

Faculty Senate Full Faculty Meeting

1 December 2016

Vote on December Graduates Based on the Chair-Level Reviews

Teach-In Announcement

Roberta Rosenberg

QEP Update: Undergraduate Research Literacy

Feedback by December 7, 2016

Director: Dr. Michaela Meyer

mmeyer@cnu.edu / 757-594-7495

*ppt slides courtesy of Dr. Michaela Meyer

Definitions

- * **Definitions (Approved unanimously, September 6th, 2016)**

- * “**Information Literacy** is a set of abilities requiring individuals to ‘recognize when information is needed and have the ability to locate, evaluate, and use effectively the needed information’” (Association of College and Research Libraries).
- * “**Undergraduate Research** is an academic inquiry conducted by an undergraduate student which employs discipline-specific methodologies and results in a product notable for its originality, rigor, and/or creativity” (CNU Council for Undergraduate Research).
- * “**Undergraduate Research Literacy** is a skill-set that emerges as students learn to recognize, locate, evaluate, and synthesize information necessary to conduct a discipline-specific academic inquiry and produce work notable for its originality, rigor, and creativity.” (QEP Strategic Planning Team Hybrid Definition).

Assessment:

Student Learning Outcomes

- * **SLO #1** – students will be critical consumers of information/research as defined by demonstrating the ability to (a) access, evaluate, and synthesize information (i.e., information literacy); (b) differentiate, comprehend, and use primary and secondary information/research; (c) demonstrate conventions of academic writing including assessment and use of sources, and aims and practice of argument (i.e., written communication literacy); and (d) determine the reliability, validity, accuracy, authority, timeliness, point of view or bias of information/sources/research/creative work.
- * **SLO #2** – students will have the knowledge and skills necessary to conduct research/create new knowledge as defined by demonstrating (a) the ability to conduct discipline-specific research; and (b) the ability to disseminate information/results appropriate to discipline-specific practices.

Assessment: Measures

- * In order to assess program goals and student learning outcomes, the proposed assessment of the QEP is divided between institutional and discipline-specific measures. This assessment includes both direct and indirect measures which are important in the overall assessment of a program (Hamilton et al., 2011). Both direct and indirect measures are also designed to provide measures of change with administration in the first or second year of students' study and again in the senior year.
- * **Measures:**
 - * **CLA+**
 - * **Discipline Specific Exit Survey**
 - * **Embedded Measures (ENG 223 & Discipline Specific Capstone)**

Implementation

- * **1. Office of Undergraduate Research and Creative Activities**
 - * Will be responsible for long term follow through on implementation and assessment of QEP (key from last review cycle).
 - * UGRC will serve as the faculty advisory board for this office – ideally the research component will be faculty led, with the office providing administrative support for university initiatives.
 - * Hire full-time director of this office to provide administrative support.
 - * Current Implementation Ideas sheet could be a starting agenda for this office and the advisory board.
 - * Creation of this office needs to occur in year 0/1.

Implementation

- * **2. Library Information Literacy Program**

- * Expand the library's role in helping establish information literacy best practices in our undergraduate classrooms.
- * Increase holdings and library resources.
- * Assess faculty perceptions of the role of information literacy in their disciplines by surveys and focus groups in year 2. Implement findings in year 3 and beyond.

Implementation

- * **3. Faculty Development Program in Undergraduate Research**
 - * Workshops, CET, etc.
 - * Pilot programs on campus to help faculty lead undergraduate research effectively.
 - * Creation of these programs can be ongoing, with some starting in year 0/1.

- * **4. Faculty Compensation Plan**
 - * Provide ways to compensate faculty through “credits” (potentially similar to structure in place for graduate education) at the undergraduate level.
 - * Create plan for this by year 2 to be implemented in year 3 (at latest).

Implementation

- * **5. Develop Undergraduate Research Funding/Opportunities**
 - * Combine university resources to support travel into a central account.
 - * Task the Office of UGRCA and faculty advisory board with locating, pulling together all programs on campus that currently offer funding.
 - * Audit funding resources and determine a fair and equitable plan for distribution of funds among consumables, start-up funding and travel funding.
 - * Create plan for this by year 2 to be implemented in year 3 (at latest).

