

Faculty Senate Meeting Minutes
Friday, January 16, 2004
SC 214, 3:00 p.m.

Senators Present: Virginia Purtle, Quentin Kidd, Kelly Cartwright, Cathy, Doyle, Harold Grau, Tracey Schwarze, Gary Whiting, Robert Winder, Tom Berry, Rebecca Wheeler, Don Hicks, Bob Gray, Peter Knipp, Dave Doughty, Lori Underwood

Visitors: Eric Creasman, SGA representative, Ron Mollick, Past Senate President Tim Marshall

The meeting was called to order by President Purtle at 3:03 p.m. All visitors were welcomed.

- I. Minutes of the December 5, 2003 meeting were approved by voice vote with four grammatical corrections.
- II. President's Report
 - Dates for Senate meetings for Spring 2003 will be held on the 3rd Fridays (January 16, February 20, March 19, and April 16). All meetings (except the April meeting) will be in the Student Center Board Room (SC 214).
 - Full Senate meeting with President Tribble will be held on February 6 and April 2 in the President's Room of the Freeman Center at 3:00 p.m.
 - Senate Executive Committee meetings with President Tribble will be held on the 2nd Thursdays (February 12, March 11, and April 8) in the Brauer Room at 4:00 p.m.
 - Senate Executive Committee meetings will be held on the 2nd Thursdays (same dates as above) in a location to be determined at 12:30 p.m.
 - CNU was treated relatively well in the Governor's Budget with proposed allocations for the library and the Ferguson Center for the Arts (operating funds), and an increase in base operating expenses of the university.
 - President Purtle attended a meeting on ways to work out problems with academic suspension and petitions to be reinstated procedures.
 - Task Force recommendations and Handbook changes will be coming to the Senate in February. It may be necessary to have an additional meeting in February unless the

Senate is willing to hold a very long meeting (perhaps over dinner).

- The Senate needs a Nominating Committee and an Elections Committee. Senate elections need to be held prior to March 15. President Purtle hopes they can be held no later than the first week in March.
- Provost Summerville knows of no policy related to when building must be locked and on how late faculty and staff may remain in buildings. There is certainly no policy that says people must be out of university buildings by 10:00 p.m. She will talk further with the Provost about problems raised regarding these issues.

III. Committee Reports

- There were no committee reports

IV. Old Business

- a. 2003-2004-09: Schedule for Post Tenure Review Report – Second reading. Motion made by Senator Doyle to approve the schedule as proposed by the Ad Hoc Committee on Post Tenure Review chaired by Ron Mollock; seconded by Senator Underwood. Motion passed unanimously.

V. New Business

- a. Requirements for quorums at general faculty meetings – The Senate held a brief discussion concerning problems related to getting a quorum at faculty meetings. The Senate agreed to put off this discussion and asked Senators Knipp and Underwood to look at possible options for the Senate to consider.
- b. Changes to Accounting degree/major – Senator Hicks updated the Senate on the status of the proposal for elimination of the accounting degree. Senators raised several concerns in the discussion. Eliminating one program without having anything to replace it raises concerns for students interested in that area of study. There was also concern raised about the value of accounting as a major and for having an accounting degree at all times. Motion to approved Resolution 2003-2004: 10, which recommends that the current accounting degree be retained until the new degree is in existence

made by Senator Doughty; Senator Wheeler seconded. Motion passed with one abstention (Senator Hicks).

- c. Proposal for Philosophy of Law Concentration – The Department of Philosophy and Religious Studies has proposed a Concentration in the Philosophy of Law. The Dean of CLAS does not support the proposal and the University Curriculum Committee approved the proposal. Senator Schwarze updated the committee on the UCC's thinking. Senator Underwood explained the proposal to the Senate on behalf of the department. President Purtle called the question and the proposal was approved with one abstention (Senator Grau).
- d. Information Technology Committee – President Purtle asked for volunteers to serve on a committee that would bring to the Senate recommendations on the charge and composition of a University Information Technology Committee. Senator Bob Gray agreed to chair this process. Senators Doyle and Berry offered to serve on the committee. Senator Doughty recommended that Lynn Lambert in physics be asked to serve as well.
- e. Nominations and Elections Committees – President Purtle asked for volunteers to serve on this committee. The committee will be composed of one senator from each of the four sub-units of the university. Senator Grau (Science and Technology), Berry (Social Sciences), Schwarze (Humanities), and Hicks (Business) agreed to serve.

