

CNU Faculty Senate Minutes
17 February 2012
DSU Washington

Present Selim, Puaca, Connell, Hall (left 3:55), Martin, Carpenter, Weiss, Zestos, Redick, Wang, Von Burg, Barnello, Adamitis (arrived 4:10)

Absent: Bardwell

1. Call to Order 3:04 Call to order
2. Affirmation of Minutes from 1.20.12. The minutes were electronically approved by the Senate on 16 February 2012. President Pollard asked us to affirm that approval. Senator Wang asked to discuss a proposed modification to the characterization of his statement regarding the FRC and DRC relationship from the last meeting. In the minutes, his comments were construed and therefore depicted differently than he had intended. The statement in question comes from the department and liaison report section of the minutes. Senator Wang referred in general to cases where the DRC was overridden by the FRC. Senator Wang's comments while they seemed to refer to a PCSE colleague – he in reality was referring to the general issue of the faculty in his department that DRCs should be given discretion to determine the quality of research and that the FRC may not be as good a body to determine disciplinary expertise. The minutes will be changed to reflect this distinction.

Senator Connell also added a modification to the minutes as a friendly amendment.

In the section regarding the representation on the Senate, the minutes use the word College in several instances where department was clearly intended. These changes will be reflected in the minutes posted on the Senate website.

Senators, in light of the changes voted again to approve the minutes. President Pollard called the vote, seconded by Senator Hall.

In Favor: Selim, Puaca, Hall, Martin, Carpenter, Weiss, Zestos, Redick, Wang, Von Burg, Barnello, Connell

Opposed: none

Abstain: none

3. President's Report:

President pollard provided **this report** to the Senate. His comments to the Senate followed closely his report. He began with the survey of faculty life and religious tolerance. He reported that those surveys had been completed and the committees were preparing reports for the Senate.

President Pollard then discussed briefly his reflections upon the IDEA administration from the fall. The major issue seemed to be isolated to relatively few courses but involved students who had either withdrawn from classes and were still given the survey to assess the course. Apparently the Office of Assessment and Evaluation had already taken care of the problems and was working diligently to insure that it would not recur.

The final exam schedule problems from the Fall are being handled proactively by the Registrar's Office. Some senators had already been contacted that had potential conflicts in the spring term. The president and the Senate in general praised this effort on the part of the University Registrar and look forward to a smoother experience in the spring. Department Liaisons from the Senate were asked to talk to their departments to see if they can get faculty to identify potential conflicts in the schedule early so that they might be addressed well in advance of the exam period.

The President reported that the SEC had met with the Provost and discussed the University budget. The Provost also talked about the budget at his faculty meeting on 16 February. President Pollard also talked about the budget prospects for the coming year with President Tribble. President Pollard reported that in the long term President Tribble was optimistic and expressed great confidence in the Board of Visitors and the Governor of Virginia to continue to prioritize our academic mission. Provost Padilla was less optimistic in the immediate term and reported to the Senate and the general faculty that AY 2012/13 might present significant challenges and that even this budget year might see a drawback of funding to meet state requirements for a potential bonus next year.

President Pollard reported on the dossier reorganization proposal forwarded by the Senate in 2010/11 and the counter-proposal provided by the University Administration. The SEC discussed with the Provost the Senate position that it intended in 2010/11 to streamline the dossiers to make them reflective of what is needed and to limit the unnecessary bulk. The Provost did not see the need to change making the argument that he liked the paper version in binders and the ability it gave him to find material that he needed to see. He also argued that change would be difficult and would generate dissatisfaction among faculty. The Provost made the persuasive case that sticking with the current system works well and the proposed changes will engender unnecessary conflicts – a position held by some on the Senate in 2010/11 when the proposed change was initiated. The SEC felt that this was a reasonable position. In the long term, however, the SEC would like to see the University embrace fully an electronic dossier when it can commit the resources.

President Pollard and President Tribble met on 2 February and discussed a variety of issues including making formal spaces on campus for faculty to gather. President Tribble explained to President Pollard that he does not support the idea of creating a faculty club, or any kind of permanent dedicated space for faculty to gather, during his tenure as university president. He does support setting aside space in the dining facilities for faculty lunches and might dedicate a portion of Regattas to such a purpose. President Tribble also reiterated his support for child care solutions to be made available for more faculty.

