

Minutes for the Faculty Senate Meeting
MCM 101
April 20, 2012
3:00PM-

Present: Redick, Von Berg, Weiss, Puaca (left at 3:25, returned 3:36), Barnello, Carpenter (arrived at 3:39), Pollard (left at 3:25, returned at 4:10, left at 4:11, returned at 4:14), Bardwell, Connell, Wang (left at 3:25, returned at 3:58), Martin, Depretis, (left at 3:25, returned at 3:36), Keeling (left at 3:25, returned at 3:36), Manning (left at 3:25)

Absent: Adamitis, Hall, Selim, Zestos

1. Call to Order at 3:16

The Senate proceeded out of order to consider the election at 3:16.

2. Approval of 3/16/12 The Senate returned to order at 3:36

Motion to approve by Bardwell

Seconded by Von Burg

Discussion: Secretary Connell noted that the minutes had some edits that needed to be completed. The Senate delegated to him and the SEC the authority to edit the minutes for style. The Senate then held a vote to approve the minutes with necessary style edits pending.

In favor: Redick, Weiss, Barnello, Carpenter, Bardwell, Connell, Martin

Opposed: None

Abstained: Puaca

3. President's Report: President Pollard asked that his discussion from the All Faculty Meeting held at 2PM stand for his report. In that meeting he presented a number of issues before the Senate.

He first discussed the recent disclosure of information to the SEC and Deans regarding the Virginia Retirement System. Lori Westphal, the Director of Human Resources, explained that faculty who are enrolled in the Virginia Retirement System (VRS) should expect a change in the way the University manages their contributions to the system. A new State-level policy requires employees to contribute to the VRS when they are under contract. Since most faculty are on 9-month contracts, they will have to pay their 5% contribution that the state now requires over those 9 months even though they are paid over 12 months. Beginning with the September 15th pay period, VRS faculty will have to contribute 6.67% of their salary to VRS and that will continue while they are under contract (until May). During the months that they are not under contract, they will make no contribution to the VRS. This effectively takes the 5% that VRS employees already pay, and concentrate it over 9 months. In aggregate, employees will have larger contributions during the 9 months they are under contract but they will have the very same take home pay over the course of the year.

The President reported that the SEC has continued to work with the senior administration to establish an annual evaluation using IDEA for Chairs, Deans, and the Provost. This has encountered significant resistance and no proposal was possible this academic year.

President Pollard also reported that the Faculty Senate of Virginia held a meeting on campus in March. This body is largely interested in legislative initiatives dealing with higher education in Virginia. Its president has pushed SB 104 which seeks to provide faculty with a 50% tuition waiver for their children at Virginia Universities. President Pollard reported that the bill went very far in the legislature. Unfortunately it was not funded this year, but tabled for the next session to be reconsidered. There is significant support for the bill in the legislature, both in the House of Delegates and the Virginia Senate.

President Pollard reported on the state of handbook changes that were not adopted by the University.

The Handbook Change 12, which the Provost put forward to address what he characterized as an inequality where the modest number of faculty on campus who receive an unsatisfactory AR score in scholarship currently have no sanction for lack of performance beyond the withholding of merit pay. His proposal would allow the appropriate Dean to assign an augmented teaching load to those faculty to address the deficiency. The Senate opposed this and made two specific arguments to support their opposition. First, it is not a particularly useful means to elicit scholarship and thus does not address the identified problem (it makes it harder for faculty to produce). Second, the administration would find greater support if it were to devise a way to allow faculty who choose to teach or who were hired in a different era with less emphasis on scholarship to choose a higher teaching load without the stigma of sanction. The Provost agreed to table this proposal and to take it up next year.

The Handbook Change 15, which created the Faculty Development and Evaluation Committee was not supported by the Provost who argued that the scope of the committee had moved too far into the evaluation process and was thus creating unnecessary redundancy. While the intent was to have the FDEC take over the work of the IDEA taskforce – the means with which this was communicated in the proposal was not sufficiently clear to make that evident. The FDEC will have to wait another year and be proposed by the next Senate.

