

Minutes for the Faculty Senate Meeting  
DSU Washington  
March 16, 2012  
3:00PM-

Present: Pollard, Von Burg, Bardwell, Adamitis, Puaca, Barnello, Redick, Martin, Selim, Zestos, Hall, Connell

Absent: Weiss, Wang, Carpenter

Guests: Kevin Hughes, Michael Meyer

1. Call to Order 3:04PM
2. Affirmation of 2/17/12 minutes: The minutes of the meeting from February 17 were brought to the table by Senator Bardwell and seconded by Senator Redick. As the minutes had been approved electronically in advance of the meeting, the senate voted unanimously to affirm their electronic vote.

The Senate, which had invited guests, moved out of order to hear from Dr. Kevin Hughes, the Dean of Students, and Dr. Michaela Meyer, the Chair of the Faculty Review Committee.

Proceeded out of order at 3:05

3. President's Report. The Meeting resumed to order at 4:05.  
President Pollard made the following statement observations in advance of his **report**. He began by asking the Handbook Committee (Senators Connell and Adamitis) to review the University EVAL-4 to see if there are issues that need clarification regarding the role of the Departmental EVAL-4 and the University EVAL-4. He then spoke regarding Dr. Meyer's commentary that the Senate may wish to take up the motions it has before it out of order. He also expressed his great appreciation to Dr. Meyer for her appearance before the committee and expressed that she conveyed useful information. He also expressed that he wished the Senate had been able to meet with her earlier in the year so as to avoid the kind of confusion that characterized the Senate and FRC interactions this academic year.

The Senate then proceeded out of order to consider the motions associated with agenda items 8b and 8c at 4:07

Presidents report in order back on schedule 4:25

The President reported on the status of handbook changes the Senate voted not to adopt or that had conflicts with the Provost when reported. On handbook change 12, which put into place a sanction for faculty who do not produce sufficient scholarly output to earn a satisfactory rating in their annual review in two out of three years was opposed by the Senate. The Provost agreed to table that handbook change for next year.

The Senate passed the handbook change to create the Faculty Development and Evaluation Committee. President Pollard reported that the Provost could not support the creation of that committee as it was drafted. Apparently the issue was the implication that the FDEC appeared to the Provost to have expanded its mission since our first proposal to include a role in faculty evaluation.

The chair of the University Handbook Committee, Roark Mulligan, offered to create two committees to resolve the conflicts. While committees were established, it appears that there was too much work involved in the resolution of the issues and as a result, both Change 12 and Change 15 are tabled until next academic year when they may be resurrected.

The President reported that Deb Moore, the Director of the office of University Assessment, will not be in charge of the IDEA administration. The Provost reported to the SEC that Deb is to focus her attention on the coming SACS 5 year review. The Provost will take over the administration of IDEA and Lorraine Hall will be in charge of the operation and administration.

President Pollard reported that Gaines Theater apparently has changed its rules and now is not a venue that can be scheduled by faculty, even for events that involve students. Apparently, there were some complaints from student groups who had hoped to use the theater only to find a faculty sponsored event already scheduled. So, apparently if a student group would like to reserve the theater, they are authorized to do so.

President Pollard discussed briefly the appeal filed with the Board of Visitors in the February meeting regarding one of the tenure denials. This appeal was not successful. The President expressed his concern over the process of appeal which he felt was necessary to pursue because the candidate who was denied tenure felt the case was mishandled. President Pollard also expressed his frustration with the inability of the Senate or any faculty body to express its misgivings with tenure and promotion decisions.

President Pollard reported on the Sabbatical applications that were not fully considered because they were not delivered to the Senate (see the February minutes for the discussion of this issue). The resolution which came from the Deans of the three colleges was to create an electronic tracking system, a 'drop box' which will be something that those responsible for each level of review will have access to and will ensure that no applications are lost in the review process.

The Senate went into recess at 4:46

#### 4. BOV reports

The Senate Returned from its recess at 4:56 to take up the reports from the BOV meeting held 24 February 2012.

President Pollard reported on the general meeting of the full board. He noted the Board is going to conduct a performance review of President Tribble. He also announced that the BOV approved the Academic Freedom language that President Carlson and Dr. Ronnie Cohen helped to draft with University Council William Thro.

President Pollard reported to the Board the activities of the Senate this year, highlighting its accomplishments regarding soliciting faculty ideas at the August All-Faculty Meeting, focusing on the Child-Care center, the catering changes that the Senate worked with Executive Vice President William Brauer, the Committee on Religious Tolerance among other issues the Senate has pursued. The Board met mostly in closed session, however, to discuss the confidential personnel matters it had to consider.

The Finance Committee was attended by Senator Adamitis. She commented that the Administration reported no shortfalls in the overall budget, and explained items that appeared to be underfunded were not actually overspent. The finance committee reported that everything in the budget appeared normal for this time of the academic year.