President Pollard discussed the tenure appeal case and stated that he had submitted, in consultation with the SEC, a letter that reflected the concerns discussed by senators in the November and January Faculty Senate meetings. The BOV meeting on 24 February will provide a final ruling on the tenure cases that went forward this year and will also

consider one appeal by a faculty member. The letter emphasized the concerns raised in the Senate and emphasized areas where apparent problems may have occurred.

The SEC in its meeting with the Provost did not have an opportunity to discuss tenure decisions. In part it is procedurally difficult as there are confidentiality issues that cloud any effort to discuss specific issues and the SEC and Senate support fully a healthy and vibrant tenure system and thus have very little in general to say beyond that we and the faculty we represent fully support tenure. President Pollard suggested that we take time at the end of the year to organize a faculty meeting led by the Faculty Senate to gather faculty ideas about the tenure process and to explore some of the challenges from the past two years. President Pollard also offered that the American Association of University Professors (AAUP) guidelines are very specific and encourage transparency at all levels in the decision making process including the right to have an explanation of cause for the denial of tenure and a review of the decision.

President Pollard mentioned briefly that Deb Moore in the Assessment office wanted to make us aware that two surveys are coming to the whole faculty. One, from Dr. Mary Wright who directs the writing program at CNU, will assess faculty workload and the writing intensive courses. A second survey will solicit faculty feedback on the fall electronic IDEA survey. Some senators expressed concern about the abundance of surveys with the three bundled surveys in early February, the Standing Committee Election and now two more. The hope is that these surveys will not overly burden the faculty who may see the value in different constituencies of the University seeking to learn about faculty views on matters of institutional policy.

President Pollard spoke at the student assembly and was impressed with their interest in university governance. Student representatives seem generally interested in participating in community-wide initiatives such as the committee on religious tolerance. President Pollard will see if the committee can invite student representation on that body.

4. Chairs' Reports

The Liaisons to the chairs committees were asked to provide updates on the business of these groups. Each liaison responded that discussions in the meetings were of ordinary matters and had nothing of special importance to avail the Senate.

5. Department and Liaison Reports

There were several issues that emerged from department liaisons. One quite important issue emerged in Philosophy and Religious studies involving the Sabbatical applications of two department members. The two individuals in questions noted that the minutes of Faculty Senate from January reported the awarding of sabbaticals, and then realized that they had not received any information on the status of their applications. Some background is in order: Sabbatical applications are due each Fall to a faculty member's chair who first evaluates and offers commentary on each application. These are then submitted to the Dean of the college who conducts a college-wide assessment of sabbatical applications. The Dean forwards those applications to the Faculty Senate

Sabbatical sub-committee which makes a final recommendation to the Provost. The Provost then awards the sabbaticals.

The liaison from Philosophy and Religious Studies, Senator Redick, was notified by those in his liaison department of the problem and asked to investigate. He approached the chair of the department who produced her records that she received the applications and had sent them to the Dean of Arts and Humanities. The chair of the Senate Sabbatical Committee, Senator Puaca, stated that he had no record of the applications from Philosophy and Religious Studies. President Pollard offered to contact with Senator Redick the Dean of Arts and Humanities to determine if the applications made it to his office and if there was some reason why they never made it to the Senate committee.

The Senate discussed the issue in several ways. At first, many wondered if the applications were late or if they were submitted improperly or incompletely. Senators also were concerned that the applications came from a single department and wondered if there was a connection or a problem at the level of chair (this was not the case). Senators also expressed concern that with sabbaticals already awarded that the University had no viable avenue to rectify the apparent mistake. As for solutions, the Senate discussed the obvious need for a tracking system. Some suggested an electronic system of some kind so that all who apply can be certain that each level review (Chair, Dean, Senate, and Provost), knows of all applications that have been submitted and thus will be aware if any do not make the transfer from one review to the next.

The Senate then turned to other liaison reports. Senator Connell raised two issues that emerged in history regarding Student Athlete academic reports and team travel schedules. The first issue involved a sense from faculty that academic performance reports solicited by the Athletic Department on student athletes seemed to come regularly, but then there is very little communication if a problem is identified on the form. While the athletic department may act on these forms, faculty expressed a desire to know about the actions and to hear about any interventions initiated by the athletic department.

