Faculty Senate-All Faculty Meeting Minutes
17 August 2016

I.   Call to Order: President Adamitis called the meeting to order at 1:45 p.m.

II. Introduction of AY 16-17 Faculty Senate: This year's Senators are:
   A. Arts and Humanities: Jana Adamitis (MCLL), Rachel Holland (MUSC), Michael Mulryan (MCLL), Brian Puaca (HIST), Hussam Timani (RSTD)
   B. Luter School: William Donaldson (MGMT)
   C. Natural and Behavioral Sciences: Ed Brash (PCSE), Costa Gerousis (PCSE), Chris Kennedy (MATH), Harold Grau (MBCH), Jessica Thompson (OENB)
   D. Social Sciences: Sean Connable (COMM), Lynn Shollen (LAMS), Robert Winder (ECON), Linda Waldron (SSWA)
   E. SEC: Jana Adamitis (President), Chris Kennedy (Vice President), Michael Mulryan (Secretary), Harold Grau (Parliamentarian), Lynn Shollen (*Handbook*)

III. Updates on Library Expansion and Copyright Policy
   A. Library Expansion (notes provided by Mary Sellen, University Librarian, and slightly edited)
   As President Trible said in his Getting Started Week address, construction will start in September 2016 and will take two years to complete. The purpose of the expansion is to increase seating from 400 to 1000 and add more individual study rooms. The main area of construction will be over the collections area and push out toward Warwick. The new space will include a 100-seat theater for faculty presentations; a 40-seat viewing room for group watching; a new media center; 2 new classrooms; and 3 floors with a 2nd cupola. The Mariners' collection will permanently move out of the library and its current area, in addition to the new space, will offer more room to house our collection. Next summer Einstein's will be reconfigured for more seating.

   The expansion required some temporary changes, which are as follows:
      1. Mary Sellen's office is on the second floor by the classrooms.
      2. 30,000 books and 20,000 bound journals that were identified as out of date and/or that have had little circulation have been moved to Gosnold Hall; the journals are also available digitally
      3. the remainder of the collection has been moved to the south side of the current library
      4. the library now offers a request service through the library catalog during the semester, and there is desk by collections for immediate pickup

5. there is a Trible Library Study Annex in the Freemen Center, a mere 235 steps away for the library, with additional study space; this room may not be reserved

B. Copyright Policy Update
[*Background*: Last year faculty raised concerns about a *Handbook* proposal on copyright policy prepared by an ad hoc committee comprising faculty and administrators. Chief among the concerns was that the *Handbook* proposal included language about potentially serious consequences for violations of copyright law but provided no guidance on how to follow this law, which can be rather nebulous at times. In fact, the committee *had* developed educational materials on copyright policy, but these were not mentioned in the *Handbook* proposal. After receiving the faculty feedback, the committee withdrew the proposal.]

The Library website now provides extensive guidance on copyright policy on the Trible Library website at this address: http://cnu.libguides.com/facultyservices/fscopyright (Or from the Library homepage, click on "Faculty and Staff" in the left column; then "Copyright Guidelines" at the top of the page.) The Library has also created copyright postcards to be distributed to faculty. Faculty should direct all questions regarding copyright to Beth Young, Access Services Librarian. The ad hoc committee will resume meeting this year to work on the *Handbook* policy.

IV. Updates from the Office of Communication and Public Relations
Amie Dale introduced several members of the OCPR team. Amie now serves as the Executive Director of University Relations; Matthew Schnepf is Assistant Director of Communications; Brian McGuire is Writer & Editor and Social media Manager; and Tom Kramer is Director of Public Relations, taking over for Lori Jacobs, who now works exclusively for the Ferguson Center for the Arts. Tom Kramer also serves as a liaison to the state government in Richmond, focusing especially on bills and policies that affect high education.

Last year OCPR began the process of overhauling the CNU website, which entails dividing it into two units: a public site for recruitment and a private, password-protected site for internal business. The site will have a soft launch this fall, which means that it will be accessible only to members of the CNU community, who may provide feedback prior to the public launch this spring. The new public face of CNU will do a better job of showcasing our programs and achievements and will have a look that is more appropriate for modern digital media. The private, password-protected site will look similar to the current one, but it will be better organized for easier use by faculty and staff.

Please assist OCPR by communicating achievements both faculty and student achievements for inclusion on the website and in other media.

