Christopher Newport University
Washington Room, David Student Union
April 17, 2015
3:00 PM - 6:00 PM

Senators Present: Adamitis, Manning, Martin, Grau, Brash, Nichols, Holland, Timani, Jelinek, Thompson, Hasbrouck, Hunter, Busch, Barnello, Winder

1. President Adamitis called the meeting to order at 3:03

2. Introduction of Visitors (Dr. Ann Mazzocca, CISS Chair, and Ms. Lorraine Hall, Assistant to Provost)
At the beginning of the academic year, the Faculty Senate asked the Committee for IDEA Survey Support (CISS) to make recommendations on best practices for using IDEA student survey feedback in summative faculty evaluations. Throughout the year the committee engaged in extensive literature review, meetings with academic deans, and faculty interviews. Their recommendations are as follows:

* For significant evaluation decisions, the IDEA Center recommends a minimum of 6-8 courses be used to create a comprehensive overview. Courses should not be looked at in isolation.
* Reliability might be diminished in courses with enrollment below fifteen students and in courses with response rates below 65%. In these cases it is particularly important to look for response patterns over multiple courses.
* The primary purpose of the IDEA instrument is to provide formative feedback to faculty to inform possible instructional changes. Therefore, student survey results should represent no more than 50% of the teaching portion of the annual, promotion and/or tenure evaluation. The remainder of the evaluation may be based on some combination of the following (and other elements also listed in the UE4):
-- Mentorship of undergraduate and graduate students
-- Publication involving undergraduate and graduate students
-- Peer observation of teaching
-- Course innovation/development of new course materials
-- Facilitation of student participation in academic presentations/conferences such as Paideia
-- Incorporation of service learning in courses
-- Participation in Study Abroad or international education opportunities
-- A teaching portfolio
-- In some disciplines, student pass rates on major field tests or exit exams may be considered in addition to survey results
* Review all of the information provided in the course summary report, pages 1 through 4, to ensure that an accurate assessment has been made. While the information on page one is helpful, it only provides a limited summary of the feedback provided.
* Compare student survey results to comments about course difficulty and course grade distribution. In general, scores are not looked at in isolation from comments.
* Administrators should reinforce that one bad evaluation does not have a negative impact on the faculty member. It is important to remind faculty that administrators are reviewing patterns in teaching performance. Patterns include performance in the key areas including

students' perceived progress on relevant objectives, excellence of teacher, and student comments over a set of similar courses across several semesters. One rogue comment might be an anomaly and therefore not indicative of teaching talent and therefore given little if any weight at all. Are there consistent patterns in the comments regarding teaching? If so, it is given far more weight than the one outlying negative comment that is incongruous with the other comments.

* Review faculty self-assessment narrative highlighting successful practices, unsuccessful experiences, and anticipated changes based upon student reaction to instruction.
* Set specific expectations for faculty results. (For example, what constitutes, "meets expectations"? "surpasses expectations"?)
* Take into account bias against nationality, particularly when looking at comments referencing accents.
* Take into account where the faulty member is in their career. Is there improvement? Is the faculty member learning?
* Be aware of potential bias based on gender, specifically certain descriptors used for women and others used for men to describe the same behavior.
* Consider the use of adjusted versus raw scores: The adjusted scores take into account student perceptions of their own effort and willingness to take the course. (For example, a required course for non-majors might have a higher adjusted score than raw.)
* Discuss teaching evaluation, including IDEA, with new faculty at New Faculty Orientation or shortly thereafter.
* Identify faculty who could mentor others and assist with completing the Faculty Information Form, adapting instruction, and interpreting survey results.
* Deans may look at evaluation independently of department chair's evaluation. If there is a disparity, re-examine.

One Senator wondered whether any discussion had taken place regarding our transition from paper surveys administered in class to electronic surveys. A significant concern about electronic surveys was that students sometimes mistakenly submit responses for the wrong class, as is evident from the written comments. The CISS response to this question was that we will not return to the paper surveys, because our institutional response rate of around 70% for the electronic surveys is statistically sound. Moreover, past concerns raised by faculty have already been addressed, and the University will continue to address new concerns as they arise.   With respect to the problems of students submitting the wrong feedback: Ms. Hall mentioned that she receives approximately ten student emails each semester in which the student indicates that they completed a survey on the wrong instructor. She is able to correct the problem easily and encourages faculty to let students know that they should email her if they realize they have made a mistake after submitting their form.