The Second issues was more substantive. One faculty member in the History Department was presented with a travel schedule for a student athlete that required that s/he miss more than 30% of the class s/he was enrolled in with that faculty member. The faculty member expressed deep frustration that, first, the Athletic Department should have advised this particular athlete to avoid the particular time slot in question to ensure that such a scenario could not happen. The Senate discussed the matter and anecdotally referred to other similar situations experienced by Senators. Senators also noted that the Athletic Department generally knows the travel schedule for all teams in advance of the semester and should clearly at the very least be aware that their athletes will miss particular classes excessively. Senators also wondered if there might be a way to determine within the Athletic Department itself when athletes will miss substantial numbers of classes and to make some kind of intervention to either avoid such situations or, if that is impossible, notify more officially and sooner when these situations arise.

The NCAA faculty representative, Senator Redick, was fortunately able to speak to these issues. He suggested on the first issue that faculty who have concerns and would like additional information to contact him or Coach Nuttycombe to solicit such information.

On the second issue, he spoke generally that Division III rules make situations where students might miss class excessively rare and that the athletic department is committed to making academic work a priority for student athletes. He also said that faculty who are confronted with student-generated forms that show excessive travel dates might first check these dates with the coach to ensure that there is not a misunderstanding. Senators wondered if it would not be a more effective system to have the Athletic Department send faculty lists of student athletes and the days their team will travel and the likelihood that the individual student in the class will be on the travel squad. Senators also felt that such data would be useful if provided just after the drop/add period expires at the beginning of the term.

6. Faculty Mentoring Report

Professor Filetti, the chair of the Faculty Mentoring Committee, submitted a detailed report that assesses the work of the committee. That report can be found [here](#) and it provides some assessment data gathered from mentors and new faculty and provides a description of the activities of the committee and of faculty mentors. General perceptions from the survey data seem to indicate that none of the faculty surveyed were dissatisfied with the experience, but the report notes a significant percentage of neutral responses. The report made a series of recommendations, they are:

The initial meeting of mentors and mentees should be positioned again during “Getting Started Week.”

Given the number of restricted hires at the university, the FMC should continue to assign mentors to both tenure-track and restricted faculty.

The Faculty Senate should recommend to the Provost, for inclusion in the University Eval-4, how this mentoring should be valued and where this commitment counts (teaching or service).

The FMC should develop an “inventory” that would gather information on research interests, teaching, and other areas (such as, daycare needs, service interests, etc.) to help with matching mentors and mentees.

The recommendations specifically asked that the Faculty Senate take of the issue of how the University Eval-4 characterizes mentoring of other faculty. Senators wondered if mentoring was not already in the UE-4 and were surprised to learn that it was not. In the UE-4 that was most recently revised in June 2011, mentoring of students, student groups, and graduate students was mentioned but not the mentoring of other faculty.

The Senate discussed several issues. Some wondered about the effectiveness of the program overall. Is there some measure or survey that the committee is developing? Are there standards and benchmarks for mentoring of faculty? Is there a uniform set of expectations for faculty mentors who agree to serve? A specific set of meetings? A specific time commitment?

Senators also thought about how and where mentoring might best go in the UE-4, arguing that without a specific reference in that document it may limit faculty interest in devoting their time to such important activities. The Mentoring Committee recommended that it be listed as 'valued' activity in University service. Some discussion ensued as to whether it might be regarded with greater weight, a 'highly valued' service for example. Senators came to agreement that it would be best as university service, as the nurturing of new faculty is not college specific. Senators also agreed that valued was sufficient.

Senators forwarded the following motion.

The Faculty Senate supports and recommends to the Provost that Mentoring of Junior Faculty under the auspices of the Faculty Mentoring Committee will be considered 'valued' service to the University in the revision of the University Eval-4.

Senator Puaca called the question
Senator Von Burg seconded

There was no additional discussion by the Senate other than that above.

Vote

In Favor: Selim, Puaca, Connell, Martin, Carpenter, Weiss, Zestos, Redick, Wang,
Von Burg, Barnello

Opposed: None

Abstain: None

7. Old Business

a. Teaching Award

The Senate took up the teaching award out of order at 4:15 as Senator Adamitis who is leading this initiative for the Senate was not yet present when the matter came up on the schedule.