V.   Center for Effective Teaching Initiatives
Jessica Thompson introduced Dr. Laurie Hunter as the new Assistant Director of the Center of Effective Teaching (CET) and provided an overview of the services offered by the CET. The following text is taken from Dr. Thompson's 8.16.16 email to the faculty:

CET consultations
You may make an appointment for an individual consultation at any time during the year. Consultations are confidential and provide an opportunity for faculty members to discuss any topic in teaching and learning or to receive feedback from the CET Director on issues or challenges they are experiencing in the classroom. To schedule a consultation, please visit the following website:

http://www.signupgenius.com/go/60B094BA9AB28A64-cetconsultations

Complete instructions for signing up for a CET consultation are attached to this email.

2016-2017 Workshop Series
The schedule for the 2016-2017 CET workshop series, along with detailed descriptions of each workshop, is attached to this email. As in past years, each workshop topic during the academic year will be offered on Monday from 1:00-2:15 pm and again on Tuesday from 9:30-10:45 am. Registration for these workshops is not required, and all workshops are held at the Center for Effective Teaching (Trible Library Room 209). Please note that the CET will also, once again, offer a one-day Innovation in Teaching workshop in early May 2017 and a two-day Course Design Workshop in early August 2017. More information about these immersive workshops will be provided as we get closer to next summer.

Peer Observation and Review Services
The CET has added four new peer observation and review services this year. These services are described briefly below. Additional information and instructions for requesting these services is provided at cnu.edu/cet/. Please follow the instructions on the website carefully so that we can respond to your needs promptly and efficiently. I would like to take the opportunity to thank the CET Advisory Board for providing feedback during the development of these services, as well as all the faculty members who have agreed to assist the CET by serving as model teachers and/or peer reviewers.

The four peer observation and review services occur along a spectrum from

informal sharing of ideas and techniques to more formal review of teaching effectiveness. In brief, these services include:

a) *Observing a model teacher:* faculty may sit in on class(es) offered by one of our "model teachers." Watching good teaching in action is an invaluable resource to aid faculty members as they seek to adopt effective teaching strategies in their own classroom. The CET website has a list of faculty members who have agreed to serve as model teachers and open their classrooms to interested colleagues; this list contains brief statements about the strategies used by each instructor so that you can determine who you would like to observe. Please note that this list was developed, in consultation with department chairs, to include instructors across disciplines and pedagogical techniques and should not be interpreted as a comprehensive list of the many exceptional teachers at CNU.

b) *Collaborative group observation:* groups of 3-4 faculty members (either self-selected or facilitated by the CET) will observe each others' classes to improve their own teaching by observing others and to provide informal, constructive feedback to other members of the group. This is a great option for faculty members who would like to work together to further their development as effective instructors. The CET will assist these groups by providing a recommended structure for group meetings and questions for discussion; see the CET website for more information on forming a collaborative group.

c) *Peer review:* faculty may choose to be observed by a colleague who has been trained by the CET to serve as a peer reviewer. This process is designed to provide formative, constructive feedback to faculty members in their efforts to become effective, innovative instructors. The peer review service is completely confidential; faculty members who are reviewed may choose to report this activity on evaluation materials but that choice is wholly up to the faculty member. Additional information on the logistics of the process and the steps that will be taken to ensure confidentiality is available on the CET website.

d) *Mid-semester adjustment:* this service provides the most extensive feedback to faculty members seeking to improve their teaching effectiveness. The CET Director or Assistant Director will observe a faculty member in the classroom and facilitate gathering anonymous feedback from students. As with the peer review service, the mid-semester adjustment is completely confidential and designed to provide formative feedback to CNU faculty. Additional information is available on the CET website.

As always, we welcome any questions or suggestions that you have about CET services. We have set up a new email address (cet@cnu.edu) to facilitate your communication with the CET and encourage you to use that address for

the fastest response. Thank you for your attention to the information in this email, and we look forward to working with you in the coming year to achieve your professional development goals.

VI.   Update on the Curriculum Proposal
      [*Background*: In Fall 2015 a Faculty Senate subcommittee developed a proposal to modify the curricular process in response to faculty concerns. The Senate reviewed the proposal in January, received feedback from faculty and the administration, which was presented at the Senate/All Faculty meeting in April, and then modified the proposal based on the feedback. The Faculty Senate website contains the meeting minutes at which the proposal was discussed (subcommittee progress reports: October, November; proposal presentation: January; presentation and discussion of feedback: April Senate/All Faculty and regular Senate).]