The Academic affairs committee met largely in closed session and was therefore a short affair for Senator Bardwell. They discussed in open session the prospect of Child Care which is a Senate initiative. They also reported on the ways in which the University Speaks to the media.

The Development Committee was attended by Senator Connell who submitted the following report:

Development meeting report  
Board of Visitors Meeting  
24 February 2012

The development committee received a substantial report from the Vice President for University Advancement, Adelia Thompson, and the meeting was presided over by the committee chair, Ann Hunnicutt. Adelia provided an overview of the Comprehensive Campaign which is still in its quiet phase and will be for several years to come. What this means, apparently, is that the University makes no public solicitation of donations on a broad scale, does not disclose the intended fundraising targets, and does not speak about the timeline publically.

The substance of the meeting was involved mostly with several main issues. The report on giving detailed the relative monetary and donor base support for this year relative to past giving over several categories including alumni participation and community giving beyond the alumni base. The numbers are officially nearing the goal in the overall campaign, reaching nearly 80% now and with commitments that are verbal for giving before the end of the fiscal year in excess of the goal for the year. Alumni giving is officially down from last year, but this is an accounting issue more than a real issue. Apparently, current seniors make a class gift, but they cannot be counted as alumni until after May. Taking into account the senior class, the current alumni have given more and

in greater numbers than last year. Adelia also reported on the solicitation of large gifts and reported progress in identifying large-dollar donors who might contribute significantly (defined as those who give \$25,000 over 5 years).

Adelia reported on efforts to make focus groups to cultivate giving among alumni. Quentin Kidd has introduced the development office to a focus group specialist who is offering training to the staff on how to manage well these groups. The expert is working pro bono for CNU which is an added benefit.

Adelia also reported that they have begun to line up giving for the next academic year and already have significant contributions front loaded into the goal for the coming year.

The committee discussed a number of issues. One focused on the regional captains of the campaign – and the importance of those individuals to bring in donations personally. Others asked about the Presidential Dinners with potential donors that BOV members attend regularly. Some expressed concern about the nature of money raised and its purpose. The argument here focused on distinguishing gifts for ‘bricks and sticks’ which are buildings and other items that are permanent but require capital outlay with funds received, from endowment directed funds that can be accumulated and used to fund specific activities. Others raised concern that the university needs to eventually in the coming campaigns focus its efforts on raising significantly larger sums of money so that the university can have an endowment that matches its growing reputation. Others were concerned that the numbers this year are high and that next year we have no gala, referring of course to the fiftieth anniversary gala in 2011.

The Student Life committee was attended by Senator Weiss. He submitted this report:

#### Student Life Committee

Admissions report – Rob Lange: admissions status reported, need 500 more admits to make 1200 class; increased efforts have been made out-of-state; questions raised as to recruiting efforts in local community, board members expressed willingness to assist in these efforts; recommendations made to be proactive in University’s outreach into local community

Center for Career Planning – Lisa Duncan Raines: information on various programs presented by CCP provided, programs work with students at all levels and work to stay connected beyond graduation, also involve parents; three students presented their experiences with CCP programs and with internships they have had as students

Student Life – Kevin Hughes: update on student success efforts provided (#s of at-risk students about the same as in previous years), work of University Fellows described especially to do with initiatives centered around finals (extended Library hours and study space in McMurran), description of Signing Day and its success, presented information on the growth of Greek population (17% of women and 15% of men), new Greek groups are on the horizon

Student Assembly – Jett Johnson: provided information on organization and activities of this new student government body, current initiatives presented with the one dealing with co-ed residential options generating the most discussion

## 5. Liaison Reports

One Liaison report came from the University Assessment and Evaluation Committee which is focused on department assessment reviews that are coming at the end of the year.

## 6. Department Reports

Reports from departments focused on the recent dictums from the Deans of the three colleges that budgets are tightening. Some liaisons had heard from their departments that the order had come down from their Dean that they no longer had money to spend. This has significant effect, particularly in light of upcoming honor programs and the graduation events that tend to draw significantly upon department budgets at the end of the year. Some Senators had reports from their departments as well that chairs were very suddenly informed of the tightening budgets. Senators discussed that even though budgets generally are restricted as the close of the fiscal approaches – they expressed that it seemed to come earlier than usual and that it seemed to restrict more severely than usual the normal spending. In Arts and Humanities chairs were told that spending was frozen and that state money could not be spent on events and that all further travel money and supplies funds could not be spent despite healthy balances. Liaisons reported that this was equivalent to a budget reduction in excess of 20%.

The Senate asked the SEC to discuss with the senior administration the budget at its upcoming meeting. The Senate is concerned that such budget cutting causes managers to overspend in the fall in anticipation that their budgets in the spring will be limited. It also evokes concern in the minds of faculty who perceive the early budget freezes as a sign of financial distress. More communication on financial matters should be done to quell any anxiety such budget management produces.

