Three-Year Contract: Instructor and Lecturer Rank". While the Senate agrees in principle with both

documents, it will consider them both in the next meeting. The President asked Senators to read carefully the documents and to consult with their liaison departments. Some discussion ensued. Senators asked if these review documents would make their way next year into the *University Handbook*. Senators reaffirmed their preference for all hiring to be for tenure-track lines with the understanding that the temporary move to expand the restricted and contingent ranks is a necessary condition for moving toward the 3/3 teaching load – also a Senate priority. Some Senators saw the problem with creating a large contingent faculty, particularly if regular University hiring procedures are loosened to bring restricted faculty to campus thus making difficult the transition to probationary status (e.g. if a restricted hire earned a degree from a University not on the approved list).

c. The Senate asked for volunteers to serve on the Liberal Learning Core Review Panel being organized by the Provost. Ron Von Burg offered to serve and the Senate accepted his self-nomination. The Provost will be officially notified.

d. The Senate considered the revision of the Academic calendar that occurred this semester and will raise the issue with the Provost and President. Background: The closing of the University for Hurricane Irene (8/26-8/29) provoked the university to add days to the end of the term. While this is not a problem, the faculty of the university were not involved in the discussions and were not notified of the decisions until days after the University resumed classes. This created awkward moments in class for many faculty whose students had been notified.

The president asked for a motion to adjourn at 5:16, Senator Puaca offered the motion, it was seconded by Senator Von Burg. Vote was Unanimous to adjourn.