

# Faculty Senate Full Faculty Meeting

14 April 2016

Vote on the May 2016  
Graduates

# Intraweb Update

Maggie Vaughan, Website Content Administrator

# QEP Update: Undergraduate Research *Literacy*, Dr. Michaela Meyer, Director

March 2016 - QEP Strategic Planning Team Formed

April - May 2016 - Preliminary Planning / Logic Modeling

May 19, 2016 - On-site Visit from SACSCOC Commission Liaison

Summer 2016 - Finalizing Logic Model, Preliminary Assessment Plan

Fall 2016 - Plan Conceptualization / Writing

Spring 2017 - QEP Submission to SACSCOC (at on-site visit, March)

# QEP: Discussion Topics

- How do we define undergraduate research literacy? In general? By discipline?
- What are best practices?
- What skills do our students need to develop most?
- How do we currently support undergraduate research literacy? What additional needs do we have?
- What are our top priorities?

# Title IX Policy: Annual Review

Send feedback to Jana Adamitis: [jadam@cnu.edu](mailto:jadam@cnu.edu)

# Curriculum Proposal

# Why review the curricular process?

- Response to rapid, massive institutional transformation
- Response to faculty concerns in AY 14-15 and AY 15-16
  - AY 14-15: Senate proposed curriculum sponsors
  - AY 15-16: subcommittee charged with reviewing the current process



# What was the process for review?

August 19, 2015 All Faculty Meeting: Curriculum Review on 15-16 Agenda

August 28, 2015 Faculty Senate meeting: Subcommittee formed

October 16, November 20, 2015 Faculty Senate meetings: preliminary subcommittee reports

December 3, 2015 All Faculty Meeting: faculty advised to expect a full subcommittee report in January

January 29, 2016: Faculty Senate meeting: report with proposal presented by the subcommittee and supported by the Senate

February 2, 2016: proposal sent to all department chairs, curriculum committee chairs, and administration with request for feedback

# Does the current system need revision?

- See *Handbook*, Section VI with the flowchart for the curricular process, and *Handbook*, Section XIX for committee charges
- Problems Identified
  - communication among reviewing bodies
    - *Handbook* requires recommendations, not justifications
  - weight of approvals, denials, approvals with conditions, revisions
    - No guidance in *Handbook*

# Does the current system need revision?

- Problems Identified
  - weight of administrative decisions vs instructional faculty recommendations
    - No guidance provided in *Handbook*
  - process for interdisciplinary approvals, including changes to the Core
    - No point at which faculty and administration come together to reconcile differing recommendations
  - adequacy of forms

# How can we address the problems?

- Transform the UCC into an Educational Policy Committee (EPC), and integrate the deans and provost into this committee, so that independent dean and provost reviews are no longer necessary, and communication among all colleges/schools and the administration improves.
- Charge the EPC with maintaining an electronic comment board for curricular proposals, so that all instructional faculty may have an opportunity to contribute to the process.

# How can we address the problems?

- Establish clear roles for each committee whose charge has a curricular component, articulate responsibilities for committee chairs and secretaries, require all committees to record outcomes and justifications in writing, and ensure that all curricular committees are included in the *Handbook*.
- LLC: Steering Committee provides oversight for Core maintenance

# How can we address the problems?

- Clarify the weight of each review. Implement a new process for addressing denials, approvals with conditions, or revisions at any level of review.
  - The EPC makes the final decision on all academic policies and curricular proposals through simple majority vote.
- Review and revise all forms so that each reviewing body receives the information required for decision-making.
- Develop an effective tracking system.
  - This recommendation assumes that we will still have an administrator who tracks forms and helps move the process forward.

# Feedback as of April 14, 2016

## THANK YOU!

CAH Curriculum Committee (Chairs) + HIST, MCLL

CNBS Curriculum Committee (Chairs) + MATH, PCSE

CSS: COMM, GOVT, LAMS, SSWAG

Honors Program

Liberal Learning Council

Undergraduate Curriculum Committee

Academic Deans

# General Points

- well thought-out proposal
- improves communication
- clarifies weight of each recommendation
- Educational Policy Committee more inclusive and efficient
- revision process moving too fast
- over-reaction to changes to the Core
- unclear that changes are necessary
- need a point-by-point comparison to current system



# Specific Points

- EPC Logistics
  - Will the comment board become a discussion board?
  - Require a minimum number of meetings
- Student Member of EPC
  - Do we need one?
  - Should be non-voting
  - Could be an MAT student

# Specific Points

- EPC Faculty Membership and Responsibilities
  - Increase CSS membership to three
  - Ensure that the chair is a faculty member
  - Transfer some responsibilities of the EPC Secretary to the tracking administrator
- EPC Provost Membership
  - Will faculty hesitate to voice their views if the Provost is present?
  - Should the Provost retain independent authority to some degree?

# Honors Program Feedback

- Support reform with one change
  - Course proposals need to be reviewed quickly due to the challenges of Honors scheduling
  - If the EPC will not be structured in such a way that Honors courses can be reviewed quickly, perhaps the current process should be retained (Honors Council to Provost)

# Liberal Learning Council Feedback

- Support reform with these two changes
  - LLC can perform all of its duties without a Steering Committee
  - Edited language describing the LLC's assessment functions

# Undergraduate Curriculum Committee Feedback

- General Concerns and Questions
  - Process is moving too quickly
  - Impetus for change and degree of dissatisfaction with the current process unclear
  - Faculty may not understand the current process, and a clearer comparison of the current and proposed processes is needed

# Undergraduate Curriculum Committee Feedback

- Responses to Proposal Specifics
  - Redundancies may not be a weakness, as different committees approach curriculum from different vantage points
  - Feedback on proposals already available through tracking document and curricular sponsors
  - “Do curricular decisions at a State University need (by law) the approval of an appointed representative or academic officer (The Provost)?” Would the new structure alter the Provost’s job description?
  - Would faculty feel comfortable voicing opinions before the Provost and Deans on the EPC? Would factions form?