      President Adamitis began with an overview of the proposal and feedback. The proposal identifies the following problems with the current curricular system: insufficient communication among reviewing bodies; weight of approvals at lower levels in the process; lack of a process for reviewing cross-college/school programs; and inadequacy of forms. The recommended solutions in the original proposal are as follows:
      • Adopt an electronic approval flow system that allows for easy communication among reviewing bodies and the sponsoring faculty group, and require written justifications for decisions from each reviewing body. The system will allow the sponsoring faculty group and all reviewing bodies to follow the proposal through the process and see outcomes at each level of review.
      • Transform the UCC into an Educational Policy Committee comprising faculty from all four academic units, the academic deans and the Provost as voting members; and one non-voting student. This partially addresses the problem regarding weight of approvals, as it creates a body that can reconcile differing recommendations from the reviewing bodies. It also creates a body well suited to address curricula that cross departments and colleges, such as the Liberal Learning Core and interdisciplinary majors and minors, where communication and collaboration both across disciplines and between faculty and administration are essential for establishing and maintaining curricular coherence.
      • Clarify the weight of approvals. In the new system, reviewing bodies may make one of four initial recommendations: approve, approve with conditions, return to the sponsoring faculty group for clarification and/or revision, and deny. The EPC serves as the reconciling body when decisions differ among the reviewing bodies; the EPC also has the right to request clarification and/or revision and

recommend conditions. Before the EPC makes a final decision, the sponsoring faculty group will have an opportunity to respond to the recommendations of all reviewing bodies and at that point may take any of the following courses of action: make clarifications and/or revisions, agree to recommended conditions, provide a written rebuttal to recommended conditions or changes, or withdraw the proposal.

- Revise the forms, so that they include written recommendations with justifications from all reviewing bodies. Ensure that the forms elicit all of the information necessary for informed decision-making.

As noted above, the Senate gathered feedback on the proposal during the spring semester from both the faculty and administration. Based on that feedback, the Senate made the following revisions to the original proposal:

- *Provost*: The Provost will not serve as a member of the EPC but will be able to veto <u>approved</u> proposals. Proposals denied by the EPC will <u>not</u> go to the Provost for additional review. The VP for Undergraduate Education will retain a seat on the EPC as a non-voting member and serve as the voice of the Provost's Office, so that we have communication among the faculty, Deans and Provosts.
- *Deans:* Departments must consult with their Dean before submitting a proposal, and the forms will have a place where Deans can indicate that this has happened.
- *Senate*: The EPC will report to the Senate on matters of policy and procedure (like the current UCC), and the Senate will decide tied votes on the EPC.
- *LLC:* The LLC will not have a Steering Committee, since the group says that it can accomplish its tasks without one.
- *Honors*: Course proposals will go from the Honors Council directly to the Provost because speedy review is essential for this group.
- *CSS*: Membership increases from 2 to 3, and LUTR has 1 additional seat (so 3 CSS and 1 LUTR).
- *EPC Logistics*
  - A quorum is necessary for voting; Names will be recorded for votes and thorough minutes will be kept.
  - Both the names and the minutes will be sent to the Provost for consultation before he reviews the proposals approved by the EPC.
  - The chair must be a faculty member who is elected by simple majority among all voting members.
  - The EPC must meet at least once per month during the fall and spring semesters and finish its agenda by the end of the spring semester (i.e., no extended tabling).
  - There will not be a student on the EPC.

- In a nutshell, the secretary will be responsible for written communications (minutes and memos to reviewing bodies) and the tracking administrator will be responsible for maintaining all electronic systems and moving the process along.
- The EPC will not maintain a comment board, BUT all proposals to be reviewed by the EPC will be posted on the Intraweb at least one week prior to each meeting. Faculty may contact EPC members with comments or concerns (as we do now for the Senate)
- The graduate curriculum will follow the same procedures for curricular review, though its reconciling body will be the Graduate Council, not the EPC.