Senators also pointed to the report given to the BOV which indicated that all appears to be in order. President Pollard also recounted that President Tribble has expressed his confidence in the Governor who is committed in a way previous governors have not been, to funding higher education as a priority in his budget.

## 7. Old Business

- a. IDEA for administrators: The Senate has been at work on the issue of the evaluation of the administration for a number of years. The IDEA task force identified a product created by IDEA itself to provide formative assessment of administrators that could serve to communicate, from the perspective of faculty, how administrators are doing. Such assessment mirrors other kinds of assessment the University does in other areas, and it uses the same kinds of measure the University values when it assesses the faculty and their teaching.

The director of assessment, Deb Moore, has communicated that at her other institutions she has supervised this kind of assessment and has some clear ideas about how it might work.

There are a number of issues to work out. But what is appealing about using IDEA is that it brings a product that is already on campus and has been trusted by the administration to deliver valuable data to assess individual faculty and programs in their effectiveness at achieving relevant objectives. Such data would also be useful to provide Chairs, Deans, and the Provost with information that can be used formatively so that individuals might learn strengths and weaknesses in order to improve their effectiveness.

The Senate under President Carlson undertook the task of doing its own assessment a few years ago. In the 1990s apparently our institutional psychologists devised an assessment for the administration that was regularly utilized. Both of these assessments, however, did not persist despite their value.

The SEC will again raise this with the senior administration at the next meeting.

b. Faculty Awards

The nomination process is ongoing for the newly devised Faculty Awards that are to be given this year for the first time. At the next Senate meeting in April, Faculty Awards in the areas of Service, Scholarship, and Teaching will be presented by the committee (Senators Adamitis and Von Burg).

The SEC will discuss with the President and Provost these awards at the next meeting. We hope to determine with the President and the Provost when the awards will be given and when the honorees might expect to receive the stipend associated with each award.

c. Elections

The Elections took place and were completed just after the close of the February Senate meeting. The Election committee, (Senators Connell, Weiss and Barnello) reported a successful and smooth election with no problems and that filled all open seats for University standing committees. The election also included one restricted member of the faculty who will serve on the Senate.

- d. Curriculum: Theater : The theater department asked to have the University Curriculum committee to approve a change to make it a stand along BA in Theater. It was discussed in the last Senate meeting. There has been no further action to report
- e. Liberal Learning Core Assessment Memo  
Senator Bardwell had some comments on the LLC Assessment memo. She referred to an email she had written in advance of the February meeting. I have taken liberty to reproduce her commentary in full as they were delivered to the SEC in an email on 10 February 2012:

Some observations on the **Report on Assessment of the Areas of Inquiry**

The report made a number of interesting recommendations regarding best practices and choice of assessment instruments, including tools used at other universities. It appears the report concludes that the CNU in-house tools have not been uniformly successful and only the AIII assessment tool has been "***proven reliable***".[p.3, l. 3] However, in an apparent contrary statement relevant to AIII on page 4 of the report, the **AIII** paragraph concludes, "Consequently, the LLC cannot submit any valid assessment data from this Area of Inquiry at this time." [p.4, l.18,19]

The general recommendations found on pgs. 6-8 suggest a potential to "dove-tail" assessment of the SCHEV Core Competencies with the Liberal Learning Foundations. However, one might conclude, based upon additional reasons, that this "dovetailing" may need to await further guidance and further evidence from SCHEV itself.

1. According to the SCHEV website accessed while I read the report, "***SCHEV is currently reviewing the Core Competencies and will republish the information in mid- to late-2010.***".

[<http://research.schev.edu/corecompetencies/default.asp> February 10, 2012 5:17pm]. What are the likely reasons SCHEV has not yet republished this information relating to the Core Competencies...or updated its website?

2. On the other hand, SACS website shows accreditation standards and guidelines just adopted [revised editions] in January 2012 This includes The 2012 Edition of the *Principles of Accreditation: Foundation for Quality Enhancement* (adopted December 2011 and effective January 1, 2012).[<http://sacscoc.org/principles.asp> February 10, 2012 5:26pm].

3. It may be that SACS guidelines could provide the most up to date "advice" on whether content assessment should be avoided, or not.

The Senate discussed the issues raised by Senator Bardwell briefly. The commentary centered on the uncertainty in SCHEV's republishing of the Core Competencies. We also wondered about the inability to assess the areas of inquiry reliably and the need to do that as we approach the next incarnation of SACS review.

The Senate also wanted to recognize the Liberal Learning Council for its work on the Core Curriculum and to thank Deb Moore expressly for her dedication and hard work.

The Senate called for a motion.

The Faculty Senate thanks Deb Moore, the LLC and those involved in producing the LLC assessment, but particularly Dr. Sharon Rowley, the Chair of the Liberal Learning Council.