Senator Adamitis explained that she has drafted language to explain to faculty the application process for these awards. She has also spoken with the Provost and been in communication with others in the administration. Essentially, the Senate is ready to solicit applications for awards given by the Senate in teaching, research, and service. Each award will include recognition and a cash award of \$2000. The Senate has been working on these awards for a number of months. Senator Adamitis and others on the SEC expressed their appreciation, acknowledged by the full Senate, to President Tribble who supported enthusiastically the initiative when first proposed and to Provost Padilla for providing the funding for the awards. The Secretary of the Senate will send out a call for nominations in the coming weeks.

b. Surveys (3)

The three faculty surveys that went out earlier in the semester are, according to the Senators who are working on them, still being analyzed. The Faculty Life Committee and Committee on Religious Tolerance will report when they have analyzed sufficiently the data.

c. Dossier Organization: The Senate considered this measure out of order at 3:50. President Pollard discussed the reorganization in his report and noted only that the Administrative response proposed to the original Senate initiative did not find support on the Senate. Senators commented briefly about the dossier organization work done last year raising the question that if the Senate does nothing more what will happen. The SEC reported that the Provost was pleased with the status quo and that no changes would be made if the Senate did not act further.

d. IDEA for Administrators The Senate Returned to Order at 4:20. President Pollard prepared a draft motion to propose IDEA branded assessment for the University administration. He also briefly informed the Senate of the discussion the SEC had with the Provost regarding the IDEA for Administrators proposal. He stressed that the SEC presented the evaluation of the administration as a formative assessment and thus intended to improve communication and interaction between administration and faculty in a way that might not be possible without the protection afforded by a third party like IDEA. The formative assessment, like other assessments of University faculty, is intended not to justify merit pay or other bonuses, but rather as a means to communicate and provide feedback in a meaningful way that can be used to help the administration identify and understand faculty concerns with administration practice.

The Senate engaged in a vibrant discussion. Senators asked if administrators had been evaluated in the past. Some faculty remembered an instrument created by professors to assess administrators from the 1990s. Others recalled the more recent Senate initiative from several years ago that assessed deans. The Senate concluded that these instruments seemed to exist for brief moments and then disappear. They also recognized that the data gathered in these surveys was never publically shared or reported in any way other than to those being evaluated. Other Senators asked if such data should be reported publically or even how such information might be used and by whom.

Senators also expressed the concern that even though it is a formative assessment and has no purpose other than to improve, develop and strengthen the relationship between faculty and the administration, that it might damage the relationship between Deans, the Provost, Chairs and the faculty.

President Pollard reminded Senators that the AAUP sees the evaluation of University administration by faculty as an indispensable and necessary part of faculty participation in University governance. The AAUP also suggests such data derived from these assessments be made available to faculty. He also raised the point that SCHEV and SACS likely require such data for reporting purposes and evaluation of the University.

The Senate agreed to table the motion until the next meeting where the Senate will consider again the motion by President Pollard.

8. New Business

a. Curriculum

i. ENGL/ULLC 223 – move this back to English

The Senate considered a proposal that apparently originated with the Liberal Learning Core Curriculum Assessment Task Force to move the second-year writing seminar back into the English department. The Liberal Learning Council and the Undergraduate Curriculum Committee have already seen the proposal and the LLC has acted. Apparently the English Department is willing to take on the responsibility of teaching all of the 223 classes and Professor Filetti, the chair, has incorporated the additional work into her department's 3-3 readiness plan.

The Senate was presented with two memos. One, from the Liberal Learning Council stated that the council voted unanimously to adopt the recommendation of the Liberal Learning Core Curriculum Assessment Task Force (LLCCATF). The other memo was the recommendation itself from the LLCCATF. The LLCCATF memo argued that the ULLC 223, unlike ENGL 123, has no direct oversight which "raises fears that we [the University faculty] are not providing a consistent experience for our students among the sections of ULLC 223." The solution proposed by the committee is to change 223 from its ULLC designation and to put it into the ENGL where it can receive necessary oversight. The other memo from the LLC stated that they concurred with the LLCCATF and voted unanimously in support of the change proposed.

