

Faculty Senate Minutes
Nov. 5, 2004
3 p.m. SC 214

President Purtle called the meeting to order at 3:05 p.m. Senators present: Berry (arrived 3:10) Cartwright, Doyle, Hicks, Kidd (left at 5:25), Knipp, Purtle, Schwarze (left 5:30), Underwood, Vachris (arrived 3:55), Wheeler, Whiting (arrived 3:08), Wymer. Senators absent: Doughty, Grau. Visitors present: Dr. Dorothy Doolittle, Dr. Glenn Weber, Prof. Stephanie Bardwell, SGA Secretary for University Relations Kristen Agenburger

I. Approval of 9-24 Minutes: approved.

II. President's report:

A. On behalf of the Faculty Senate, the Executive Committee approved the following Faculty Development Grants as recommended by the Faculty Development Grant Review Committee:

1. Sharon Rowley (English)
2. Richard Sherwin (Biology)
3. Webb, Lisa and Grau, Harold (Biology)
4. Sishagne, Shumet (History)
5. Gibbons, Jeffrey (Psychology)
6. Riedl, Anton (Physics/Computer Sci)
7. Cartwright, Kelly (Psychology)
8. Pringle, Pam and Sledge, Sally

Total Recommended: \$14,611

Total amount remaining for this year: \$15,389

B. The resolution to grant emeritus status to a faculty member in the School of Business was not acted on by the Dean of the School; therefore, no action has been taken by the Provost. According to the Handbook, the department, the Dean, the Faculty Senate, the Provost, the President and the Board must approve the emeritus status for it to become effective.

C. David Doughty and I are on the Vice Provost Search Committee that is being chaired by Robert Colvin. Others on the committee are Amy Boykin, Brian Bradie, Laura Deiulio, Joan McMahon, Cynthia Perry and Carol Safko. Review of applications will begin January 4, 2005.

D. The President is appointing a Committee to study the campus alcohol policy. I was asked to nominate faculty members for the Committee. Faculty members on that committee will be Robert Colvin and Ronnie Cohen, Co-Chairs and Robert Hasbrouck.

E. There will be no Board of Visitors Committee meetings next week due to the Board being on retreat.

F. Many consultants have been on campus this semester for the following areas: public relations, capital campaign, retention, admissions and our web page. Several of them are coordinating with one another.

G. The Provost responded to our letter to him regarding the role of Chairs in the School of Business.

H. No action has been taken yet by the Provost regarding Resolution 16:2004 Mandatory Class Attendance on the First Day of Classes. He has established a committee to determine its feasibility.

III. Presentations

A. Dr. Dorothy Doolittle, Associate Provost, described a faculty survey from the UCLA Higher Education Research Institute that will be administered shortly to CNU faculty.

Dr. Doolittle noted that CNU has been participating in this survey as a faculty since 1992. It is a triennial survey and was last administered here in 2001. It will arrive in faculty's campus mailboxes, individually addressed and numbered. UCLA tracks which surveys come back (this is the reason for the tracking number), but CNU does not. UCLA will send a second survey along with email reminders to people who do not respond the first time; the tracking numbers are important so that UCLA does not send a second survey to people who have already completed one, thereby contaminating the data pool. Two reports come back to CNU: a comparison of 2001 results to those of 2004, and a report that compares our faculty with other normative faculty groups from peer institutions. All of this information comes as aggregate data, with no pullouts. There is no way for the administration to find out what individuals said or even who responded. The survey takes about 10 minutes and asks what faculty members are satisfied with and what they are not, as well as how faculty members spend their time. The survey is administered by the same group that does the freshman surveys and the satisfaction surveys for upper level students. The Office of Institutional Effectiveness is becoming a repository for all these reports. Other offices on campus are contracting with this agency for their own data collections, too.

Discussion: Senators expressed concern over whether the survey was truly anonymous if there were tracking numbers and individual names on it. Dr. Doolittle shared the certifications of confidentiality that UCLA provides. Senators indicated that perhaps UCLA should provide similar assurances of confidentiality in its cover letter to faculty to ensure participation as well as accurate responses.

B. Dr. Glenn Weber discussed the Senate's deletion last spring of MATH 105 in the new curriculum requirements, contrary to recommendations of the UCC and the Task Force on Curriculum and Academic Life. Dr. Weber was concerned that perhaps the Senate

had misunderstood the nature of MATH 105 when it voted to delete the course from the curriculum. The initial Task Force curriculum proposal included ONE mathematics course in the areas of Calculus (MATH 135, 140), Discrete (MATH 105, 145), Statistics (MATH 125) or any 200-level course. When asked to provide this list, the Mathematics department eliminated MATH 110 (College Algebra) and MATH 130 (Elementary functions/Analytic Geometry), as the only purpose of these courses is to prepare students to take other courses. They are not reasonable mathematics literacy courses for the liberal arts majors. This is the way the proposal went through the Chairs and the UCC. But when the curriculum proposal got to Senate, the Senate increased the requirement to TWO mathematics courses, dropped MATH 105, and added MATH 110 and MATH 130. The Provost then removed MATH 110 from the list of approved courses, but did not reinstate MATH 105.