The motion was moved by Senator Hall and Seconded by Senator Adamitis.

Vote: Unanimous in favor

The motion is adopted.

## 8. New Business

- a. *Student Handbook* (Kevin Hughes) out of order 3:05. President Pollard introduced the guest, Dr. Hughes and invited him to speak. Some background. In past academic years, the Senate has expressed concern that the Student Handbook, which is technically part of the University Handbook (Section XVI), is generally updated during the summer when most Faculty are away from campus. Because the handbook must be prepared in advance of the arrival of the students, changes are often made during the late summer. The Faculty Senate has asked that they be consulted if any changes to the Student Handbook will require changes that effect faculty. Dr. Hughes spoke to elaborate upon his procedures, explaining that there are a variety of factors that cause his office to update the Student Handbook and that they are often difficult to anticipate. There is also continuing work of the faculty and administration that goes on well past the January deadline for updating the University Handbook. It is therefore not possible for the Student Handbook to be prepared in advance of the end of the academic year. He cited as an example the prospect that the Presidential



Taskforce appointed to review the honor code which is currently meeting to make policy recommendations that may result in changes to the overall policy.

Discussion followed Dr. Hughes's statement. Senators asked about the feasibility of moving the handbook deadlines until later in the spring semester. Senators also suggested that a subcommittee of the Senate might be able to meet in the late spring or summer. President Pollard also mentioned to Dr. Hughes that the Senate has been considering a motion to require all updates to the Student Handbook that effect the University Handbook and also effect faculty that these go through the normal University Handbook approval that other changes must go through. Dr. Hughes noted that it might not be possible to wait a year to update the Student Handbook. The Senate discussed the motion.

### *Student Handbook*

To expedite Faculty Senate approval of faculty-related sections of the *Student Handbook*, the Senate proposes that

1. The faculty-related section of the *Student Handbook* be identified
2. The Faculty Senate form a subcommittee that would meet in February or March each year with the Dean of Students (or designee) to identify faculty-related changes to the *Student Handbook* and prepare them for presentation to the Faculty Senate.
3. Review of any changes would happen at the April meeting of the Faculty Senate.

The friendly amendment was added as

4. Faculty Senate President or designee and the Faculty Senate Vice President or designee will consult with the Dean of Students regarding faculty-related Student Handbook updates as they come up over the summer.

The Faculty Senate discussed the motion in detail. It built upon the discussions we have had over the past few months regarding this issue. Senators expressed concern that there might be difficulties in arranging the meetings when class is not in session and people are away, particularly when the time frame for action is so limited, as indicated by Dr. Hughes. At the same time, however, the Senate appreciated that this past year there have been no substantive updates to the University Handbook that this procedure would have solved. Senators expressed their general agreement, however, that this become a policy of the Senate. Senator Connell called for a vote, seconded by Senator Von Burg.

Vote

Unanimous in Favor:

Dr. Hughes left the meeting at 3:15.

- b. FRC (Michaela Meyer) At that moment, Dr. Michaela Meyer joined the discussion. Dr. Meyer is the chair of the Faculty Review Committee and was invited by President Pollard to speak to the Senate regarding the fall review cycle. Some background, the Senate has followed closely the fall reviews because of several missteps in reporting the rationale for decisions made by the FRC when their decision differed from that of the Department Review Committee (DRC). The Senate, in 2010-2011, initiated a handbook change that required the FRC and the Deans to report their reason when they differed from the judgment of the DRC in second, fourth, tenure, and promotion reviews. As this has been discussed on numerous occasions in recent Senate minutes and is available in the minutes of the February 2012 meeting, it seems redundant to review those details again. In the fall of 2011 it appears that the new reporting requirements were not sufficiently communicated to the FRC.

President Pollard began by thanking Dr. Meyer for her willingness to appear before and to speak about her experience in the fall. Dr. Meyer commented at length, referring to a prepared statement which she made available to the Senate secretary afterwards. She reported that she had objections to the characterization of the reviews by the Senate as expressed in the reported minutes. She also reported that her committee had been frustrated by what she considered a mischaracterization of the committee as its actions were discussed by the Senate. Particularly the insinuation that recent incidences where the FRC differed from the DRC were motivated by an effort to move beyond the published standards in the UE-4 in order to establish the independence of the FRC. She noted that their position is a difficult one that has to represent the best interests of the faculty, but at the same time, also make a recommendation to the administration. She called it a kind of “limbo” in which the committee is not administrative, but has a University-wide perspective on reviews in the same way senior administration does, but cannot really represent faculty in the same way a DRC might.