Discussion of the memos attached to the proposal ensued. Senators raised specific questions regarding the rationale for the changes and asked about the extent to which students might be denied something by the change. Senators also noted that the principle reason for teaching 223 as a ULLC course was to meet student needs, particularly those who might elect to take a course outside of the limited disciplinary expertise of the English Department. 223 seemed to make it possible for students to satisfy the second-year writing requirement, in other words, in areas of interest to them. Senators in the sciences seemed particularly concerned. Other Senators valued the goal of diversity as a centerpiece of the core curriculum. Senators also raised the concern that faculty had been hired in certain departments outside of the humanities specifically to cover 223 classes and thus objected to the proposal. Other Senators wondered if the English department might need to hire additional faculty to staff the 223 load they would be taking on in the coming years and the extent to which that was an effective use of limited resources.

Senators also discussed the substance of the LLCCATF assertion that oversight is indeed an issue. The LLC has a subcommittee that oversees ULLC 223 and it is supposed to review syllabi and monitor the course. Others suggested that if the identified problem is oversight, the solution might be simply to improve the oversight of the existing courses rather than making such a radical curricular change. Senators also wondered where the evidence was in the proposal that substantiated the claim that the course lacked oversight and was also therefore not serving its intended purpose in the curriculum. The memo from the LLCCATF seems to identify the problem in its own reasoning when it refers to a "lack of coordinated assessment"

which makes it difficult to confirm the “anecdotal reports” from which the call for change seemed to derive according to the memo itself. Senators suggested that there is value in teaching writing to second-year students outside of the English department and that the assessment and oversight issues could easily be addressed without the changes advocated by the LLCCATF.

Senators were averse to challenging the proposal after it received the endorsement of the LLC as they are effectively the oversight body and those most responsible for the stewardship of the core curriculum.

Senators also suggested that because students with 15 hours would be allowed to take 223, the title should be changed to reflect that many will take it in their first year.

Senator Puaca called for a vote and Senator Adamitis Seconded.

In Favor: Martin, Carpenter, Weiss, Von Burg, Barnello, Adamitis, Pollard

Opposed: Connell, Wang, Puaca, Redick

Abstain: Zestos and Selim

ii.Theater

The Senate then moved to consider the changes proposed by the department of Theater and Dance which hopes to change the designation of its major, allowing it to offer a “Bachelor of Arts in Theater” instead of its current degree “Bachelor of Arts in Fine and Performing Arts with a major in theater”. The substance of the proposal is justified because graduates would fare better in seeking opportunity were there major not conflated with fine art in the title of the degree. By changing the title, the Department of Theater hopes to improve the chances of its graduates when they pursue careers and graduate school.

The Senate supported the proposal in spirit, but Senator Weiss, a former chair of the Undergraduate Curriculum Committee, raised the question to senators that the program change was more complex than presented. He argued that the State Council of Higher Education for Virginia (SCHEV) might need to weigh in on such a program change which would effectively create a new independent department. The Theater Department, at least in its proposal, seemed to be aware of the required SCHEV approval and wrote that it is in “the process of gaining SCHEV approval”. From the Senate’s perspective, we felt it needed a different route through the bureaucracy and asked that the department to resubmit when it had determined the requirements for SCHEV to create the new department independent degree. The Senate will reconsider when it has more information.

b. Reports from the subcommittees

i.On-Campus Child Care (Hall) the Child Care Committee is putting together a survey to determine faculty interest and the likelihood that faculty would use a facility run in some fashion in conjunction with CNU

ii.Faculty Life (Carpenter)

The committee has no report but is working on its survey as well.

iii. Religious Tolerance (Bardwell)

Senator Bardwell, although absent from the meeting, reported in advance that she and the committee are in the process of collecting and analyzing the survey data. There was apparently some misunderstanding of the purpose of the survey expressed by the University Administration. Senator Bardwell spoke with members of the Administration to allay their concerns.

c. Handbook Changes (15)

The Senate took a short break at 4:42 before taking on the Handbook changes. It returned to session at 4:50

Handbook changes 1-11, 14 and 15 were considered together in two separate votes. These changes were either Senate initiated, correcting clerical issues, or not particularly controversial.

Change 1, was initiated by the Faculty Mentoring Committee and it removes the requirement that mentor-mentee partnerships be established in consultation with the Dean of the college.

