

**CNU Faculty Senate Minutes**  
**21 October 2011**  
**DSU Jefferson Room**

**Present:** Adamitis, Bardwell, Barnello, Carpenter, Martin, Pollard, Puaca, Selim, Von Burg, Wang, Weiss, Zestos

**Absent:** Connell, Hall, Redick (excused for sabbatical)

- I. The meeting was called to order at 3:05 p.m.
- II. The Senate acknowledged the electronic approval of the minutes of the 9.2.2011 and 9.9.2011 2011 meetings.
- III. President's Report: Please see the attached document for charges and progress reports from Faculty Senate subcommittees working on campus child care, enhancing faculty life, negotiating restricted faculty representation on the Senate, examining religious tolerance on campus, revising catering policies, and increasing chair and adjunct pay. The Senate will also create a committee on Faculty Development.

On behalf of the Senate, President Pollard extended thanks to University Vice President Brauer for swiftly and successfully addressing the faculty's concerns about parking, catering, and Follett textbooks.

**Additional Information:**

At the Board of Visitors meeting, the Academic Affairs subcommittee passed the policy on Academic Freedom proposed by the 10-11 Faculty Senate, but it is still under review by the full Board. President Pollard will speak with John Conrad, the University Rector, to represent the faculty's view on this matter and will present a Senate motion in support of the policy.

As requested by the Faculty Senate, Chief Brown offered a series of sessions on Emergency Management Training for faculty and staff. However, not all faculty who wished to attend were able to do so because of class conflicts. Perhaps it might be possible in the future to offer this training via a video or powerpoint that is accessible through the website, so that scheduling will not be an issue.

**IV. BOV Reports**

**A. Student Life**

Mr. Rob Lange from Admissions presented information on the incoming class:

- melt of 50 students
- 1243 enrolled freshmen (2nd largest class)
- 375 PLP students, 100 of these also in Honors
- 280 minority students, 133 African-American



#### Admissions statistics

- early decision: 303 applied, 217 admitted, 205 enrolled
  - early action: 3713 applied, 2410 admitted, 656 enrolled
  - regular decision: 4069 applied, 1691 admitted, 382 enrolled
  - 1651 applicants chose to do an interview as part of the admissions process, 679 of these students enrolled
  - 892 out-of-state applicants, 57 enrolled
- The Common Application Consortium was discussed.

Ms. Lisa Duncan Raines presented information on Financial Aid awards (document provided).

Dr. Kevin Hughes presented information on the retention rate and graduation rate. He described the transition programs for freshmen, Setting Sail and Welcome Week. The University Fellows program and the duties of the fellows were presented. The role of tutors in the residence halls and the increasing presence of student organizations in terms of helping students make connections to CNU were discussed.

Mr. Maury O'Connell was also present and provided information as requested.

**Discussion:** The distinction between "early action" and "early decision" is that "early decision" students applied only to CNU.

#### B. Development

The development committee meeting was led by the new Vice President for University Advancement, Adelia Thompson. She presented a comprehensive plan for fundraising and commented on the fundraising successes so far this year. She also reported on the trends in giving to the University and laid out a plan for the future focused around a comprehensive giving plan.

The goals of the advancement office are to identify fundraising opportunities, to fill the staffing positions to realize best those opportunities and to change the culture of giving at the University and among its alumni. To that end the Ms. Thompson reported that there has been an upswing of 2% in the number of alumni giving to the school over the past year. She also reported that the University is planning to increase University fundraising efforts through the application of a multi-year campaign that targets corporate donors, family foundations, and other opportunities to attract large-scale gifts. Among the most interesting initiatives was the focus on identifying and targeting specific alumni groups in the region and nationally and to develop strategies to get them involved in giving to the school. Ms. Thompson has begun to build a detailed database of alumni.

To achieve these goals, the advancement office is hiring 4 new staff members. The goal of the advancement office is to increase efficiency, that is lowering the



cost per dollar donated, and to build the endowment of the University over time by setting lofty but achievable fundraising goals and building upon the momentum gained this year at the Gala.

C. Academic Affairs

At the Sept. 30th meeting of the BOV Academic Affairs committee, the Provost offered updates on STEM hiring (new faculty lines in computational mathematics, electrical engineering, and chemistry). There was discussion about the expense (faculty, labs, infrastructure) and funding of STEM curricula as well as concern about how the state is preparing students NK-12 for entering college STEM programs. The Provost also introduced the Faculty Workload Plan. The one action item was a unanimous vote of support for the new Academic Freedom and Responsibility policy for the *University Handbook*. The vote came after presentation of the new policy by Drs. Ronnie Cohen and Pete Carlson.