Dr. Meyer then proceeded to explain the FRC process. She reported that the FRC Chair and Vice Chair meet with the Provost and Vice Provost in advance of the review cycle. During this meeting, the FRC leadership is trained by the office of the Provost – they are also informed about the expectations, and any changes to the process. For example, the FRC has advocated for a more nuanced set of

choices for reviews that they can report on the EVAL-8. Whereas formerly the choices were recommend, recommend with significant reservation, or not recommend, the FRC advocated for the inclusion of recommend with reservations. Since the main issue was whether or not the FRC was trained in the new handbook language adopted by the University for the academic year 2011-2012 which required the FRC to report when it differed from the DRC – Dr. Meyer said directly that the issue of reporting their rationale came up at the training meeting with the Provost, and that she specifically asked if they had to provide rationale when their judgment differed from the DRC. She was told by the Provost that the committee had the option to report or not report their rationale. She indicated that the Provost would have liked the FRC to report, but at that time communicated that there was no requirement to do so, allowing the FRC the power to vote on the issue. Dr. Meyer, in the first meeting with the FRC, communicated to the FRC that in cases where the FRC may differ from the DRC, the committee would vote on whether or not they would provide additional commentary to candidates on a case-by-case basis.

Dr. Meyer also made the argument that her understanding of the FRC's role, having served on it for multiple years, was to provide an assessment of each candidate, but that it was the role of the senior administration to articulate rationale on any final decisions related to retention, tenure and promotion. According to Dr. Meyer's statement, the FRC struggled with this issue internally and engaged in vigorous debate. The pertinent issue here stems from the FRC's reluctance to engage in articulating their dissent from department committees because of the uncomfortable position it might put them in. The gravity and finality of these decisions (so life-changing and personal) made many on the committee reluctant to put themselves in the position to explain the problem, opting instead to pass that role onto the administration. Across all cases, the FRC voted to include comments on 3 cases, and for others they preferred to remain silent.

Dr. Meyer also commented on the scale of the task in front of the FRC. The committee had a tightened schedule because of the school closure at the beginning of the fall term necessitated by Hurricane Irene. According to Dr. Meyer, initially, the Provost promised to provide the committee with extra time, but that in the end it was not provided.

Once the fall reviews were completed and sent to the Provost, the issue came up that the University Handbook required the FRC to provide written comments on reviews in which it disagreed with the DRC. Dr. Meyer attempted to convene an

emergency meeting to allow the committee to make the necessary comments. As this was not possible on very short notice, the committee empowered Dr. Meyer as chair to make the comments for the committee. Dr. Meyer crafted these comments from the University Handbook language and standards provided for each appropriate rank.

Dr. Meyer addressed specifically the question of to what extent the committee had relied upon the recommendation of the deans to make its case. She said that she did not see the dean's comments until after the initial reviews were completed and submitted to the Provost. She stated that the deans' comments were not sent to her as chair until after she had submitted the FRC reviews.

Dr. Meyer also responded to a discussion the Senate had in January regarding disciplinary expertise and the assessment of scholarship. The FRC, as a general rule, asks for clarification if it has a question about someone's scholarship and does not know. The committee operates under conflict-of-interest parameters, in that individuals who served on a DRC of a candidate or are a member of the candidate's department are required to abstain from discussion and voting on those cases. While they are prohibited from having a member on the committee from evaluating directly a dossier from someone in their own department, the FRC can find ways to ask for clarification with someone who has the necessary disciplinary expertise. The FRC also relies heavily upon the University EVAL-4 (UE-4) as the basis for making its recommendations. The FRC, as it has endured criticism for the very issue of disciplinary expertise in the past, has worked to shield itself from criticism by consulting with those who might know better the disciplinary area of the faculty member being assessed.

Dr. Meyer also engaged the Senate in a discussion of the role of the FRC in the review process. FRC members and leadership are aware of their position and are sensitive to the consequences of their reviews. As a result, they disagree with DRCs only irregularly and only in instances where they feel they are on firm ground and have identified significant problems. In this past year, there were thirty reviews. The FRC disagreed with the DRC in one fourth year, one tenure, and three promotion cases (roughly 16%). In all of the others they concurred with the DRC recommendation. In the instances where they disagreed, the entire committee (absent those affiliated with the department of the person under review) reviewed the cases. In the cases of Full Professor candidates, Dr. Meyer gave the Senate a sense of their process and argued that the FRC was bound by the UE-4 but also wished that there were more specific criteria for basing their recommendation. In this discussion, Dr. Meyer and the Senate concurred that the

UE-4 needs to provide more specific guidance on the standards for promotion to Full Professor.

Senators asked Dr. Meyer a number of questions. She was asked to clarify the timeline of the fall reviews in specific terms. She said that her reviews were completed by 31 October and that the response from the Provost that the committee had to have feedback from the FRC in those few cases where it did come when she was presenting at a conference more than a week later.