The President reported on the coming initiatives from the Administration regarding the Liberal Learning Core. There is a significant push, as we approach the 5-year mark for our SACS accreditation, to align the LLC with SACS criteria and to work on effective measures of the areas. He referred to a report from the Liberal Learning Core Assessment Task Force that met this year. In their report, the committee identified challenges in finding appropriate educational measurements in 5 of 6 areas of inquiry.

President Pollard reported that in response to the Senate discussion last month of the academic calendar, the University Registrar has posted academic calendars in draft form going out several years into the future. This marks significant progress and will substantially aid the faculty in planning for upcoming academic years. The Senate would still like registration periods, IDEA administration periods, and Exam Schedules posted

along with the academic calendar and also made available on the University Google calendar that faculty have access to include through the Banner system.

Finally, President Pollard discussed the University Eval-4 which the Handbook Committee (Connell and Adamitis) took on the challenge of proposing revisions. President Pollard discussed the meeting between the SEC and the Provost where the proposed changes were reviewed. The Senate took up this issue further below, but President Pollard reported that progress was made and that the annual UE-4 changes will take place, but more importantly, the UE-4 will undergo a revision in the coming academic year to assess its effectiveness and to update it to reflect current assessment of faculty.

4. Liaison Reports.

The Senate then turned to consider Liaison reports from University Standing Committees.

The report from the Admissions committee came from Senator Redick who informed the Senate that the Committee elected a new chair, and that at the last meeting there was a detailed report from the Dean of Admissions. The fall Freshman Class is nearing completion. He also reported that the Admissions Office is working on electronic maps to aid new students so that they might become more familiar with campus. He also reported that the demographics of the new class would be similar to those of last year's freshman class.

Senator Bardwell reported that the University Assessment and Evaluation committee is working on the Weave program and its members are writing a report. They have met many times over the course of the academic year and are finishing their summary report.

Senator Connell gave a report on the International Studies Advisory Committee (ISAC). The chairman of that committee reported that 2011-12 had been a very successful year for Study Abroad and that more than 200 CNU students had participated in some kind of study abroad program including 40 who were involved in semester-long programs. ISAC has worked with Mandi Work who is the Study Abroad Coordinator. The committee itself has drafted handbook language to reflect the current administrative structure of the Study Abroad office, and has developed procedures for establishing programs affiliated with the University and sponsored by its faculty which should help to ensure all are clearly defined and that privilege what the University values in the study abroad experience. ISAC has also worked to develop a contingency account for overseas emergencies to assist our students.

5. Department Reports

There were no official reports from departments. There was one concern that was raised regarding emeritus status. Some background is in order. Last year, a number of senior faculty retired in response to an incentive program offered by the University. As a result, Senators remembered that there were many emeriti faculty but that during the honor ceremony these were not read as has been customary. Some wondered if this was to be the policy of the University going forward. The Senate discussed this briefly and had no

official answer. Senators felt that it was appropriate that emeriti faculty be appropriately honored for their service and resoundingly supported the reading of honor plaques at graduation.

Some among the Luter faculty wanted to discuss the University Calendar. They hoped that in addition to augmented information on the Academic and University Google calendar that scheduled faculty events, such as speakers and symposia, might also be included to increase awareness among the faculty but also to avoid scheduling multiple events on the same day as happened earlier in April.

6. Old Business

- a.** Report from Ad Hoc Committee on Religious Tolerance (Bardwell) This business was done out of order at 3:18. Senator Bardwell (who had just presented to the All Faculty Meeting), moved to push her committee's recommendations as a motion to be considered by the Senate next year. She also asked the Senate to accept her report and to publish the PowerPoint and data from her committee's survey of faculty on the Faculty Senate website. This was done unanimously.
- b.** Report from Child Care Committee (Hall) Senator Hall provided the Senate with a draft motion. It will be presented electronically to the full Senate which will vote on the motion. It reads as follows.