D. Finance

The meeting began with discussion of Follett's poor performance thus far regarding online textbook adoptions. Follett cited a number of reasons for the problems faculty encountered in the spring, including the implementation of new technology, a significant increase in the volume of their business, and an insufficient infrastructure for managing that increase. Vice President Bill Brauer conveyed our concerns to Follett, who assured the University that the process would improve this semester. The committee then turned to a review of the AY 11-12 budget, which is on track thus far as compared to AY 10-11.

E. Full Board: Please see the full report.

The most significant topics of discussion were the Six-Year plan and the policy on Academic Freedom.

The six year plan is a benchmark document based upon state mandated assumptions and is exclusively for planning purposes. It assumes for example, that revenues from the state will not increase in the next six years, but then highlights the projected revenue increases necessary to attain 'base adequacy' or a university that is equipped with sufficient staff and resources to perform its mission by 2018. Should these revenues not come from increased commitment from the state, they will have to come from tuition increases. The six-year plan affirms the University's commitment to maintaining faculty compensation in the 60th percentile of its peer institutions level which will require regular faculty salary increases over the coming 3 biennia. The plan does this with proposed incremental raises of the average salary of teaching faculty in the coming five years with the goal of putting CNU in the 60th percentile of its peer institutions. This, according to the plan, will require a 6.05% increase of the average faculty salary in each of the coming 5 years. The six-year plan is a planning document which only sets benchmarks, it does not constitute policy. The six year plan also includes curricular adjustments which are well outlined in other places but generally increase classes with fewer than 20 and reduce the numbers over 49.



Support undergraduate research, increase the number of faculty to 300, and encourage contracts and grant writing among faculty. The report also focuses attention clearly on the STEM disciplines, but actually proposes that of the 50 new faculty lines that will be added, 40% will be in STEM and 60% in “non-stem” positions. After some discussion, the board voted to approve the six-year plan. Provost Padilla and University Council Thro addressed the issue of the Academic Freedom policy. Generally this was met with some skepticism from the board who raised issue with the clause “The University will not censure or discipline a faculty member for speaking privately or publicly on such matters, whether or not as a member of a body of university governance.” Although well defended by the University administration, the board expressed doubts that this was language they could adopt. The rector tabled the vote for a subsequent meeting, when it could be more fully considered. The University Council offered to provide further explanation of the policy to the board in advance of its next meeting.

V. Old Business: None

VI. New Business

A. Motion in support of the new statement of Academic Freedom and Responsibility

1. Whereas in response to recent events (*Garcetti v. Ceballos*, 547 US 410 - Supreme Court 2006) that have had an impact on academic freedom in the United States, members of the CNU faculty (Pete Carlson, Ronnie Cohen) have authored a new Academic Freedom and Responsibility policy to more effectively protect CNU faculty rights, be it resolved that the Faculty Senate supports this new policy and its language.

**Discussion**

- Why include *Garcetti* in motion? The argument against doing so is that the *Garcetti* case is now a few years old; there may be other, more relevant cases that one could cite. The argument for retaining the reference is that it gives the motion credibility.
- The motion should state that the BOV Academic Affairs subcommittee approved the revised policy.

**Action:** Senators Puaca and Zestos moved to endorse the motion and accepted the following friendly amendment to the final clause: "be it resolved that the Faculty Senate supports the new policy and its language as drafted by Profs. Carlson and Cohen and approved by the BOV Academic Affairs subcommittee."

**Vote in Favor:** unanimous

**Motion Passes**

B. Reports from the subcommittees

1. On-Campus Child Care (Hall):



**Discussion:** The committee should involve the administration in the discussion early on in the process. Childcare is also currently under discussion by the student government, so the Senate committee should also contact Jett Johnson, SGA President.

2. Faculty Life (Carpenter): The committee presented a handout containing several ideas for enhancements to faculty life, many of which derive from the Senate-and-Faculty meeting held during Getting Started Week. The committee would like to hear additional ideas from faculty and so will email the list to all faculty for comments and host a brown-bag lunch open meeting.

### **Discussion**

- The subcommittee should create a faculty life website.
- The subcommittee should find ways to organize athletic activities for faculty.
- #4 on the list presented by the committee (negotiate catering “rules” to enable on-campus faculty picnics/potlucks, etc.) has already been accomplished.
- The Provost proposed using RATC 117, currently an IT room, as a faculty space, but the Senate does not yet know where faculty would get the funds for furniture, etc.
- President Pollard suggested converting the new student lounge in the Freeman Center to a faculty space, since the students do not appear to be using it.
- We need spaces on main campus for faculty currently housed in BTC and other remote locations who need on-campus work spaces that they might use in between classes.