Sample QEP Budget	Year 0	Year 1	Year 2	Year 3	Year 4	Year 5	
	(2017-2018)	(2018-2019)	(2019-2020)	(2020-2021)	(2021-2022)	(2022-2023)	
Staff Director	\$105,000.00	\$107,100.00	\$109,242.00	\$111,426.84	\$113,655.38	\$115,928.48	
Administrative Support	\$10,000.00	\$20,000.00	\$20,000.00	\$20,000.00	\$20,000.00	\$20,000.00	
Office Expenses	\$2,500.00	\$3,500.00	\$3,500.00	\$3,500.00	\$3,500.00	\$3,500.00	
Marketing	\$10,000.00	\$4,000.00	\$4,000.00	\$4,000.00	\$4,000.00	\$4,000.00	
Assessment	\$0.00	\$1,000.00	\$1,000.00	\$1,000.00	\$2,000.00	\$2,000.00	
Student Project Support							
Summer Scholars	\$150,000.00	\$150,000.00	\$150,000.00	\$150,000.00	\$150,000.00	\$150,000.00	
Spring/Fall Scholars	\$0.00	\$105,000.00	\$105,000.00	\$105,000.00	\$105,000.00	\$105,000.00	
Scholarships	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$20,000.00	\$30,000.00	\$30,000.00	\$30,000.00	
Student Travel	\$0.00	\$5,000.00	\$7,500.00	\$12,500.00	\$15,000.00	\$17,500.00	
Faculty Project Support							
Research/Creative Activities Materials	\$0.00	\$25,000.00	\$30,000.00	\$35,000.00	\$35,000.00	\$35,000.00	
Faculty Travel	\$0.00	\$5,000.00	\$7,500.00	\$12,500.00	\$15,000.00	\$17,500.00	
Course Release (Adjunct Cost)	\$9,324.00	\$9,324.00	\$40,404.00	\$55,944.00	\$71,484.00	\$87,024.00	
Summer Stipend	\$0.00	\$35,000.00	\$35,000.00	\$35,000.00	\$35,000.00	\$35,000.00	
TOTAL	\$286,824.00	\$469,924.00	\$533,146.00	\$575,870.84	\$599,639.38	\$622,452.48	\$3,087,856.70

PR Branding



RESEARCH LENS

LEARN • EXPLORE • NOTICE • SHARE

Feedback Requested by Dec. 7

- * Feedback on Preliminary Plan (Reaffirmation Committee, Faculty Senate, University Community)
- * QEP Strategic Planning Team Full Meeting – December 7th
- * Full Draft of QEP – December 16th
- * Finalize QEP Proposal for SACSCOC – January, ongoing until complete

- * QUESTIONS? SUGGESTIONS?

Please contact QEP Director Michaela Meyer (mmeyer@cnu.edu / 757-594-7495) with any suggestions/questions as we proceed with this process.

Proposed Changes to Faculty Development Grants

Sent to Faculty: October 20, 2016

Senate Review: January 20, 2017

Senate Vote: February 24, 2017

Faculty Development Grants

- * Concerns

- * Need for informed evaluation and fair allocations
- * Difficult to rank applications from different colleges at the Senate level
- * No mechanism for deans to collaborate on interdisciplinary projects that cross colleges

- * Proposed Solution

- * Split FDG funds as follows: 80% across colleges on a per capita basis and 20% to Provost's Office
- * Each Dean makes decisions about college-level applications
- * 20% used for applications not funded or partially funded at college level and interdisciplinary projects that span colleges

Statement on Diversity and Inclusion

Sent to Faculty: October 20, 2016

Senate Review: January 20, 2017

Senate Vote: March 17, 2017

Diversity and Inclusion

- * Issue

- * Recent increased support for diversity and inclusion (e.g., QEP Survey, creation of Council on Diversity and Inclusion, job ad in *Chronicle's* Diversity Issue)
- * Yet we have no statement indicating *why* diversity and inclusion are important for a liberal arts education

- * Proposal

- * Faculty Senate writes a statement indicating the academic value of diversity and inclusion and submits it to the Council on Diversity and Inclusion with a recommendation that they use the faculty statement in crafting their own mission statement

Update on the Curriculum Proposal

Two Developments
Since August All-Faculty Meeting

Senate Vote on *Handbook* Proposal:
February 24, 2017

Undergraduate Curriculum Review Committee (CRC)

- * Originally called the Educational Policy Committee (EPC)
- * Composition
 - * 10 faculty members (3 A&H, 3 NBS, 3 CSS, and 1 LUTR) elected by the faculty of each area, the Academic Deans (4), the Vice Provost for Undergraduate Education (non-voting) and the University Registrar (non-voting)
- * Role of CRC
 - * reconcile outcomes at lower levels of review and render a final outcome
- * Provost's Role
 - * may veto approved proposals
 - * makes a decision on appeals

Appeals:

Who Can Appeal a CRC Decision?

- * Who can appeal?
 - * A full college delegation (i.e. dean plus faculty members) on the CRC who are members of the voting minority with the support of the sponsoring faculty group
 - * Five members of the voting minority on the CRC with the support of the sponsoring faculty group

Procedure for Appeals

- (1) The requesting party writes a rebuttal to the CRC in conjunction with the sponsoring faculty group, including the curriculum proposal as presented to the CRC originally (i.e. with any and all recommendations and revisions from earlier review bodies and record of the initial CRC discussion).
- (2) The CRC and Provost meet to hear the appeal of the requesting party. The requesting party along with appropriate faculty sponsors present the rebuttal to the CRC and Provost.
- (3) The Provost determines the outcome of the appeal, providing one of the three options.
 - (a) Approve the proposal.
 - (b) Approve the proposal with recommendations or revisions suggested by the CRC or other review bodies.
 - (c) Deny the proposal.

Thank you!