

Faculty Senate Minutes
Dec. 3, 2004
3 p.m. SC 214

Senators present: Doughty, Doyle, Grau, Hicks, Kidd, Knipp, Purtle, Schwarze, Underwood, Vachris (arrived 3:55), Wheeler, Whiting, Wymer (arrived 3:18). Senators Absent: Berry, Cartwright. Guests: Dr. Bob Winder, Dr. Anita Tieman, Dr. Kevin Hughes.

President Purtle called the meeting to order at 3:10 p.m.

Motion to approve Nov. 30 General Faculty Meeting minutes for posting on the Senate website for access and corrections by the general faculty. **Vote:** Unanimous.

I. President's report—None.

II. Presentations

A. Dr. Anita Tieman, Director of Career and Counseling Center, spoke to the Senate regarding the issues of student depression and suicide. CNU is fortunate in that there have been no completed suicides on this campus. Generally there are 2-6 suicide attempts during the academic year; this semester there have been two attempts. There have been many articles lately, in publications such as Psychology Today, and The Chronicle of Higher Education about the upswing in depression among college students. There are too many types of disorders—faculty can't diagnose them, especially if one doesn't know the student.

Q: Is there a pattern of suicides among lower vs. upper level students?

A: Here at CNU the attempts are almost exclusively by freshmen.

Policy on handling attempted suicides at CNU: Dr. Tieman goes to the hospital, and the Dean of Students gets involved. Students are removed from the residence hall and are medically withdrawn from school. Before they can return, a psychiatrist must call Dr. Tieman to arrange for off-campus therapy that will continue after the student returns. If there is a suicide threat, the Counseling Center looks into it and offers counseling, but doesn't force students to accept the offer. Students often resist offers of counseling, especially if it is a third party referral (e.g., when a faculty member calls the Counseling Center and asks that a student be contacted). Students are more receptive if faculty members give permission to the Counseling Center to release their names to the student.

Q: What is our policy on notifying parents of students who attempt suicide?

A: Counseling Center personnel are obligated to maintain confidentiality, but other university officials are not. Whenever there is a suicide attempt,

a legal way is found to inform those officials—hall directors, dean of students—and parents are notified very quickly. Parents have never NOT been notified, but the Counseling Center cannot make that call.

Q: The Senate resolution on this issue has to do with faculty training regarding intervention. What is appropriate training for faculty?

A: Training would raise awareness in faculty of signs of depression. Often emotional issues present initially as academic problems. Crisis response techniques might also be useful—that is, how to deal with a student who is in crisis. There is training that can help faculty respond; it involves actually asking the question (Are you thinking about killing yourself?), then persuading the student that this is treatable, then getting them to the Counseling Center.

Dr. Tieman will contact the schools mentioned in the U.S. News and World Report article that have faculty training programs. Our residence advisors get training every semester.

Perhaps training at the department level would be a good strategy (it should not be offered during Getting Started Week, which is already over-full), or perhaps training could be offered twice each semester in a more formal way, during the Tuesday/Thursday 12:15-1 p.m. interval. Dr. Tieman will set up a program consistent with the resources of her office.

Vote on agenda item IV.C.: Resolution 2004-05-02: Responding to Student Depression. Second reading. Available:
www.cnu.edu/facsen/04_05/resolutions/2.doc

Friendly amendment to correct resolution clause to change “it be provided with appropriate training” to “that appropriate training be made available to the faculty”.

Vote: Unanimous.

B. Dr. Kevin Hughes, Judicial Affairs Coordinator: Sexual Misconduct Policy.

The Senate congratulated Dr. Hughes on his completion of his Ph.D. this very afternoon at William and Mary. Dr. Hughes indicated that last year he and current Dean of Students Donna Eddleman attended a conference on judicial affairs last year and realized CNU’s judicial process is in a good place. One area that needed attention, however, was how CNU dealt with sexual misconduct issues. The guidelines given to the Senate are CNU’s attempt to address this area, and Dr. Hughes would like Senate response to these guidelines, which are intended for the Student Handbook and by extension, the University Handbook.

Q: A possible Senate concern: that the new, smaller hearing panels have two students and only one faculty member. If faculty members have the more practiced critical eye, as Dr. Hughes indicated, is this not a problem?

A: Perhaps.