3. Restricted Faculty Representation (Barnello): See attached report. One of the concerns raised at the Senate-and-Faculty meeting during Getting Started Week was the lack of Senate representation for restricted faculty, who will comprise 25-30% of the full-time faculty for the foreseeable future. The Senate subcommittee charged with preparing a motion on this matter supports adding representation and devoted the bulk of its discussion to determining whether restricted representation should be limited to a fixed number of seats on the Senate. The subcommittee proposed the following changes to the *Handbook*:

1) On page 154, under Membership, c. 1) change the current language to: "All members of the Instructional Faculty are eligible to serve in the Faculty Senate."

2) On page 155, Membership c, 2: change the last sentence of paragraph two to read: "Three of the five members from each college must be tenured, one member must be probationary, and one member must be restricted."



## Discussion

- On p. 154, add "full-time" to exclude adjuncts: "All full-time members of the Instructional Faculty are eligible to serve in the Faculty Senate."
- The subcommittee at first had considered allowing only one restricted faculty member to serve on the Senate. However, because 25-30% of the faculty is restricted, it seemed more appropriate to increase the restricted representation to 3 out of 15 members (20%), or one restricted faculty member per college.
- There will be some practical challenges concerning elections. Senators serve for two consecutive years, but many restricted faculty are on one-year contracts. When we conduct elections in the early spring, restricted faculty (except those holding three-year appointments) will not have contracts yet. Restricted faculty on the Senate could be elected separately and serve only for one year, but that could unintentionally suggest inequality among Senate members.
- It may be better to give the bulk of the Senate seats to tenured faculty, whose job security allows them to challenge administrative decisions and policies when appropriate. Thus, we might reserve 12 seats for tenured faculty and open the remaining three to both probationary and restricted. The problem here, though, is that it would be possible to have a year without any restricted (or untenured) representation on the Senate.
- We could increase the size of the Senate to 18 members and add three restricted seats to the 15 seats we currently have.

**Action:** Senators Barnello and Bardwell moved to support the motion and accepted these friendly amendments:

- On p. 154, add "full-time" to exclude adjuncts: "All full-time members of the Instructional Faculty are eligible to serve in the Faculty Senate."
- On p. 155: change to "4 of 5 members must be tenured and the final member may be either probationary or restricted."

The motion will remain on the table until the November meeting. In the meantime, Senators will solicit faculty feedback.

Finally, Senator Adamitis reported that faculty in the fine and performing arts have not had representation on the Senate in some years and so they are advocating a change to the Senate constitution that would ensure representation from the affected departments.

## Discussion

There was not much support for changing the constitution of the Senate to a representative model. However, if we were to change the *Handbook* language



to require that five (not four) departments per college have representation on the Senate in any given year, a faculty member from at least one affected department would have to serve.

4. Chairs' Summer Stipend/Adjunct Pay (Pollard)

Last year the Senate advocated increasing the chairs' summer stipend to \$5000, which is the equivalent of the salary for teaching a summer course. The stipend was subsequently raised to \$4000, with the goal of reaching \$5000 incrementally. The Senate supports raising the chairs' stipend by another \$1000 in 2012 to meet that goal.

The SEC is researching adjunct salaries throughout the state. Based on the data collected thus far it appears that CNU is at the bottom of the pay scale; we do not compete well even with community colleges. In order to attract and sustain qualified adjuncts, we will need to offer salaries that are competitive with both our peer and local institutions. After completing the data collection process, the SEC will draft a motion to that effect.

5. Standing Committee on Faculty Development (Pollard): The committee has shared ideas via email and is working with ad hoc committee on IDEA through the Provost's Office.

6. Catering Committee (Puaca): Please see the attached report. The University will implement several welcome changes to its catering policies:

- We will not be required to use catering for internal events, e.g., department meetings, majors' meetings. We are only required to do so for events to be attended by the President's Office and individuals outside of CNU, e.g., donors, parents, community members.
- New "in-house" catering menus with pricing that does not exceed the state *per diem* maximums for meals will be distributed to department chairs. These prices will include set-up and plates, napkins, etc.
- Faculty members will no longer be required to submit sign-in sheets with payment. A description of the event and number of attendees will suffice.
- Department chairs may approve all paperwork related to catering; we will not have to seek approval from the Dean or Provost.