Faculty Senate Resolution on Child Care

Whereas there is keen interest among the members of the faculty at Christopher Newport University for a high-quality child care center,

Whereas such a center would facilitate CNU's efforts to attract and retain talented workers,

Whereas child care benefits (including on-campus facilities) are predominant among our peer universities, whether in the category of selective Liberal Arts universities or in the category of public universities in the commonwealth of Virginia,

Whereas CNU is large enough, and has a young enough faculty, that there is little doubt sufficient demand for a high-quality child care facility exists,

Whereas CNU students would benefit from having access to training in early childhood pedagogy,

Whereas CNU staff members could also benefit from having access to high-quality care for their children offered on or near campus,

Whereas child care centers have been demonstrated to be cost effective, and even able to return a small profit to the university,

Whereas there are numerous other good reasons for CNU to provide a child care facility as detailed in the faculty senate child care committee's final report,

Therefore be it resolved that:

1. The CNU administration should no later than August 31, 2012 convene a task force that would as necessary study and assess the following issues related to the construction and maintenance of a child care facility located on or near campus: location, physical attributes (size, security), staffing, quality control, supervision (e.g., management of the facility either outsourced or done in-house), student participation (e.g., for the MAT program), and date to open the facility, and
2. The task force will by the end of AY 2012-13 make recommendations on those issues to the administration.

- c. Committee on Intellectual Property Nominees (Rachel Holland, Andrew Velkey)
President Pollard solicited the following nominations for the Committee on Intellectual Property. They will be passed on to the President who appoints the committee members.

7. New Business

- a. 2012-13 Senate Elections (President, Vice-President, Secretary, At-Large Members (2))

President Pollard (as is customary, assisted by the Senators present who are going off the Senate at the completion of their terms at the close of the Academic Year, invited new Senators to the floor and convened the 2012-13 Senate. The 2012-13 Senate came to order at 3:17

President Pollard presented the following candidates for elected positions on the Senate Executive Committee. These nominations were made in advance of the meeting as is customary.

President: Stephanie Bardwell

Vice President: Kip Redick

Secretary: Bill Connell

At Large: Jana Adamitis

At Large: Edward Weiss

President Pollard then asked for other nominations from the floor. None were offered. The Senate thus agreed to vote on the whole slate as there were none standing in opposition.

Vote:

In Favor: Connell, Redick, Bardwell, Puaca, Weiss, Wang, Martin, Depretis, Keeling, Manning

Opposed: None

Abstain: none

Following the vote, the 2012-13 Senate completed its business and the 2011-12 Senate reconvened at 3:25.

- b.** Faculty Awards (Von Burg) The Senate went into closed session at 3:26 to consider Faculty Awards in Teaching, Scholarship, and Service.
- c.** Faculty Development Grants (Bardwell)
The Senate Continued in Closed Session to consider FDGs.

The Senate returned to Order at 3:36 to approve the minutes

- d.** Spring IDEA was considered in order at 3:50
Senators briefly discussed the IDEA report that was given by Deb Moore to the full faculty. Some Senators were concerned that although on average the rate of response by students was high, at around 70%, the responses were uneven. In some cases, the response was high, but Senators had heard from colleagues that their response rates were dismally low. Senators appreciated the efforts by the assessment office to purge from the lists students who had withdrawn up to the date that IDEA was administered. This was obviously a harrowing task and one that the assessment office under the leadership of Deb Moore took on willingly and went beyond the expectation of the faculty.
- e.** Wednesday-Tuesday Term Schedule
Senators discussed briefly the problems associated with the Wednesday start date of the spring semester. The primary concern comes mostly from lab sciences where there is stress upon splitting a lab between week 1 and 16. Senators from NBS seem to have figured out how to make this work. Some Senators wondered what the purpose of the Wednesday start to the semester and questioned its utility. What, for example, was the rationale and why, if it creates problems, did this change happen if it does not add something necessary?
- f.** Academic Calendars, Advising Calendar, Google Calendar
The President's report seemed cover this item sufficiently. Senators were greatly pleased by the publication of the Academic Calendar for several years into the future.
- g.** Faculty Notification About Suspended Students in Classes (Puaca)
Faculty in several departments were concerned about the management of information, particularly to faculty, who have had students in their classes who were suspended from campus due to disciplinary infractions. Faculty Senators expressed concern that there should be notification to instructional faculty (when it is appropriate and affects them directly) when students are barred from campus for whatever reason. These concerns have come from faculty in the past when students are deemed a security risk or might be considered dangerous to faculty. Most recently, students taken off campus in the spring semester were an issue

because faculty felt they were not adequately informed or given direction as to what these students were entitled to (e.g. could they take the final exam?). Senators recognized that there are confidentiality issues that make sharing such information difficult, but also reasoned that there should be a protocol in place that everyone is aware of at the very least.