Change 2.2 (which supersedes change 2.1) was proposed by the Graduate Programs Council and it changed the name of the committee to the Graduate Council and alters some of the administration to conform with additional SACS requirements, and to reflect the changing constitution of the Graduate faculty.

Change 3 was proposed by the Senate and has been reviewed a number of times already. It updates the handbook section on restricted appointments and clarifies the policies for 3-year contracts.

Change 4 also proposed by the Senate puts into the University Handbook the procedures for awarding 3-year contracts proposed by the Provost in the fall of 2011. The Senate asked for the friendly amendment regarding the deadlines. The current language now requires the Provost to provide notification to applicants for 3-year contracts in February, the Senate recommends moving that deadline to December 15 to coincide with other reviews. The Senate also recommends that a checklist of some kind should be included with restricted reviews in a way it is not now required to ensure that candidates are properly notified.

Change 5 also proposed by the Senate updates the assessment criteria for the restricted ranks to put them into line with the current weighting system proposed by the Provost in the fall semester of 2011. There are two changes that the Senate recommended to this document. First, in e.2, the first line should read, "A candidacy for promotion to Professor will be evaluated" in currently includes the word Associate which should be eliminated. The Senate also saw a problem of consistency in a.2 and would like the line "Service and research are expected. . ." to read, "Research and service are expected. . ."

Change 6 was also proposed by the Senate. The change to the constitution was approved by the faculty in December 2011 and allows restricted faculty to serve on the Senate. Senators, upon further reflection, found that the language seemed to prohibit 5 tenured representatives from each college from serving implicitly suggesting 4 members be tenured and one be either probationary or restricted. This was not the intent, and therefore we propose that it read, “4 of 5 members must be tenured and the fifth member may be either probationary or restricted.”

Change 7 came from the ISAC committee which voted to change modestly its description in the catalog. The Senate raised no objection.

Change 8 corrects a wording error in the Handbook. There was no discussion.

Change 9 comes from ATAC and adjusts the language of the Handbook regarding the committee’s responsibility and membership to reflect the organizational structure of the University.

Change 10 is the revised statement of Academic Freedom and Responsibility. The Senate fully endorses and has endorsed for the past two years, these changes.

Change 11 modifies the Sabbatical leave application deadlines to accommodate all involved.

Senator Adamitis called the question and asked for a vote on changes 1-11 with the friendly amendments, this was seconded by Senator Puaca

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

Opposed: none

Abstain: none

Change 12 was proposed by the Provost, first to the SEC in the fall semester and now as a handbook change. It makes a change to invest in the deans the authority to reassign the teaching load to a 4/4 to faculty who, in two of three annual reviews, receive an unsatisfactory review in research. The Provost’s rationale suggests that this will create equity by providing an overt consequence for an unsatisfactory review where none currently exists.

The Senate engaged in a rather lengthy and detailed discussion of the matter and attempted to consider also some of the faculty derived objections aired at the December 2011 meeting of the faculty (in which Fall graduates were approved). These included the objection that assigning additional teaching does not seem to be a viable way to inspire additional research. If this is a consequence and thus a negative rebuke of some kind, it seemed inappropriate to the faculty to use additional teaching as a negative incentive. Senators also observed that the Provost has cautioned that there are very few cases in which such a rule might apply, but also wondered that the

lack of a firm definition of what precipitates a negative or unsatisfactory evaluation on the AR opens up the possibility that changing expectations might cause this rule to be invoked with differing and inconsistent regularity.

Senators also recognized that there may be times in the career of a faculty member when an enhanced teaching load balanced with fewer expectations to publish might be desirable. In these instances, Senators recommended that the Provost open an avenue so that some might choose the additional teaching without the stigma of having the deans reassign individual faculty to the 4/4. Senators also observed that Annual Review numbers determine merit pay and thus unsatisfactory assessment in any one area does carry with it a potential consequence – that is denial of merit pay. Senators also wanted to encourage administrators to find ways to encourage scholarship among the University faculty who are less productive. Senator Von Burg called the question and Senator Redick seconded which initiated the vote.

In Favor: None

Opposed: Selim, Puaca, Connell, Martin, Carpenter, Weiss, Zestos, Redick, Wang, Von Burg, Barnello, Adamitis

Abstain: None

The Senate opposes this change to the University Handbook.