7. Religious Tolerance (Bardwell): Please see attached.

The committee has exchanged several ideas via emails and has met once. The committee drafted 19 goals, including a survey of faculty, students, and staff, and an exchange of academic articles on the role of chapels in universities. Their next step is to follow up on an overture to intercampus faith and discuss a number of questions that both groups are asking:

- What is the intended relationship between Intercampus Faith and the chapel?



- Should there be removable religious symbols in the chapel? If so, what?
- According to the current architectural plan, the chapel is in shape of cross, which is inappropriate to many religions. Will we implement this draft of the plan?
- How will scheduling work?
- How will the space be used?
- Can the University hold mandatory events in the chapel?
- How will the state-funded university maintain the separation of church and state?
- From what source will the chapel's annual budget derive?

#### **Break 4:45-4:53**

**Selim leaves**

#### **C. Motions from subcommittees**

1. Subcommittee On Restricted Faculty Representation Report (Barnello)
  - On page 154, under Membership, c. 1) change the current language to: "All members of the Instructional faculty are eligible to serve in the Faculty Senate."
  - On page 155, Membership c. 2) change the language of the last sentence of paragraph two to read: "Three of the five members from each college must be tenured, one member must be probationary, and one member must be restricted."

See Section VI, B, 3 above.

2. Motion in Appreciation: Catering, Parking, Textbooks
  - Whereas the Faculty Senate met with members of the CNU administration (Paul Tribble, Mark Padilla, Bill Brauer, Cindi Perry) on September 9, 2011 to discuss a variety of faculty issues, the Senate would like to express its appreciation for the quick action taken on three issues that have a direct, positive impact on faculty life:
    1. The modification of catering policies for academic departments
    2. Pushing the start of open parking in faculty-designated parking lots from 3pm to 5:30pm
    3. Negotiating with Follett to create new policies to improve textbook ordering and distribution for the future

**Action:** Senators Weiss and Martin moved to pass the motion and accepted friendly amendments to add Bob Midgett and Christine Ledford to the list of administrators named, and to remove the meeting date and parentheses. The first paragraph in the resolution reads: "Whereas the Faculty Senate met with members



of the CNU administration, Paul Tribble, Mark Padilla, Bill Brauer, Cindi Perry, Bob Midgett and Christine Ledford, to discuss a variety of faculty issues, the Senate would like to express its appreciation for the quick action taken on three issues that have a direct, positive impact on faculty life..."

**Vote in Favor:** Unanimous

**Motion Passes**

3. Motion to raise summer stipends for chairs to \$5000 (see also above, Section VI, B, 4)

- Whereas the time and energy to do departmental business during the summer is equivalent to a 3-credit summer course, the stipend for department chairs should be raised to match the pay rate for a full-time faculty member teaching a summer course (\$5000).

**Action:** Senators Von Burg and Puaca moved to pass the motion and accepted a friendly amendment to add the phrase "as soon as possible" to the end of the sentence.

**Vote in Favor:** Unanimous

**Motion Passes**

D. Motion from the Senate Handbook Subcommittee

1. The Senate resolves to ask the Administrative and Professional Faculty Program Review Committee (APFPRC) to update section VII of the *University Handbook* to bring it in line with Section XII updates performed by the Faculty Senate. The Committee should review its evaluation standards and consider introducing language to review Administrative Faculty. (Connell, Adamitis).

**Action:** Senators Puaca and Carpenter moved to pass the motion.

**All in Favor:** Unanimous

**Motion Passes**

2. Senators Adamitis and Connell are reviewing Section XII of the *University Handbook* with the goals of adding sections on 3-Year contracts and conversion from restricted to probationary status and revising sections on evaluation to include references to the University EVAL-4.

See the attached document for proposed changes to the description of Restricted Appointments on p. 86 of the *University Handbook*. In brief, these changes clarify the current language and add information regarding 3-Year contracts.

**Discussion:**

The revised language needs further clarification, specifically:



- It not always clear whether "appointment" refers to the candidate or the position.
- "Reappointment" may suggest an expectation of continuity for restricted lines.
- Add "of position" the heading for section 5, e: Conversion of Position to Probationary Status.

For the November meeting, the subcommittee will present the addition of application procedures for a 3-Year contract to this section of the *University Handbook*. The implication of placing the application procedures here is that 3-Year contracts are awarded based primarily on institutional need; this is not a merit-based process, as is promotion to associate, full or distinguished professor.