The timeline for moving forward is as follows:
- August 26: Senate engages in a first reading of the *Handbook* language
- September: Faculty Feedback and Ongoing Discussion with Provosts and Deans
- October 21: Senate vote; proposal submitted to *Handbook* committee

VII. Important Changes to the 16-17 *University Handbook*
These changes are all in bold print in the section on Instructional Faculty Personnel Regulations.
- The **Search Process** was updated to reflect actual practice.
- **Parental Leave** was added.
- The designations for **Lecturer Rank Streams** and the process for application and review were added.
- The process for **Conversions** was added.
- In awarding **Sabbaticals** additional consideration will be granted for service of six or more consecutive years as a department chair or commensurate leadership role completed within two academic years of the application.
- **Departmental EVAL-4s** must be used in conjunction with the University EVAL-4 for all tenure and promotion reviews, inclusive of Lecturer rank streams.

VIII. 16-17 Faculty Senate Agenda Items
- *Faculty Grievance and Hearing*: The Senate will form a committee to review internal policies and procedures for two reasons: (1) these processes have not been reviewed in well over a decade, so it would be appropriate to ensure that we are compliant with current best practices; and (2) the Grievance and Hearing processes will be used for faculty undergoing Title IX review, so we need to ensure that they are appropriate for that context.

- *Transcript Notation*: The state requires us to place a notation on the transcript for students while they are undergoing a Title IX investigation and if they have been found responsible. However, the state also requires that we have a process for removing the notation:

  "Such notation will be removed for a suspension if the Responding Party (1) completes the term of the suspension and any conditions thereof and (2) is determined by CNU to be in good standing." (*Handbook*)

  We do not currently have a process for removing transcript notations in place, and the Senate should make a recommendation for a process to commence in AY 17-18.

- *Diversity and Inclusion*
  The Senate will draft a Faculty Statement to be submitted to the Council on Diversity and Inclusion with a recommendation that the Council adopt a university-wide statement. The main purpose of the document is to explain what we mean by diversity and inclusion, and why these are essential to the liberal arts environment. We will also recommend doing a campus survey on diversity and inclusion that we may use, in combination with the Statement, to help us prioritize our goals.

- *Study Abroad*
  The Senate fully supports the University's goal of enhancing students' study abroad opportunities and offers the following suggestions:
  - Promote semester and year-long study, which provides a high impact study abroad experience.
  - Re-envision summer programs so that they are integrated into the University curriculum, and not just major curricula. Consider creating 6-credit learning communities that target freshmen and sophomores and fulfill Core requirements.
  - Provide academic recognition for study abroad. Consider offering a Global Diversity Distinction with curricular and extracurricular components, and applying for admission to a national Honor Society for study abroad.
  - Provide additional administrative support to the SA Office.

- *Departmental Strategic Planning*: The Senate recommended department-level strategic planning in AY 15-16 that would indicate how departments could contribute to meeting institutional quantitative benchmarks (e.g., percentage of 19-cap classes, 75% tenure-stream full-time faculty etc.) within the context of academic best practices and the University's academic mission. The plan that the Senate recommended was integrated into the new Program Review reports, which department will submit on a

cycle. The Senate recommends that departments engage in planning now, because we will need a qualitative context for interpreting the Delaware Cost Study data. That is, the Delaware Cost Study data must be interpreted in the light of our institutional mission and academic best practices.

- *Annual Review Phase II*: Each college will complete an evaluation rubric to be used in AY 17-18 by the end of October.

- *Departmental EVAL*-4s: The FRC has been using the DE-4's for some time now, and the *Handbook* now requires that all reviewing bodies use the DE-4's together with the University EVAL-4 for faculty review. All departments should ensure that their DE-4's indicate which items on the University EVAL-4 are appropriate to their discipline(s), articulate minimum expectations for tenure and promotion, as well as for multi-year contracts and promotion to senior and master lecturer.

- *Faculty Concerns about Evaluation*: These items are a direct response to concerns brought to the Senate last year.
    o **Promotion to Full Professor**: Begin a University-wide discussion of the standards for promotion to full professor with the goal of articulating these in the DE-4s. The Senate should consult with the CUC/Deans and FRC, and possibly host open sessions to solicit feedback in addition to encouraging departments to meet with their liaisons.
    o **FRC Non-Recommendation**: Form a Task Force comprising Senators and past FRC members to determine whether we should continue offering the option of "no recommendation."

IX. Additional Issues
As we had reached the end of our allocated time slot, we had time for only one question. Faculty continue to have concerns about the lack of a bookstore on campus and wonder why we renewed our contract with Follett, given all the trouble we have had with them.