# Undergraduate Curriculum Committee Feedback

- Suggestions
  - Add a representative from the Budget Advisory Committee to the UCC who can speak to resource issues
- Feedback
  - Give all faculty access to the tracking document
  - Educate department chairs on sharing information about proposals with faculty members
  - Ask the Provost to provide written rationale for decisions

# Academic Deans' Feedback

- Support the proposal with three revisions
  - The Provost is a non-voting member of the EPC and his vote occurs at the next level as the final stage of the process
  - The EPC records names for votes, keeps thorough minutes, and sends the minutes along with the votes to the Provost for his vote
  - Departments consult with Deans prior to submitting proposals for review (add a signature line to the form)



# Feedback: Big Picture Observations

- Feedback from majority of respondents primarily positive
- Most Common Concern: Role of the Provost
- Senate will consider all concerns and suggestions and make revisions as appropriate

# What happens next?

## April 15, 2016: Faculty Senate Meeting

- Discussion of feedback and revisions to proposal

## April 20, 2016: SEC meets with Provosts and Deans

- Feedback from Provost

## April 29, 2016: Senate meets with President and Provost

- Final version of proposal

# Faculty Senate Year in Review

# *Handbook: Instructional Faculty Personnel Regulations*

## Status: Under Administrative Review

- Added Parental Leave, as approved in AY 14-15
- Added Lecturer Rank Streams
- Added Conversions
- Updated the Search Process to reflect actual practice
- Departmental EVAL-4s
  - Due to Deans on Friday, May 6th

# *Handbook: Copyright Policy*

- Issues
  - Employees must abide by copyright law
  - Copyright laws can be vague and/or complicated
  - Misunderstanding that Scholar excuses employees from copyright law
- Committee comprising faculty and administrators worked in AY 14-15 to produce a document providing both the policy and guidelines on fair use
- *Handbook* proposal submitted in Fall 2015 contained the policy, but not the guidelines
- The *Handbook* proposal has been withdrawn, and the committee is revising the policy to include guidelines

# *Handbook* vs Policies

- The University has a new policies directory on the website
  - The link is at the bottom of the CNU homepage
- Benefits
  - All policies are transparent
  - Policies are easy to find
- Questions
  - What information goes into the *Handbook* vs on the Policies page?
  - What is the approval process for policies?

# Six-Year Plan

- President Tribble invited the Senate to consult on the Six-Year Plan on an annual basis
  - Focus of March 25 Meeting with the President and Provost
- The Senate will make recommendations in the areas identified as funding priorities in their annual memo to the Budget Advisory Committee
  - Strategic Planning at the Department Level
  - Diversity
  - Undergraduate Research
  - Study Abroad
  - Internships and Service Learning
- April 15: Subcommittees working on each area present recommendations to Senate
- April 29: Recommendations shared at the Senate meeting with the President and Provost

# Virginia Retirement System ORPHE

## Status: Resolved

- THANK YOU for helping us make our voices heard!
- ICMA-RC will not serve as the third-party administrator for employees already invested with TIAA-CREF and Fidelity
- New employees will be able to choose ICMA-RC as an additional option
- The Faculty Senate recommended that the administration explore the feasibility of an opt-out from the ORPHE



# Annual Review Proposal

## Status: Approved

- Formative Component
  - Eliminate the required norm of 3.0
  - Score faculty based on a consistent, shared rubric
  - Give the raw number for the summary score (e.g., don't round)
- Merit Pay Component
  - Scores tabulated by college
  - Score adjusted to a mean of 3, where 3's earn 75% of the possible merit dollars
    - Adjustment ensures equity across colleges (each score has the same dollar value in each academic unit)
    - Adjustment prevents colleges from "gaming" the system

# 75/25 Ratio for Tenure-Stream/Renewable Contract Status: In progress

- The AY 14-15 Senate recommended that the University increase the ratio from the current 65/35 to 75/25 by 2022 (the end-date for the current Six-Year Plan)
- Progress report presented at last week's Provost-All Faculty meeting
  - The following four slides were prepared by Provost Doughty

# Searches: Provost's Presentation

- 28 Searches...so far
  - 4 “Growth” positions - all assistant professor
  - 4 “Replacement” assistant professors
  - 8 “Replacement” lecturers
  - 11 Positions changed from lecturer to assistant prof.
  - 1 Assistant professor position changed to lecturer
    - Christmas departure
    - One-year
- Net gain of 14 assistant professors!

# Searches – status: Provost's Presentation

- 22 searches completed
  - 15 #1s before “jilted”
  - Early searches are important!
- 6 searches in progress
  - Two Christmas departures
  - One Ph.D. admit!

# Faculty Size and Profile – 2015-2016

## Provost's Presentation

- At start of this year our faculty looked like:
- 179 tenured and tenure-track
- 96 “restricted”
- Total = 275
- 34.9% restricted

# Faculty Size and Profile – 2016-2017: Provost's Presentation

- 10 Lecturer positions switched to Tenure-Track
- 4 new (growth) Assistant Professors
- 2 conversions from Lecturer -> Assistant Prof.
- If remaining 6 searches successful, we will look like:
  - 195 tenured or tenure-track
  - 84 restricted
  - Total = 279
  - 30.1% restricted

The background is a solid blue color with a gradient. It features several overlapping rounded rectangular shapes in different shades of blue, creating a layered effect. The shapes are positioned diagonally, with the darkest blue in the bottom-left and the lightest blue in the top-right.

**THANK YOU!**