Q: Some sexual misconduct is crime—how does the university determine whether and what to report to external authorities? Are there circumstances under which the institution is obligated to notify the civil authorities?

A: It is the alleged victim's decision to press criminal or administrative charges. If administrative action is taken first, such action does not preclude later criminal charges.

III. Senate Committee reports

- A. Faculty Governance Review (Underwood, Chair)—the committee is working through inconsistencies in the University Handbook. The faculty as whole will need to discuss any possible changes to the apportionment of senators; Senator Underwood passed around four proposals whose intent is to start a conversation about the issue of Senate representation. Senators should discuss these proposals with their departments, and share them with departments who do not currently have Senate seats.

**** Please note that the following are meant to begin a conversation about the need for change and possible ways to meet that need. None of the below proposals should be interpreted as a current proposed action by the Faculty Senate. Available:**

www.cnu.edu/facsen/04_05/misc/senate_restructuring.doc

- B. Retention (Doughty, Chair). Hold until January 21.
- C. Sabbatical Application Review (Underwood, Chair). Senator Underwood presented a memo from the subcommittee recommending that applications for sabbatical from Drs. Mollick and Cones be approved. However, the subcommittee noted its concern for the departmental burden, since both candidates are from Biology. Senators suggested that allowing two sabbaticals during the same semester from the same department might not be good precedent. Additionally, it was noted in discussion that the sabbatical cost is really 24 LHEs, rather than 18, since Dr. Cones' administrative time also needs to be taken into account. The Senate also expressed concern regarding Dr. Mollick's potential wish to teach a class during his sabbatical. Senators indicated that faculty members on sabbatical should not teach at CNU during their leave, as this undercuts the notion of a sabbatical. Senator Kidd's Committee on Sabbatical Policy will take up this general issue.

The Senate therefore voted to amend the subcommittee's recommendations in the following ways:

Motion (Wheeler/Kidd): That one sabbatical be granted in Fall 2005 and one in Spring 2006, allowing the department to decide the order. **Vote: Unanimous.**

Motion (Kidd/Doyle): Amend language to remove the erroneous reference to 18 LHEs and use aggregate numbers instead. **Vote: Unanimous.**

Motion (Doughty/Schwarze). That Dr. Mollick's sabbatical be contingent upon not teaching during the sabbatical period. **Vote: Unanimous.**

Motion to pass entire document as amended. **Vote: Unanimous. (Amended document is attached, below).**

- D. Instructional Technology Committee (Doyle, Representative) regarding email broadcast issues. Hold comments for discussion of Resolution 2004-05-05: Faculty Email Policy.
- E. Status of Curriculum Proposal Corrections (Underwood and Doughty), including Mathematics changes. Hold comments for discussion of Resolution 2004-05-06: Renumbering of MATH 105.
- F. Additional Committee Report: Senator Doyle reported that the subcommittee (including Senators Wymer and Whiting) for the Harold Cones Distinguished Professor Nomination had met to recommend a peer review committee for Dr. Cones, and the Senate needs to debate the recommendations. The proposed peer review committee would consist of distinguished professor Tony Santoro and full professors Drs. Jay Paul, Marty Buonchristiani, Ed Weiss, and Ronnie Cohen. The subcommittee recommended that Dr. Weiss chair the group.

Motion (Underwood/Kidd) to approve recommendations. **Vote: Unanimous.**

IV. Old Business

- A. Vote on Advanced Placement Credit Recommendations. **Motion to approve: Schwarze/Doyle. Vote: Unanimous.**
- B. Resolution 2004-05-01: Time in rank for Promotion to Associate and Full Professor. Second reading. Available:
www.cnu.edu/facsen/04_05/resolutions/1.doc

Senator Wheeler reported that she and President Purtle had met with Provost Summerville about his concerns with the initial resolution. The Provost wanted to quantify what might constitute an 'extraordinary'

candidacy for early promotion to full professor. Therefore, the amended resolution includes specific language that defines this to mean that the candidate has been ranked by the dean in the top 10% in previous annual faculty reviews. If the bid for promotion from Associate to full fails, then a 3-year waiting period applies. This provision was initially intended to discourage frivolous early applications, but now it applies to all comers.

Part II of the resolution is new and is contingent upon passage of the first part. The change would bring parity in waiting periods (in that it would also impose a 2-year waiting period on failed bids from assistant to associate), and was suggested by the Provost.