There was brief discussion about how the committee would operate. It was the Sense of the Senate that anyone expressing interest in running for an office will have their names placed on a ballot, assuming they are otherwise eligible to serve in that office if elected.

VI. Other Items

- a. Student e-mail Account Problems – Senator Kidd noted that several students have complained to him that their e-mail accounts were closed over the holiday break. The Senate discussed this problem briefly, with several Senators noting that they have a hard time interacting with students with whom they are working on projects during break and over the summer because student e-mail

access is cut off. The Senate agreed that this is one of the many problems with information technology on campus that the new University Information Technology Committee should deal with.

- b. Criteria for Promotion From Assistant to Full Professor – Senator Wheeler asked the Senate to look into the criteria for promotion, saying that she thought the time line was too long. The Senate agree to have her collect comparative data on this and report back to the Senate and a future date.
- c. Royalties from Textbooks by Faculty Authors – Senators Gray, Doyle and Grau presented the Senate with a resolution concerning royalties from textbooks by faculty authors for a first reading. Motion by Senator Gray. Motion seconded by Senator Whiting. Approved by voice vote.

There was a brief bit of discussion concerning the resolution.

VII. Meeting adjourned at 5:13 p.m. by President Purtle.

**Christopher Newport University
Faculty Senate
Resolution 2003-2004: 09**

Whereas, the Faculty Senate formed an ad hoc post tenure review committee during the Spring 2003 semester and that ad hoc committee has produced a report recommending a schedule for post tenure review,

Therefore Be It Resolved that the report of the ad hoc post tenure review committee be forwarded to the Handbook Committee for inclusion in the University Handbook.

Report

Page 95, line 10, part e):

(SECTION e) WAS MODIFIED)

e) Possible results of the evaluation process include:

- (1) judgments of satisfactory performance,
- (2) judgments of unsatisfactory performance

(WHAT FOLLOWS IS A NEW SECTION, f))

f) Judgments of unsatisfactory performance for any two of three consecutive years may place tenured faculty into an unscheduled peer review track. Unsatisfactory performance ratings in the area of teaching alone could be an initiator or unsatisfactory ratings in both professional development and service or unsatisfactory ratings in all three areas. This process is a performance review process conducted according to the applicable parts of section 4); it is not a dismissal process. The unscheduled review process has the potential to lead to sanctions but it is designed to be a helpful process aimed at improvement and will focus on individual faculty and not institutional needs. The process will not impinge upon academic freedom. The outcome of this process will be a judgment of satisfactory or unsatisfactory offered by a peer group and will include a summary statement explaining its judgment together with judgments by the Dean, the Faculty Review Committee, the Provost, and the President. If the final judgment is unsatisfactory, administrative sanctions may follow possibly including initiating the dismissal process.

(1) What follows outlines the procedures and general schedule leading to and including an unscheduled review. A specific schedule with dates will be provided yearly by the Provost's office.

a. When a tenured faculty member receives an unsatisfactory rating in the annual evaluation process in any two of three consecutive years, this will result in a recommendation on the applicable EVAL-AR from the Dean to the Provost to begin an unscheduled review. The Dean will include specific reasons for this recommendation. The Provost may choose against an unscheduled review. If the Provost decides that an unscheduled review is appropriate, the Dean and Faculty Review Committee are notified and an unscheduled review takes place the following spring semester according to the steps of section 4) and the timetable for the spring

peer evaluation cycle specified on form EVAL-1. In addition to the other materials specified in step 13, the dossier must include a performance improvement plan.

