

Members present: Adamitis, Manning, Martin, Grau, Brash (entered at 3:20), Holland, Barnello, Nichols, Hunter, Timani, Jelinek, Thompson, Busch, Winder, Hasbrouck

The October 17, 2014 faculty senate meeting was called to order at 3:04 PM

President Adamitis first welcomed our guest Dr. Geoffrey Klein, Vice-Provost for Research, Graduate Studies, and Assessment. Dr. Klein agreed to give us an update on the state of assessment at CNU.

Dr. Klein began by reporting that there is a search taking place for a new assessment director. Our former assessment director, Dr. Jill Kern, left at the end of September. Dr. Klein will also update the Senate regarding assessment initiatives that are occurring at CNU.

According to Dr. Klein the hiring committee is one-third of the way into the search process for the new assessment director. The search committee consists of the following six members: Dr. Roberto Flores, Dr. John Hyland, Ms. Anne Pascucci, Ms. Mandi Pierce, Dr. Stephanie Valutis and Dr. Klein. The search committee has completed their telephone interviews. There were 33 applicants which led to eight phone interviews. Two candidates will be brought to campus with the possibility of others being brought in later, if necessary. The first of their selected candidates, Dr. Yongmei Li, will be coming to CNU to interview on Monday October 27 and the second candidate, Dr. Stephanie Zedler, will interview on Thursday October 30. The on-campus interviews will include meetings with HR, the search committee, etc. Each candidate will give a presentation on the subject of the role of assessment as a resource for continuous improvement at a liberal arts university. During each candidate's visit, the hiring committee will also conduct a Q&A session which will include all people affiliated with assessment, including the LLC, all chairs, department assessment liaisons, UAEC members, and any other interested faculty. Geoffrey expressed that the committee welcomes feedback from all faculty based upon the on campus interviews. Please send input to any member of the hiring committee.

The hiring committee is on schedule with the entire process. Depending on the candidates, the plan is to hire someone by mid-November. In the meantime, Dr. Klein pointed out that assistant director of assessment, Shaun Smith (who began at CNU in August) is available to help department assessment liaisons as we move toward reaccreditation and beyond.

Dr Klein moved on to discuss the assessment initiatives that are currently taking place at CNU. He recently sent an email to department chairs and assessment liaisons that communicated the assessment calendars including the submission dates of PLO's, CLO's and curriculum maps. Each of these is due at the end of October. This is the final culmination of the work done last year on assessment. A full assessment plan for academic programs is due at the end of April and Dr. Klein offered the Office of Assessment as a resource for help in that work. The full assessment plan from each department will include, programs included in the department, CLO, PLO's, and the methodology that the program will utilize to assess whether students gained class objectives and the dates by which these data will be collected.

Something new is that the office of assessment is shifting to a tri-ennial (3 year cycle) for departments undergoing full assessment. Every three years departments will be asked to send in a full assessment report. However, departments will still be asked to include assessment data in all annual reports sent to the Deans. Dr. Klein indicated that the timeline for departments for full assessment will be sent out in the next month or two. The first set of full assessment reports will be due in the fall of the next

academic year. Under the new triennial scheduling, each college will have two or three departments undergoing full assessments each year.

Dr Klein next reported on the work the LLC is specifically doing on assessment. The LLC is working on the assessment of our Area of Inquiries. The LLC has broken down into subcommittees to perform this task. Our assessment of the Area of Inquiries occurs every three semesters. Each Area of Inquiry is on a different schedule for assessment. Currently INW is now collecting assessment data from several courses. Civic and Democratic engagement and Western Traditions is developing how they hope to collect data in the upcoming Spring 2015 semester. They will collect data in the spring semester and will be reporting to the LLC.

In terms of assessment of foundations, Geoffrey has touched base with all five foundations and he will meet with the point people to see where they are in the process of assessment. Dr. Klein will meet with those point people in the next week or so. Dr. Klein hopes that they will develop a staggered timeline with assessment, with reports sent to the LLC to demonstrate how students are meeting outcomes associated with the foundations.