Dr. Weber, with the support of his department, contended that MATH 105 should be reinstated to this list, and offered the following background. Years ago, two mathematics courses were required for the General Education distribution requirements: one was MATH 120, Finite Mathematics, which addressed broad mathematics topics such as finance, economics, linear programming, etc. Courses like MATH 120 and MATH 125 (Statistics) were encouraged, and MATH 110 was not, but students were not taking 120 because it was harder than 110 and had a higher number; they took 110 which was NOT the best course for them. So the department renumbered MATH 120 as MATH 105, giving it with a lower number to entice students into enrolling in the proper course. The current MATH 105 is really the old MATH 120—it's finite mathematics, and it is a more rigorous and more appropriate college course than MATH 110. It is harder than MATH 125. The textbook for the course, Finite Mathematics, includes a chapter of high school material at the start, but the syllabus goes far beyond that. Students don't do particularly well in the course—the average GPA is usually in the "C" range.

The department would like to fine tune this course for the new curriculum, change the topics it addresses or create new ones, and perhaps create a third kind of choice for liberal arts majors to satisfy their requirements, along the lines of the present MATH 105. But the department first needs to understand the Senate's concerns about the course, and if they are founded on misconception, see if the Senate might be willing to clarify its intent to the appropriate bodies. This is not an official proposal, as the Mathematics department wasn't asked for a response, but the Senate probably could act.

Discussion/Action: What action should the Senate take? Would the change need to go all the way back through the curriculum process? Since the problem originated with the Senate (MATH 105 was part of the Task Force curriculum package, and was approved at both the Chairs and UCC level), perhaps the Senate could communicate this clarification/amendment to the Provost in a memo, with copies to other levels. President Purtle will talk to the Provost and explain the misrepresentation of MATH 105 to the Senate and the Senate's resulting misunderstanding of the nature of the course, and clarify our willingness to include a course like this in the new curriculum requirements.

IV. Senate Committee reports

A. Advanced Placement Credit (Vachris, Chair): Senator Vachris reported that her committee had looked at competitor schools in Virginia to see what they were awarding in terms of AP credit and how CNU diverged. Differences from the norm occur in foreign languages, geography, music, calculus, and history. The committee contacted these departments to discuss the issue, and produced the following recommendations with the concurrence of the departments involved. The committee's specific recommendations are as follows:

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.*

The subcommittee strongly recommends that a study be undertaken to assess student performance in upper level courses to determine if there is a significant difference among students that took the lower level courses here, students that took the lower level courses at another higher education institution and students who received AP credit.

B. Governance (Underwood, Chair): Senator Underwood reported this committee has met once, and each member has a project—looking at a section of the Handbook for contradictions. All chairs of standing committees are sending requests for changes to their sections to Senator Doyle by next week. The committee is trying to make the university committee structure reflect who we are now rather than who we were. Changes to constitution must go before whole faculty.

C. Retention (Doughty, Chair): No report, as Senator Doughty was absent.

D. Faculty Development Grants Review (Whiting, Chair): Senator Whiting provided a summary of Faculty Development Grant recommendations for Fall 2004 and reviewed rationales for these decisions (see President's report above for this information). He also handed out a model evaluation sheet for individual packages that might assist future assessments. Other committee members indicated that they thought the sheet was very helpful. If anyone has further suggestions for the sheet, please send them to Senator Whiting. When the Senate approves it, it can become part of the Faculty Development Grant paperwork, available on the Provost's web page, so that faculty can clearly see the evaluation criteria and submit the review sheet with their individual packages. This will also ensure that the sheet is retained in the institutional memory of the Senate. This committee will meet again to fine tune the form and the Handbook requirements for Faculty Development grants.

E. Sabbatical Policy Review (Kidd, Chair): Senator Kidd reported that this committee has organized, but has nothing to report yet.

F. Advising (Knipp, Chair): Senator Knipp reported that this committee has met once and that it is still working out its goals. It has determined, however, that weaving mentoring into academic advising is dead in the water.

G. Study Abroad Compensation (Kidd, Chair): Senator Kidd reported that this committee has organized, but has nothing to report yet.

H. Sabbatical Application Review (Underwood, Chair): Senator Underwood reported that no applications have been received yet as the deadline (Nov. 15) has not yet arrived.

Additional Business. Senator Knipp asked to return to President Purtle's report, and wondered if the Senate could do a better job of communicating with the rest of the campus, especially in terms of the resolutions it considers. Currently agendas and copies of resolutions are emailed to all faculty inboxes by the Senate Secretary at least one week in advance of the meeting, but perhaps faculty are not reading them. Minutes are usually emailed to faculty inboxes more than a month later, as they must be approved at the following month's meeting before they can be disseminated.

Other options to encourage greater faculty participation include paper distribution of the minutes via departmental secretaries and more emphasis on representative government by

all Senators, to include departments from their divisions which do not have Senate representation.

Senate enters closed session for the purpose of discussing a personal issue related to lack of communication between the Senate and the university community at 4:25. Open session resumes 4:35.