Senators expressed several concerns about the amended resolution.

Q: How do faculty members know they have been judged to be in the top 10%?

A: A block will need to be added to the performance review forms.

Q: This resolution doesn't solve any big problem, and it creates a few. The 12-year criterion will still keep people from going up early. Perhaps that criterion should be changed to 10 or 11 years. Also, the 3-year waiting period is a problem. These changes might actually weaken the University Handbook criteria for promotion to full. Peer committee members might be less likely to vote against a weak candidacy because of that 3-year wait. Finally, the deans will have to score everyone much more carefully than they presently do in order to determine that top 10%.

A: The resolution does solve a university problem: Some associate professors are highly talented, highly producing people, and the university faces the possible loss of these talented, mid-level people if we maintain time-in-rank standards that are out of step with other fine liberal arts colleges. Some of the best people at the associate level have already produced scholarship worthy of full professor. This change rewards and recognizes these people. Regarding the problem of the 3-year waiting period: a candidate may withdraw from the review process at any point. Instead of finding against promotion, the peer committee could talk to the candidate and get her or him to withdraw.

Other concerns:

--There are problems with the 2-year waiting period in the assistant/associate section. The waiting period applies to everyone, not just to those who put themselves up early. There would also be a problem with the delay in cases where tenure/promotion decisions are split. Someone can come up one year early for promotion, and that's a nice feature, but the waiting period in the case of denial creates a problem with

the tenure decision in the 6th year—we could have someone getting tenure without promotion. Maybe we could fix that with a recommendation that tenure and promotion go together.

--If one goes up early for promotion, more is required than if one goes up later. Time in service balances other considerations.

Senators decided at this point to send the resolution back to committee (which will now include Senator Knipp) with the following guidelines for revision:

- Change the 12-year criterion to 11 years
- Levy waiting period penalties only on early applicants, not on everyone
- Change 3-year penalty to 2. Three years is onerous; 2 is more reasonable
- Drop part II completely
- Consider reworking the post tenure review so that it happens at same time as promotion to full

C. Resolution 2004-05-02: Responding to Student Depression. Second reading. Available: www.cnu.edu/facsen/04_05/resolutions/2.doc

Vote: Unanimous.

V. New Business

A.. Review of Sexual Misconduct Policy: Proposed Student Handbook Change. Available: www.cnu.edu/facsen/04_05/misc/sexual_harrassment.doc

Motion (Kidd/Underwood) to move to floor for first reading. Vote: Unanimous. Discussion of this issue will take place Jan. 21.

B. Over-scheduling of Getting Started Week: Discussion and recommendations. Hold discussion until Jan. 21.

C. Resolution 2004-05-05: Faculty Email Policy. Available: www.cnu.edu/facsen/04_05/resolutions/5.doc

Motion (Kidd/Underwood) to move to the floor and waive first reading. Vote: Unanimous.

Senator Schwarze indicated that she had spoken with both Michelle Chan and Shane Leasure about this resolution and IT's capabilities to enact it. The "faculty@cnu" list actually still exists, but only President Tribble and Executive Vice President Bill Brauer are authorized to use it. Unlike the old email system, in which "all faculty" or "all student" mail sat in a

queue to be reviewed for its adherence to CNU email policies before being broadcast, no such mediation capability is available in the new system.

The portal system does have a “group” function that may satisfy the faculty’s need to communicate more broadly, however. It has not yet been activated—in this feature, a group called “faculty” could be created and all faculty members enrolled in it. Faculty members would also be able to unsubscribe if they wished not to receive such communications. Inside the group function, faculty members could communicate via bulletin boards, and they would also be able to send emails to the entire group—these emails would arrive in regular inboxes, and would function much like a listserve. This capability might be able to be brought on line early next semester, once the CNU Banner Advisory Committee agrees. This committee includes Bill Brauer, Anne Perkins, Cynthia Perry, George Webb, Maury O’Connell and Bob Midgette. Senator Schwarze suggested that the Senate might want to look into representation on this committee, especially if it will be making policy decisions of this type in the future. Senators Underwood and Schwarze also noted that the Senate might want to find out the specifics of CNU’s policy regarding email acceptability/appropriateness.

Q: What if the group is too open—that is, inundated with unwanted mail?