The UAEC is developing institutional outcomes for this year. They are charged with the articulation of institutional learning outcomes. These are more summative than others. Dr. Klein guesses that these will align with the SCHEV core competencies that CNU has been reporting on for many years. The UAEC will be bringing their ILO's through all of the proper channels including the LLC, the UAEC and the faculty senate. The University has goals for liberal learning outcomes but these are not assessable according to Dr. Klein. The UAEC must translate into outcomes that we can assess. Dr. Klein then asked if there were any questions from the senate.

Senator Winder asked Dr. Klein, as an institution, in the aggregate, how we are doing in this reaffirmation process? Are we playing catch up and does Dr. Klein feel comfortable that we are on track in this process? Dr. Klein responded that we are on track but that there are some areas that are in need of some catch up. According to Dr. Klein, assessment is an area that has changed dramatically in the last ten years or so. SCHEV has now better articulated the full assessment loop for all of the different areas including student assessment and civic engagement. However, Dr. Klein feels that we are now simply articulating what CNU has been doing all along. There are some minor changes needed in order to not overburden people involved in this effort. Dr. Klein stated that we're off to a good start for accreditation in 2017 with respect to academic programs. We have done this quite well over the past few years. Minor changes, to reduce departmental work expenditures, have already been completed. In the past, what CNU had done, didn't provide information that we could use to make curricular changes. According to Dr. Klein, all that SACS asks is that, on an annual basis, we are conscious of how our students are doing.

Senator Manning asked about the two candidates that we are bringing in to campus and whether they would keep us going in the same direction that we have been going with assessment? Dr. Klein responded that the hiring committee has made it clear to each candidate that CNU is in the plan execution phase of our assessment process. The hiring committee made it clear to candidates that we need help with executing the assessment plans that have already been created. It is the goal of the Provost's office to keep moving forward with our existing assessment plans.

Senator Thompson asked what goes into the 2017 affirmation? Dr. Klein answered that we must prepare for an onsite review by the SACCOC. That affirmation officially takes place in December of 2017, however for us as a university this will be a 2.5/3 year process. Right now we are in the initial start up phase. The leadership team on this endeavor will be attending an orientation in December. The kick off phase will take place in the spring 2015. The compliance certification stage has 90 standards with which the university must show compliance. Institutional effectiveness comprises 5 of these standards. Dr. Klein states that the reaffirmation process is comprised of two parallel tracks -- the compliance certification report and the QEP. We will run these two tracks in parallel. The compliance certification report is more of an administrative action. However, Dr. Klein would like to have a faculty senate representative on that committee. That team will be formed this upcoming year. On the other hand, the QEP is more a faculty driven process and looks at deciding what we as a university want to enhance. For the last QEP, for CNU, this was critical thinking. So the first step is to decide what to select as our quality enhancement area. Dr. Klein stated that we are in the process of putting together the QEP team now. In the spring of 2016 we will develop the plan. But, both committees will run in parallel.

A senator asked whether both the QEP committee and the compliance certification report committee will have faculty representation. To which Dr. Klein responded that the larger portion of the QEP will be faculty members. There should also be student support personnel on that committee as well, since the QEP will have a co-curricular component and facilities such as the Center for Student Success is an important part of that. The compliance certification committee will have 2 to 3 faculty members in a 12 to 15 person team. The roster for both of these committees is based upon what Dr. Klein has observed at other universities.

The Senate returned to its agenda.

4. Approval of September 19 minutes – Senator Manning moved to approve the minutes as amended and Senator Holland seconded. Vote to approve (unanimous)

2. Faculty Senate President's Report

September Budget Report

On behalf of the Faculty Senate, I would like to thank Chief of Staff Cynthia Perry for her very informative presentation on the structure of the University budget and the updates on the state budget cuts at the September meeting.

As of today, the information regarding the budget remains the same: We are facing a 2.3% reduction this year and next. At this point, there will not be any cuts on the academic side of the house.