Change 13 was initiated by the Provost and it is designed to minimize the number of EVAL-8s that are sent out when final recommendations are made by the Provost, and the President regarding retention, tenure, and promotion decisions. According to the Provost, the change makes it impossible for EVAL-8s to be sent to places that are not set up to keep them confidential. So they only will go to the Office of the Provost, the appropriate Dean and the department chairperson. DRC chairs who are not also department chairs, will be required to go their department chair to see an EVAL-8, whereas before they were given a copy of these documents. The FRC chair will need to go to the Provost's office to see the EVAL-8 as well.

The Senate spent considerable time working with this change. There was a good deal of discussion about the need for this additional confidentiality. Some raised the question, in order to understand better the context of this change, if it had anything to do with earlier issues of communication between the deans and the FRC chair. Senators argued though that this change would not make the confusion from the Fall reviews clearer, as Step 15 happens after the EVAL-8 from the Dean and FRC have been circulated. Step 15 deals with the last two recommendations for retention, tenure, and promotion issued by the Provost first and then the final decision which is the one by the President.

Senators who have been or who are department chairs offered some clarification of the issue to the Senate, suggesting that the reduction in the number of copies of the EVAL-8 would not unduly inconvenience departments. It might make the task

somewhat more cumbersome for the FRC chair, but as the Provost rightly pointed out in his rationale, the FRC chair changes regularly which makes the assurance of confidentiality of these sensitive materials less likely over time.

Senator Carpenter called for the vote and Senator Von Burg seconded.

In Favor: Connell, Weiss, Adamitis, Pollard

Opposed: Puaca, Barnello

Abstain: Selim, Martin, Zestos, Carpenter, Wang, Von Burg

The Senate approves the change

Change 14 was initiated by the Senate and modifies the section in the University Handbook to reflect changes to the responsibilities of the FRC approved in Academic Year 2010-11. As this was Senate initiated, there was no significant discussion.

Change 15 was initiated by the Senate as well. It creates the Faculty Development and Evaluation Committee, a new University Standing committee. The Senate offered one friendly amendment to the membership for clarification. It reads in the proposal, “one tenured, one probationary or one 1 restricted member from each college (elected)” which seems to say the committee will consist of one representative who can be of any rank. The intent was to have two representatives, one tenured and one probationary or restricted. We suggested changing the language to read, “1 tenured and 1 probationary or restricted” for clarity.

Senator Weiss called for a vote on Changes 14 and 15. Senator Puaca seconded.

In favor: Selim, Puaca, Martin, Carpenter, Weiss, Zestos, Redick, Wang, Von Burg, Barnello, Connell

Opposed: none

Abstain: none

This concludes the handbook changes.

d. Elections

Senators Connell, Barnello and Weiss have prepared a full panel of candidates for University Standing Committee elections for each of the three colleges. The ballot will go out immediately after the Senate meeting and the election will run for a week. Senator Connell reported that the director of University Assessment, Deb Moore, offered her assistance and advice in preparing the ballot and also granted him access to her Qualtrics account to make and distribute the ballot. Senator Connell also reported that a constitutional change will be included on the ballot to change the representation on the Senate in each college from four departments to five as voted upon by the Senate in January.

e. LLC Memo: Evaluation of the Areas of Inquiry assessments

The Senate received the LLC memo that evaluated the Areas of Inquiry. Senators had not had sufficient time to read the document carefully. The report seemed to indicate that most of the areas of inquiry did not yield data that might allow a conclusion to be drawn about their effectiveness in achieving the stated goals of the core curriculum. Senators were asked to read carefully the document in anticipation of a discussion for the next Senate meeting.

9. Other

The Senate then turned to the approval of the EVAL 1-D which is a calendar for those wishing to apply for the rank of distinguished professor. The Senate discussed the document briefly but raised no objections.

Senator Weiss moved to vote seconded by Senator Adamitis.

In Favor: Selim, Puaca, Martin, Carpenter, Weiss, Zestos, Redick, Wang, Von Burg, Barnello, Connell

Opposed: none

Abstain: none

Having concluded its business, President Pollard moved to adjourn; it was seconded by Senator Connell

A unanimous vote concluded the meeting at 5:59 PM.