Motion: (Underwood/Kidd). In order to speed distribution of Senate minutes to faculty and thereby provide faculty with more timely information on reasons for Senate actions, the Senate will approve minutes via email on a trial basis through February 2005. The Senate Secretary will email draft minutes to all senators within one week of the meeting, and senators will have one week to review and indicate their vote on approval. Any suggested corrections to the minutes must be sent to all senators. The Senate Secretary will record the vote. A quorum of Senators must respond for the minutes to be approved. **Vote: Unanimous.** It was also noted that if this system is permanently implemented, the Senate should request administrative release time for the secretary, given the shortened timeframes and increased demands of the position.

V. Old Business

Resolution 2004-05-03: Textbook Royalties. The text of this resolution can be found at www.cnu.edu/facsen/04_05/resolutions/3.doc

This resolution has a new number, though it is still old business because it was sent back to committee. It needs a new motion for consideration on the floor. **Disposition: Resolution dies for lack of a motion.**

VI. New Business

A. Appointment of a working group to nominate members for the peer committee for the nomination of Harold Cones to Distinguished Professor. The Senate is creating a working group of faculty members to nominate members of peer group. This group will consist of Senators Whiting, Doyle, Wymer. Senator Doyle will chair.

B. Resolution 2004-05-01: Time in rank for promotion to Full Professor. The text of this resolution can be found at www.cnu.edu/facsen/04_05/resolutions/1.doc

Motion to consider: first reading (Whiting/Berry). Discussion: Senator Wheeler provided background on this resolution and reviewed with the Senate the research she had done to determine what the institutional norm might be for promotion to full professor among like schools. CNU presently requires a minimum of seven years at the associate level. A search of standards provided by the Consortium of Liberal Arts Colleges revealed CNU's 7-year requirement to be outside the main. Most schools require a two-pronged test, specifying a usual time in rank, and that unusual cases may come up earlier with a minimum specification of time in rank. Senator Wheeler discussed the review of this policy with the Provost last spring, and understood that he

was not adverse to a review, so long a minimum qualification of 5 years at the associate level was specified.

The Senate then discussed the text of Provost Summerville's recent email on this topic, along with possible ways of tightening the proposal to address his present concerns. These include: changing the language from "unusual circumstances" to "extraordinary circumstances"; defining who decides whether the circumstances for early review are in fact extraordinary (a majority of tenured members of the department, to include other tenured members of the university faculty?); a provision that if the early bid for promotion is not successful, that the candidate wait two years for reconsideration (to discourage frivolous applications).

The resolution should also articulate reasons why this change will strengthen CNU. These include enhanced retention of high quality faculty because of the potential for earlier promotion and enhanced efficiency of the post-tenure review process. The current system of post-tenure review in 6 years and eligibility for promotion to full professor in 7 years necessitates back-to-back, full-up peer reviews, when only one review might suffice.

Temporary Disposition: Senators Wheeler and Purtle will meet with Provost to discuss his concerns and further ways to tighten this resolution.

C. Resolution 2004-05-02: Responding to Student Depression. The text of this resolution can be found at www.cnu.edu/facsen/04_05/resolutions/2.doc

Motion to consider: first reading (Wymer/Whiting). Discussion: This is an important issue. Should identifying signs of substance abuse be added to this potential faculty training? What type of intervention is actually available on campus once students are identified? Do we have enough resources? Do students understand that the Career and Counseling Office is a place to get this kind of help? If faculty are going to help identify troubled students, they need to learn enough to be really useful. What if all faculty members don't want to be charged with the weight of this determination—who needs help and who doesn't?

Temporary disposition: Anita Tieman, Director of the Career and Counseling office, will be invited to speak to these issues at the next Senate meeting.

Motion to suspend the order of business to consider item E, Resolution 2004-05-04. Carries.

E. Resolution 2004-05-04: Emeritus Status for Prof. Lea B. Pellet. The text of this resolution can be found at www.cnu.edu/facsen/04_05/resolutions/4.doc

Motion to suspend first reading--carries. Motion to approve resolution (Underwood/Berry). **Vote: Unanimous.**

Order of business resumes. Senator Wheeler takes over minutes when Senator Schwarze departs (5:30).

C. Campus-wide email policy: Restrictions on faculty ability to broadcast announcements and discuss issues with the faculty at-large. Discussion: Senators expressed concern regarding the inability of faculty to broadcast emails to all CNU faculty or other broad constituencies. In some cases faculty members can do this (Senate messages, for example), but their messages must be approved by administrative entities (Maggie White). Designated faculty members, such as the Senate President and Secretary will be trained to send out their own messages.

The Senate discussed other venues in which faculty might be able to communicate freely: these include chat rooms, online discussion forums, bulletin boards. Still, none of these options allow messages the type of dissemination that general email achieves. It was also noted that students should be able to broadcast emails widely to other students.

Disposition: No action was taken at this time.

Motion to Adjourn: 5:42 p.m.

Respectfully Submitted,

Dr. Tracey Schwarze
Faculty Senate Secretary