Fall Freshmen Registration

Dr. Pete Carlson, our Faculty Director for Student Success, has reached out to all chairs and deans regarding freshmen registration for Fall 2015. He has already provided a list of potential learning community pairings as well as information on the number of seats to be saved in each department for the incoming freshmen. Last week he met with the chairs in all three colleges, where he expressed his willingness to collaborate with chairs throughout the process. Dr. Carlson's efforts at collaboration and open communication are much appreciated.

Lecturer Titles and Contracts

The Provost's Advisory Staff is currently reviewing a proposal to grant lecturers additional titles and extended contracts of up to five years. At this point, I anticipate that the proposal will be presented to the faculty within the next few weeks and that the Senate will be able to discuss it at the November meeting. In order to solicit as much faculty feedback as possible, the Senate should host a series of open meetings, where faculty may communicate their thoughts about the proposal. Following past practices, I would suggest that one Senator or designee be asked to take notes at each session, which will be shared first with the attendees and then, once the attendees have approved the notes, with the faculty at large. No names or departmental or college affiliations will be included. We should also consider reserving some of these sessions for specific target groups, such as lecturers and/or tenure-stream faculty. If the proposal is released by November 3rd, I would suggest that we host the open sessions prior to the November Senate meeting so that we may be fully informed when we discuss this important issue.

Tenure-Stream vs Renewable Contract Lines

At the September meeting, many Senators expressed concerns about the ratio of tenure-stream to renewable contract faculty lines, so the SEC discussed this matter with the Provost at our September 24th meeting. At present, 32.6% of the faculty holds renewable-contract status, which is slightly higher than we would like. Provost Doughty's goal is to adjust the ratio over the next few years to 75% tenure-stream and 25% renewable contract. This may be accomplished through conversions and by using future growth positions to increase tenure-stream lines.

Department Liaisons

If you have not yet met with your department, please make arrangements to do so now. Recommendations from various administrative bodies and committees will start arriving soon, and we want to have as much faculty feedback as possible.

Faculty Senate Meeting with President Tribble: Fri., Oct. 24, 4:00 p.m., DSU Boardroom

Our primary goal at this meeting is to present a progress report on our goals. All committees should be prepared to give a report.

Regarding the President's report, senators asked if there is a PBK standard for the ratio of tenure-stream and renewable contracts. Given Senator Jelinek's service to a related committee she responded that she will check if such a ratio exists for PBK. President Adamitis suggested that we find out more about the PBK application process. President Adamitis will ask that Laura Delulio write up a list of what goes into a PBK application and will perhaps ask that Laura attend a future faculty senate meeting to speak about PBK.

Senator Busch asked if there was any more news regarding the standards that the Provost unilaterally put in place for tenure. Perhaps the Provost is using a model for how and what faculty publish before tenure that is based solely upon that used in the sciences. Senator Timani asked if we could possibly obtain information on what other university's do in terms of faculty publishing from their dissertation. President Adamitis responded that this was tasked out to the CUC. Jana said that there does exist much data from National Associations in the Arts and Humanities that speaks to the issue of publishing from the dissertation.

5. Committee Updates

Committee on Academic Standing Committees (Vice-President Manning chair)

The committee reviewed the standing committees. In particular the committee asked the following: What is the function of all University standing committees? For one, this committee is charged with looking for efficiencies in our university committee system. Given the possible development of a Business college at CNU, this committee must also examine the composition of committees under a four college model. Of course there should be representation on committees from all four colleges, but one must guarantee a fair distribution from colleges on committees. The Committee on Academic Standing Committees is considering the possibility that the faculty senate take control of faculty appointments to committees, that is, a more faculty driven committee structuring. In the future this committee will discuss recommendations for a 4-college model of representation and the valuing of certain committees (per the EVAL-4). This committee is under a strict deadline because the timeline for getting committee changes into the handbook is January. Senator Manning states that we are in a tricky position because we will soon need to repopulate committees and yet the structure of our university might change. So, as mentioned by a fellow senator, we don't want to do too much restructuring until we find out about the change to a 4-college system. President Adamitis also mentioned that a four college change is also budget driven. However, we do want a plan in place in the event the change does occur. Senator Manning also pointed out that in the past CNU was under a four college model and so it will be possible to look back at how committees were structured then. Consolidation of committees is a possibility according to Senator Manning. Senator Manning will have something to report soon. There are good opportunities for creating efficiencies and having additional reporting to the faculty senate. Dr. Klein gave valuable input at a previous meeting of this committee.