The Senate discussed the issue of FERPA protections, but wondered if the University Council might make clearer when FERPA makes it improper to discuss situations of concern to faculty who have a student in their course who is disciplined by the University – e.g. when a faculty member might need to exercise caution with a student who might pose a threat. Senators also raised the issue as one of potential liability, referencing news coverage of the ongoing lawsuits against Virginia Tech and the allegation that the University did not sufficiently inform the campus of a potential danger.

8. Other

The Senate took up additional business. One concern raised by the Senate came out of the discussion of the University EVAL-4. The Senate Handbook Committee proposed to the senior administration to adjust the percentages for evaluation to reflect what it construed as current practice. As the UE-4 currently reads that faculty are assessed according to that document using the Teaching-Scholarship-Service ratio of 50-30-20. Because in the fall 2011 semester, the Provost offered modified weights to govern faculty work correspondent to teaching load, the Handbook Committee proposed putting that table into the UE-4. The Handbook Committee exposed what appears to be a common misperception that the 50-30-20 ratio was superseded by the new work ratios outlined by the Provost in the fall. When the SEC met with the Provost and the Deans in April, they related that the faculty work guidelines that the Provost provided in fall 2011 were only applicable to the Annual Review cycle – year-to-year evaluation and that for the Provost, the UE-4 was a discreet document that governed only 2, 4, tenure, and promotion reviews. Furthermore, the Provost argued that the UE-4 was primarily for probationary and tenured faculty, and explicitly for the major reviews and promotion stages in faculty careers. The net effect is that for 2, 4, tenure and promotion reviews faculty are evaluated by different weights than they are assessed by in any given year in the Annual Review cycle.

Senators were generally unaware of the situation or that the weights proposed by the Provost in fall 2011 were exclusively for annual review. SEC members who have anecdotally polled faculty on this issue identified general unawareness of this reality and also confusion as to why there might be two systems in place to evaluate faculty, even in the same year at times. Senators expressed concern that faculty are likely unaware that they are being assessed in two different sets of criteria depending on the year they are reviewed. In addition, in a year that faculty go up for a major review (2, 4, tenure, and promotion) and an Annual review, they are assessed by two different measures at the same time for two different circumstances using the very same mechanism to make their case (the EVAL-6). Senators who were at the SEC meeting with the Provost and the Deans conveyed that the example provided by the Provost to illustrate why this must be the case. He argued, using the instance of Department Chairs, who are required to do only minimal scholarship and are thus tasked with heavy service loads and accordingly evaluated more for service than teaching or scholarship. As a result, were the University Administration to accept the chair weights of 45-25-30 for a major review the weight would place too much

emphasis upon service to meet the standards of promotion at the major reviews. They would not grant tenure for excellence in service as a Chair, in other words, when teaching and scholarship were minimized.

Senators discussed the need for clarification and for a campus-wide discussion regarding the relationship between Annual Review weights and 2, 4, tenure and promotion review weights. Senators also expressed concern that beginning next year, virtually all faculty save for those who choose a teaching emphasis and restricted faculty, will have an annual review expectation of 45% teaching, and yet those going up for major reviews and tenure and promotion will be assessed at a higher weight for teaching and lower weight for scholarship than will have been expected of their workloads for annual review. It seems to complicate significantly what should be a uniform expectation for faculty work.

Senators continued to receive reports regarding the Follett book order service and its deficiencies. One Senator was told that Follett would not make available to students earlier editions of textbooks even though those are acceptable for use in the class and considerably cheaper.

The Faculty Senate then took up the following motion.

The Faculty Senate expresses its sincerest appreciation to Faculty Senate President Scott Pollard for his extensive and productive work on behalf of the CNU faculty. Academic year 2011-12 was a successful year due to Scott's diligence and concern for the continued growth and development of CNU.

Moved by Senator Weiss

Seconded by Senator Von Burg

The Vote, Senators unanimously supported the motion

President Pollard asked for a motion to end the meeting.

Senator Redick so moved

Senator Von Burg seconded

By Affirmation the Senate voted to adjourn

The meeting ended at 4:15