The Senate also asked Dr. Meyer to offer recommendations to suggest how the FRC might perform differently. Dr. Meyer was adamant that the FRC did well and that their decisions were always a problem when they disagree with the DRC. She also felt that FRC service, as it is a major commitment, might be done differently so as to keep faculty on the committee for longer terms. There is a certain amount of learning on-the-job that goes with being on the FRC and that by the time a FRC member's term is up, they are just beginning to understand their roles well. She identified the problem in the two-year terms which make it difficult to nurture the leadership of the FRC and also make the learning process something that too many members are going through while the reviews are cycling. Senators asked Dr. Meyer if she might introduce a handbook change next year to change the structure of the FRC to provide for that additional continuity, which she indicated she was already working on in her capacity as chair this spring. Dr. Meyer also suggested that this committee be moved into the "most valued" category in the Service section of the UE-4.

Senators asked about the departmental EVAL-4 and its use by the FRC. Dr. Meyer reported that the FRC looks at the Departmental EVAL-4 only if the candidate includes it in their dossier. Dr. Meyer explained that as part of the committee's charge, they are bound to use the UE-4 and not Departmental Eval-4's unless significant portions of a candidate's service fell under the old system before the UE-4 was adopted.

Senators asked some general questions about the general perception on the FRC about the reporting requirement. Senators specifically stated that their rationale for asking the FRC to comment was to provide the candidate with something specific that they might use when they prepared their response to the EVAL-8-FRC and EVAL-8-DEAN. Dr. Meyer suggested that the FRC felt that they could offer developmental advice at the 2 and 4-year reviews that might help – but felt that their comments would not be useful for the candidate at the tenure decision.

She also reiterated the committee's general feeling that the FRC wished to leave such commentary, especially because of its finality, to the administration.

The Senate asked Dr. Meyer more about her procedures in reporting. Specifically, the issue of voting on the FRC came up and how that voting was handled and communicated. Dr. Meyer said that FRC decisions are sometimes unanimous and other times split. Dr. Meyer as chair was responsible to report the raw vote data without names to the Provost whom she assumed considered the nature of the vote in his deliberation.

Dr. Meyer concluded her discussion with some elegant thoughts on making the review process less taxing. She made the case that the administration and the FRC have held workshops regularly for probationary faculty to attend that demystify the process. She argued that faculty could benefit handily from listening to the administration describe the parameters of the review process. She also made the point that if these were a more regular part of the probationary period, fewer would find the review process surprising. The point of course is to make the standards uniform and the means to achieve them understood among probationary faculty. She also reinforced her contention that the FRC would be a more effective body with greater continuity of membership that longer terms would facilitate.

Dr. Meyer was thanked by the Senate and left the meeting at 4:05.

The Senate Returned to this part of the Agenda out of order at 4:07

Resolution 8b add to Section XII, Step 10 of the *University Handbook* the following bold-face phrase,

“The Office of the Provost provides the EVAL-8/FRC and the EVAL-8/Dean in the front of each dossier for independent reviews of the materials in Step 13 by the FRC and the Dean. The Office of the Provost will schedule separate and independent access to the secure room for the FRC and deans. Completed EVAL-8 forms will include 1) a recommendation and 2) brief comments as appropriate; a written explanation is required when the Dean's and/or FRC's recommendation differs from the DRC's; **that explanation should elucidate the recommendation.**”

The concern expressed by the Senate was that the reporting requirement mandated by the handbook might be too limited so that a cursory comment might suffice. The elucidation required by the new statement is more specific in that it calls for a

more substantive commentary that provides the reason that the FRC or the Dean came to a different conclusion than the DRC.

Senators discussed this addition in light of the commentary offered by Dr. Meyer, please see the detailed discussion above. Senators were concerned that the intent in the reporting requirement assumed a substantive comment but that in practice this may not always be the case, particularly given the proclivity of the FRC to give curt assessments. Others expressed that the language in the handbook might be adequate provided that all levels in the chain of review are aware of their reporting requirements. The Senate also expressed the need to provide faculty under review with ample information so that they are aware of the deficit identified by the FRC or their Dean that were not seen as such by their DRC. To facilitate a candidate's ability to make their strongest case, the Senate reasoned, candidates need substantive and specific commentary upon which to base a response when given the opportunity in advance of the Provost and President reviews. Senators expressed, however, that the best option might be to ensure that training, particularly of the faculty committee (FRC) be done so that they are aware of the importance of reporting. In light of Dr. Meyer's comment that they felt such comments were best given to 2 and 4 year candidates, the Senate agreed, but also pointed out that tenure and promotion candidates who are facing a negative review that could lead to a terminal contract should have all opportunities to make their case based on the material they present in their dossier. The reasoning, of course, if the FRC or the Dean identifies a deficiency that is an oversight or misconstrued, the candidate must be able to defend their record.