3. Please see the attached document for revisions to the standards for tenure and promotion. In brief, these changes remove irrelevant language and add references to the standards articulated in the University EVAL-4 by which we are all currently evaluated.

**Discussion:** What should the research expectations be for Lecturers and Instructors?

E. Motion to support the Six-Year Plan to align faculty salaries with the 60 percentile of peer institutions

- Whereas CNU faculty has not received a merit increase in four years and will not receive one for the current academic year; and, whereas the CNU administration has authored a six-year plan, a portion of which lays out a proposal for raising faculty salaries; let it be resolved that the Faculty Senate supports the Six-Year Plan.

Discussion: Add "this portion of" to the final clause: "let it be resolved that the Faculty Senate supports this portion of the Six-Year Plan."

**Action:** Senators Puaca and Von Burg moved to accept the motion.

**Vote in Favor:** Unanimous

**Motion Passes**

F. Proposal to add to the *Handbook* Procedures for evaluating restricted Faculty: See above Section VI, D, 2.

G. Accelerated Committee Elections

The Senate will move forward with the plan to begin the election process in January and complete it by the beginning of March.

H. Faculty Workload Ratios



The administration has asked the Senate to consider implementing the new weights for teaching, research and service proposed in August.

**Discussion:**

- In general faculty like the variability of the new weights.
- When will we find out whether the new weights will be applied in AY 11-12?
- What do the new weights mean in terms of expectations? For example, will the requirements for earning the norm of "3" in research on the Annual Review be higher for faculty on a 3-3 teaching load?
- We need clarity regarding expectations; rubrics would be useful.
- How do we calculate the number of hours faculty should devote to teaching, research and service in a given week?
- We should develop a service spreadsheet to ensure that service assignments are distributed appropriately and equitably among faculty?

**Motion:** Senators Pollard and Adamitis moved to approve the new Faculty Workload Ratios as an initial draft with the proviso that we believe it still requires additional thought and improvement (e.g., timetable for implementation, clarity regarding expectations, mechanism for ensuring appropriate and equitable distribution of service commitments); the Faculty Senate is willing to work with the administration on these issues.

**Vote in Favor:** Unanimous

**Motion Passes**

I. New Time Slots: Please see the attached proposal.

The revised evening slots pose a problem for the MAT program, which offers the majority of its courses in the evening, in order to accommodate non-traditional students and internships/practicums. The MAT program may need to schedule required courses at the same time, which may impact timely graduation; moreover, the new slots run too late into the evening. The Senate will return to this issue in November.

J. Teaching Award Committee: No report.

K. Dossier Organization: Administrative Response: Please see the attached proposal.

Last year the Faculty Senate submitted a proposal on the organization of the dossier, which contained lists of mandatory and optional items to be included for review. The administration has reviewed that proposal and suggested revisions. Senate liaisons should share the new administrative proposal with their departments. The full Senate will discuss the proposal at the November meeting.

L. Environmental Studies Major and Minor: The committee has met several times and has developed the following plan: Fifty peer institutions have been identified and committee members are evaluating their curricula and identifying key courses common to each program. The committee will then look at the existing curriculum at CNU to



determine whether we already have the appropriate courses in place to support a minor. At this point it appears that we will be able to implement a strong program at CNU.

M. Other

1. President Pollard will attend the Faculty Senate of Virginia (FSVA) meeting in October. One of the issues he intends to discuss will be tuition remission for children of faculty and staff. Faculty should email President Pollard with other issues they would like him to raise at the meeting. CNU has been asked to host the FSVA March meeting.
2. The faculty has voiced several concerns about administering the IDEAs electronically:
  - Response rates typically decrease, rendering the results marginally reliable or unreliable.
  - There is no control over the circumstances in which students complete the forms.
  - The Deans altered many of the chairs' selections for courses to be evaluated and types of forms to be used (long or short).
  - IDEAs will be administered to all students in merged sections of a course, not just the sections selected by the faculty member for evaluation.
  - Students will receive separate emails with links to the evaluation forms for each of their courses. Will they respond to all the email prompts?
  - Some faculty have tried to reserve computer labs to administer the IDEAs to their classes, but either no labs were available or the labs were too small to accommodate the class.
  - The IDEA reports for this year may affect raises next year, should funds become available.
  - Did the students receive information/guidance regarding the importance of the IDEAs? If so, what and how?
3. Multiple Senate subcommittees plan to survey the faculty regarding issues raised at the Faculty and Senate meeting during Getting Started Week. We should combine these into one survey for a better response rate.

The meeting adjourned at 5:57 p.m.