b. The peer group for the unscheduled spring review will judge the faculty member's performance as either satisfactory or unsatisfactory and will provide a summary statement on form EVAL-7 explaining its judgment. Judgments by the Dean, the Faculty Review Committee, the Provost and the President are subsequently rendered on form EVAL-8.

c. If the performance review is judged to be unsatisfactory, the unscheduled review process continues into the next academic year and the unscheduled review peer group remains intact. The intention is that this peer group will retain the same membership throughout this process although individual members may find it necessary to leave the peer group. If that occurs, replacements will be named by the same procedures that established the original peer group. The faculty member will next undergo an annual evaluation as usual the following fall semester. The faculty member will submit an EVAL-6 with the standard documentation and an update of the performance improvement plan. The EVAL-AR that the faculty member receives as a result of this review serves as interim feedback. The unscheduled review process continues into the fall semester review cycle of the next academic year. At that time, the Faculty member is required to undergo a peer evaluation in the fall cycle according to the steps in section 4) with their peer group and with an updated performance improvement plan included in the dossier.

d. The faculty member's performance will be judged as either satisfactory or unsatisfactory and the peer group will provide a summary statement on form EVAL-7 explaining its judgment. Judgments by the Dean, the Faculty Review Committee, the Provost and the President are subsequently rendered on form EVAL-8.

e. A final judgment of unsatisfactory or satisfactory will end the unscheduled peer review process. However, a final judgment of unsatisfactory may lead to administrative sanctions, possibly including initiating the dismissal process.

(2) All tenured faculty will undergo a scheduled performance review in the peer group format every sixth year during the spring semester evaluation cycle. Tenured faculty may elect to undergo such an evaluation in any year according to the schedule published by the Provost's office. Any Class A review that occurs for the purpose of promotion will count as a scheduled review.

a. The Provost will notify the Dean and Department Chair using form EVAL-2 identifying tenured faculty who will be reviewed. An EVAL-5 will be generated by the Department Chair and Dean and forwarded to the Provost.

b. The final judgment will be satisfactory or unsatisfactory. A satisfactory rating results in the scheduling of a new scheduled peer review in six years. A final judgment of unsatisfactory results in recommendations for improvement which the faculty member will address in the EVAL-6 to be submitted at the beginning of the next fall semester review cycle. Part 1), above, specifies how continuing unsatisfactory evaluations can place faculty into an unscheduled review.

c. In the event that a scheduled review coincides with an unscheduled review, the procedures relating to the unscheduled review will be followed.

Christopher Newport University
Faculty Senate
Resolution 2003-2004: 10

Whereas the Dean of the School of Business has recommended the elimination of the Bachelor of Science in Accounting, and

Whereas the Faculty Senate of Christopher Newport University values the discipline of accounting, and

Whereas the Faculty Senate believes that it is important that there be no interruption in the ability of student to pursue a major in accounting,

Therefore Be It Resolved that the Faculty Senate recommend students be allowed to declare a BSA until a major in accounting under the BSBA degree is approved by all relevant school and university committees and placed in the university catalog, at which time the BSA will be eliminated.

Christopher Newport University
Faculty Senate
Resolution 2003-2004: 11

Whereas the best interests of the University are served by reducing the appearance of conflicts of interest, and

Whereas the assignment of works authored that are sold for profit by an instructor for one or more of his/her classes presents a possible conflict of interest, and

Whereas a prohibition of receipt of any royalties or profits by such an instructor for sales generated from classes taught at Christopher Newport University would removed the conflict of interest, and

Whereas such prohibition would not preclude that instructor from receiving profits or royalties from sales to any and all other classes,

Therefore Be It Resolved that the University institute a policy whereby any instructor's net profits or royalties generated by the assignment of self-authored works to classes taught at Christopher Newport University be assigned to some third party designee that is fiscally independent of said instructor.