Senators opted to consider motion 8c which takes up the issue of committee training as the best vehicle for the coming review cycle next year, as the handbook updates are complete for 2012-13. By unanimous consent the Senate tabled this motion to be considered in April or by the Senate next year.

Senators discussed briefly the experience issue that Dr. Meyer raised in her commentary – that FRC members needed time to learn the processes of the committee and that such training usually took a year of service. To remedy the problem this implies, Dr. Meyer proposed that the term of FRC members be lengthened to 3 or 4 years (for full elaboration, see above). Senators were open to the idea of extending the period. Some raised questions about the negative effect it might have on recruitment – this is a difficult committee and making such a long-term commitment mandatory rather than a choice might discourage faculty who see this as a major disruption to their already demanding schedules. Others

felt that more adequate training might be as valuable as additional experience, particularly if the requirement to elucidate the reason in specific terms for any disagreement is made. The Senate recognizes that the FRC agrees with the DRC in the vast majority of cases, but that all cases require careful attention and that those candidates who make it to the tenure decision have already gone through significant vetting where many of the other candidates in their cohort were already unsuccessful. The Senate would like to see a proposal from the FRC with specifics regarding the extended terms of service. Some worried that long terms of service on the committee might not be the best option and may keep those ill-suited on the committee for too long, whereas now, committee members have the ability to stand for reelection every two years and to serve for a total of four consecutive years on the committee.

c. University Committee Training

The Senate then moved to bring 8c to the table, which reads,

University Committee Training

In its supervisory role, the Faculty Senate will provide annual training for faculty serving on University committees, apprising the faculty of the function of particular committees as well as pertinent changes in the *University Handbook*.

This motion, follows the first and comes out of the previous discussion. Senators wondered whose responsibility it might be to train committees. The Senate is, according to the University Handbook, a responsibly party for many of the committees, they report to us, the Senate has liaisons with University Standing Committees as well. Should the Senate have some role in training University committees? If so, what should that role be and how might the Senate go about training committees in their tasks? The Senate discussed the issues in light of Dr. Meyer's commentary. When asked about the procedures in the committee, Dr. Meyer reported that at the beginning of the term, she and the Vice Chair of the FRC met with the Provost and the Vice Provost for training. Some on the Senate found that this meeting might raise issues of autonomy or at least have the appearance of conflation between the senior administration and an independent, faculty-elected committee which is supposed to follow the dictates of the handbook and the UE-4. While Senators understood the importance of training the FRC to follow the terms of the handbook and understand this meeting constituted only such training – Senators wondered if there were not a way to keep the training of the faculty committee outside of the purview of the Provost's office. Although the draft of this motion was made in advance of Dr. Meyer's commentary, it struck the Senate as a way to avoid any appearance that the committee might be compromising its autonomy by receiving training from the senior administration that also renders a judgment on review candidates.



The Senate discussion was followed by a discussion of how to proceed. Senators decided that it would be best to raise this at the upcoming meeting between the SEC and the Provost and President rather than voting upon it. Senators reasoned that we need to know more about the training process.

The Senate unanimously consented to table the discussion and asked the SEC to raise the issue with the senior administration in its next meeting.

The Senate Returned to order at 4:25.

d. Subcommittee Reports (Faculty Life, Religious Tolerance, Child Care)

The Subcommittee on Faculty Life has not yet produced a report

The Subcommittee on religious tolerance will report at the April Meeting and to the Full Faculty at the All Faculty meeting scheduled for April.

Senator Bardwell and her committee are culling the data and producing a finished report that promises to reflect the results and to reveal important findings that the raw data indicates.

The Child Care committee will share its results from its survey of regional universities with the Senate at the upcoming full-Senate meeting with the Provost and President.

e. Eval-4

Each year the Faculty Senate makes a recommendation to the Provost regarding the University Eval-4. President Pollard asked the Handbook Committee (Senators Connell and Adamitis) to review the handbook, solicit any feedback they can discern from faculty and to make a proposal.

f. Handbook Change from Math Department

There are two courses that were added by the Math department to the catalog for the upcoming year. The Senate determined that these were not traditional handbook or curricular changes.

g. Faculty Development Grants

The committee will receive and review FDG applications this spring and will report on their recommendation at the April Senate meeting.

h. Qualtrics License for Faculty Senate/Survey Director

After the Senate experience with elections in the spring and the number of surveys that Senators undertook this year, the SEC proposed that it might ask for a license of its own to conduct surveys independently of the assessment office. Some background: the Senate has sponsored a number of University-wide surveys including the Child Care Survey and that on Religious tolerance. The Elections were also run using a survey tool. While in the past, free software such as Survey Monkey has sufficed to meet its survey needs, this year overwhelmed that capacity creating additional work for all involved unnecessarily. Senators were forced to draw on the limited resources of the Assessment office and relied upon the generosity of Deb Moore whose office is already overburdened.