Child Care Subcommittee (Senator Hunter, chair):

The Child Care Subcommittee has looked at what other schools have been doing. At this point there are three possibilities for us at CNU in terms of child care: 1. Create a maintained list of caregivers available for the exclusive use of CNU faculty/staff. 2. Create a cooperative agreement with an existing child care center – similar to what is done at the University of Richmond. This had been looked at by a past faculty senate committee. According to Vice-President Brauer, this is an avenue that could be quickly pursued if we decide to go this route. 3. The creation of an on-campus, privatized child care center. Senator Hunter reported that the Senate overwhelmingly supports our efforts for compiling a list of model programs. Also, there is great support for pursuing the idea of camps for days when CNU is in session, but local elementary and middle schools are not in session. The committee is working on a survey to be distributed to faculty/staff at CNU asking for their input on child care here at CNU. If there is anything that we want on that survey, you should email that to Senator Hunter.

Faculty Excellence Awards Committee (Senator Jelinek): The website has been updated to indicate all of the changes.

Faculty Development Grants and Sabbaticals (Senator Thompson) Sabbaticals have come in and the first of forms on faculty development grants are due November 7th.

Religious Diversity and Dialogue Committee (Senator Martin reported) This committee is about to meet. A report from them will be due soon.

6. Endowment Agreement for Faculty Dependent Endowed Scholarship (Senator Grau) Motion on the endowment agreement had been previously tabled.

Senator Grau moved that the motion for this endowment agreement be removed from the table.
Seconded by Senator Hunter.

As background, once \$50K is raised, CNU would be able to award one \$2000 scholarship, each year, to a faculty dependent. Senators suggested that, until this fund is built to a considerable level, a student should only be able to receive a scholarship one year. Upon discussion, the biggest point of concern involved the question of how we decide what child would get the scholarship. As written, the scholarship would go to the dependent of a CNU faculty who has the most seniority. Senator Grau made it clear that the wording of the agreement does not say that the scholarship must go to only one child. Given that there currently exists many merit based scholarship at CNU, the question was raised whether CNU needs another merit based scholarship. Many Senators were not in favor of using seniority as a means of deciding who would get the award. It was more thought that the award should be based upon the merit of the student. Senators expressed that there should be some type of application involved with this process. Senators suggested that the faculty senate could form a committee that would always decide upon who gets the scholarship. However, one drawback of this faculty senate decision making committee would be that faculty would be judging other faculty member's children. Most senators said that they prefer to have merit involved when deciding upon the awardee. Senator Brash noted that we currently lose students because of the lack of scholarships available here at CNU – so this would begin to help in that respect. One idea raised, as criterion for awarding, would be to simply use a lottery. Basing the decision upon a lottery would enhance this scholarship's service as a faculty recruitment tool. At the conclusion of a long discussion on this matter, President Adamitis suggested that all senators go back to their departments and solicit faculty opinion. We should ask faculty whether they would be willing to contribute to such a fund. Because this scholarship needs \$50K to get off the ground, it is important then that there is support from the CNU faculty on this endeavour. In the event that \$50K is not raised in the initial seven years, all of the money generated would go back into the general scholarship pool.

Senators should go back to their faculty asking, which do they favor: option 1. Need based awarding option 2. merit based awarding or option 3. a lottery for awarding. Also senators should ask, do you think that this endowment makes a good statement to the state saying that this is an important need here at CNU? Also faculty should be made aware that, upon insufficient funding, this scholarship could dissolve.

The motion to adopt the Faculty Dependent Endowed Scholarship was tabled.

7. Some concern was expressed about students completing an IDEA evaluation while the student is in the CHEKS process. This will be brought to the attention of the Provost.

Meeting was adjourned at 6:15