A: Groups can also be closed to public access, so that non-members (solicitors, students, etc.) would not be able to send emails. Non-members would have to receive permission from a list administrator to enroll. At Michelle Chan’s suggestion, Senator Schwarze had visited another university’s site to view the group function, and found that she would have had to get the vice provost’s permission to join that faculty group and send email to it.

Q: I’m concerned that the “personal message” function might be used to address this concern, and that’s a problem because the sender is not identified.

A: It’s doubtful that this would happen because in order to send personal messages, each of us would have to be trained to do it, and be individually added to the authorization list—a process that is probably too time intensive for it to be an option.

Motion (Doughty/Schwarze) to call the question. Vote: Unanimous.

VI. Other

- A. Resolution 2004-05-06: Renumbering of MATH 105. Available: www.cnu.edu/facsen/04_05/resolutions/6.doc

Motion (Wymer/Doyle) to move to floor for first reading. Vote: Unanimous. Discussion of this issue will take place Jan. 21.

- B. UCC business: Curriculum proposals were distributed to Senators.
Discussion/approvals held over until Jan. 21.

Senators are reminded that next semester's meetings will be held on the third Friday of the month. Jan. 21, 2005, will be the first meeting.

Adjournment: 5:15 p.m.

Advanced Placement Recommendations:

Foreign Languages: CNU seems to award more credit hours for a score of 3 on the Foreign Languages tests than many of the other schools. The Department of Modern and Classical Languages assured the subcommittee that the current assignment of credit hours is correct. CNU faculty have actually served as graders for the exams, and the material covered in the test exceeds the material required through the 02 level. *The subcommittee recommends no change.*

Human Geography: CNU is the only school that does not award credit for the test in Human Geography. The Government Department has not yet discussed AP credit for geography yet, but plans to as the courses are developed. *The subcommittee recommends no change.*

Music: CNU is one of the few schools that do not award credit for the Music test. The Music Program assured the subcommittee that the course content of music theory far exceeds that which is covered in the AP test. The CNU policy is in line with JMU, VCU and Shenandoah, the other top music programs in the state. *The subcommittee recommends no change.*

Calculus: CNU is the only school that awards credit for a score of 2 on the Calculus BC test. The Mathematics Department has had the opportunity to review Calculus AP scores and the Calculus AP exams. *The Department and the subcommittee recommends the following procedure for awarding credit:*

Calculus AB exam score of 3+ credit for MATH 140

Calculus BC exam score of 3+ credit for MATH 140 and MATH 240

Calculus BC exam, AB subgrade of 3+ credit for MATH 140

History: The only AP score recognized by CNU is the one for U.S. History, and CNU is currently the only school that does not award any credit for scores below a 5. *The subcommittee and the Department of History recommends that CNU award 6 credit hours for a score of 5 and 3 credits for a score of 4 in American, European, and World History.*

Amended Sabbatical Memo

Sabbaticals applications for 2005

The senate reviewed 2 applications for sabbatical for the upcoming academic year. Drs. Harold Cones and Ron Mollick applied for sabbatical for Fall 2005. If granted, Dr. Cones would compete a research project studying the influence of Commander Eugene F. McDonald. Dr. Mollick would complete a much-needed update to the laboratory manual for Biology 109.

The criteria for faculty sabbaticals are as follows:

e) Criteria

The Faculty Senate will make recommendations on the basis of the following criteria:

- (1) the concept and organization of the project;
- (2) the enhancement the project will have on the teaching effectiveness and professional development of the applicant;
- (3) the quality or the promise of quality of the applicant's work as a teacher and scholar;
- (4) commitment by the applicant to work full-time on the project to completion;
- (5) the length and quality of the applicant's service to the University; and
- (6) the potential of the project to benefit the University.

The Faculty Senate concurs with Dean Gordon and recommends that sabbatical leaves be granted for both Drs. Cones and Mollick. It is our judgment that Dr. Cones' leave be given priority subject to the criteria stated above. We also concur with the Dean that Dr. Mollick should not take on any teaching duties during his leave if granted. The senate further recommends that Dr. Mollick's sabbatical be conditional on his not teaching during the period of leave.

Since both applicants are from the department of Biology, Chemistry and Environmental Science, the aggregate LHEs to be covered in that department could be burdensome. The senate recommends that one leave be granted for the Fall of 2005 and the other be granted for the Spring of 2006.