To alleviate the reliance upon other University resources, the Faculty Senate would be well served to acquire its own resources to conduct surveys and to have a survey director who will be responsible for understanding and conducting necessary surveys of faculty. This will cost money – as there are annual fees associated with the licenses at Qualtrics or even the professional version of Survey Monkey. Senators have conferred with Deb Moore who is investigating expanding her license in such a way that it would enable to the Senate to have a dedicated account. Although she expressed her confidence and support for a Faculty Senate survey account, she was unsure of the purpose of the survey director.

Senators discussed the issue briefly. The survey director is simply a person on the SEC, who has the skills to run the survey software and to design or approve the design of Senate-generated surveys. These surveys include the annual standing committee election, and any survey required by Faculty Senate initiatives to understand more about faculty needs. Senators are aware of the possibility of survey fatigue and the need to keep the number of surveys to a minimum, but argued that a director could prioritize and coordinate with senior administration the surveys it might choose to administer.

The Senate then took up the following motion

Qualtrics License for Faculty Senate/Survey Director

The 2011-12 Faculty Senate recommends that in the future the Senate have its own ability to produce surveys for and of the CNU Faculty. To that end, it is recommended that the Senate purchase a license to the Qualtrics survey instrument and appoint a member of the Senate as Survey Director.

Senator Hall called the question and Senator Von Burg seconded.

The Senate Voted unanimously to approve the motion.

The Motion is adopted.

i. Planning for final Senate meeting with the faculty

The Faculty Senate will conduct a whole faculty meeting as is usual in the spring to approve graduates. In addition, however, the Senate would like to use this meeting as a follow up to the All Faculty meeting conducted at the outset of the semester to report on Senate accomplishments and to solicit ideas to work on for next year. President Pollard proposed the date 13 April to hold this meeting. President Pollard is setting up the meeting and has promised to provide refreshments.

j. Faculty Recognition Site

The Faculty Recognition site is an old agenda item that the Senate has worked on for better than 2 years under the leadership of Senator Puaca. President Pollard promised to ask at the next SEC meeting about the Monument and the status of it from the perspective of the administration

The recognition site, please see previous minutes for more detailed discussion, is intended to honor faculty who have served the University for 10 years or more and have left or retired after the completion of such service. The University Administration has agreed in principle to support the recognition site, but we have stalled on the placement and the form such a site will ultimately take.

k. Budget Presentation

The SEC has discussed in detail the need to have a regular meeting, as has been done in years past, to discuss in detail the finances of the University and to present a detailed version of the University Budget. The SEC, under the auspices of Senator Bardwell, has noted the absence of this reporting in recent years. To that end, the Senate was asked to consider the following motion.

8k. Budget Presentation

The Faculty Senate recommends that at the beginning and end of each academic year, a member of the CNU administration with budget expertise, present to a meeting of the entire faculty the current state of the CNU budget.

Senators discussed the merits of the motion, but came quickly to agreement that such information would be both useful and necessary for faculty. There is no concern that such information might be sensitive as much of it is already public. The question, however, remains that for proper understanding of the finances of the institution, an administrator who works with the budget should be in charge of presenting in context the information.

Senator Redick called the question, Senator Puaca seconded.

The Senate voted unanimously to adopt the motion.

#### 9. Other

A number of Senators pointed out that the approaching advising period had been riddled with difficulty, mostly because of the lack of accurate information on the University Academic Calendar. Some Senators also expressed concern over the transition of second year core advisees to major departments, noting that they had encountered students who waited excessively to learn of their advising assignment.

The Senate had a healthy discussion of these issues, but recognized that much of the anecdotal information gleaned from students who appeared confused might not reflect the experiences of all. Senators felt that information could be communicated to both advisors and students in a more clear way further in advance of the registration and advising periods.

This brought the question of the Academic Calendar and the timing of the advising, registration, and exam periods to the table. Senators wondered why the University does not publish academic calendars further in advance than is current practice. Additionally, Senators felt that fixed events such as the registration period, the advising period, and the final exam schedule are known quantities well in advance of any academic year, and that these periods might be published further in advance than is current practice.

Senators also wondered why more data was not published from the University Calendar on the electronic calendars that many faculty use that are under the banner system (this is the Google Calendar option).

The Senate then considered the following motion  
Advising and Registration Scheduling

The Faculty Senate recommends that the University Registrar publish on the Academic Calendar for the University, the advising dates, registration period and final exam

schedule for the Fall and Spring semesters at the beginning of the academic year. Furthermore, the Faculty Senate recommends that the electronic calendars maintained by the University also include references to advising periods, registration period, and final exam schedule.

Senator Pollard called the question, Senator Von Burg seconded

The Senate voted unanimously to adopt the motion.

Senator Pollard called for a motion to adjourn, seconded by Senator Connell

The motion passed unanimously

The meeting concluded at 5:52PM