Another senator asked whether the current length of the window in which students can fill out their evaluation forms is appropriate. Ms. Hall indicated that a two-week window is standard at most schools.

Ms. Hall suggested that Senators compile a list of additional questions that the CISS could examine in the next academic year. President Adamitis reminded us that, if there are any unique teaching situations (specific to an academic department) regarding student evaluations, they should be included as a part of a Department's Eval-4.

Next President Adamitis welcomed all of the new senators to the faculty senate for the academic year, 2015-2016. Senate Executive Committee (SEC) elections required us to close the 2014-2015 session of the CNU faculty Senate.

Senator Adamitis made a motion to recess from the 2014-2015 Faculty Senate meeting and begin the first 2015-2016 session.
Seconded: Senator Jelinek
Senator Martin proceeded to run elections for the 2015-2016 Faculty Senate SEC. The results were as follows: President of the SEC for AY 2015-2016 will be Jana Adamitis, Vice-President will be Linda Manning, Secretary will be John Nichols, Parliamentarian will be Harold Grau and the *Handbook* liaison will be Christopher Kennedy.

The vote in favor of the SEC candidates for 2015-2016 SEC was unanimous.

President Adamitis next moved to come out of recess for the 2014-2015 faculty senate session.

President Adamitis asked if everyone had an opportunity to look at the minutes from the March 20 Faculty Senate meeting.

President Adamitis moved to accept the minutes from the March 20 Faculty Senate meeting.
Seconded: Senator Holland

Vote in Favor: Adamitis, Manning, Martin, Grau, Brash, Nichols, Holland, Timani, Jelinek, Thompson, Hasbrouck, Hunter, Busch
Abstain: Barnello, Winder

3. We decided to delay the President's Report until the end of the meeting.

4. University EVAL-4 Review

There was only one additional correction, which came from the LLC. The LLC would like to add serving as a rater during liberal learning core assessment evaluations as a highly valued activity under university service.

Senators were all in favor of this change to the University EVAL-4.

President Adamitis put a motion on the floor to amend the University EVAL-4so that participating as a rater during liberal learning core assessments count as a highly valued activity under university service.
Seconded: Jelinek

Vote in favor: unanimous

5. Emeritus Resolutions
The senate voted on the emeritus resolutions for Dr. David Hibler, Dr. George Teschner, Dr. Marion Manton, Dr. Richard Cheney, Dr. Linda Gordan and Dr. Sanford Lopater.

President Adamitis moved to approve emeritus status for Hibler, Teschner, Manton, Cheney,

Gordan, Lopater
Seconded: Vice-President Manning
Vote in favor: unanimous

President Adamitis next moved to go into closed session in order to consider agenda items six and seven, Faculty Development Grants and Faculty Excellence Awards, which are confidential personnel matters.
Seconded: Senator Holland
Vote in Favor: unanimous

At 5:00 the Senate came back out of closed session.
There was a motion by President Adamitis to approve the slate of nominations for Faculty Development Grants by the faculty senate Faculty Development Committee.
Seconded: Senator Barnello
Vote to approve: Adamitis, Manning, Busch, Brash, Jelinek, Hunter, Holland, Nichols, Hasbrouck, Grau, Thompson, Barnello, Martin, Timani
Abstain: Winder

President Adamitis moved to approve the faculty members for the three faculty excellence awards.
Seconded: Senator Barnello
Vote to approve: Adamitis, Manning, Martin, Nichols, Holland, Timani, Jelinek, Thompson, Hasbrouck, Hunter, Barnello, Winder
Opposed: Busch, Brash, Grau
The motion was approved.

8. *Handbook* Proposals #1-11

All of these proposed *Handbook* changes have been posted to the Faculty Senate website. *Handbook* change #1 involved the proposal for new rank streams. One department expressed serious concerns about the proposal and wondered whether a full faculty vote would be appropriate. Their concern is that implementing non-tenure-stream ranks with long-term contracts creates a viable alternative to tenure, and that a future administration could easily move tenure-stream lines to this new track. Why would a future administration offer life-long tenure contracts, when they could instead grant lecturer contracts that could theoretically lead to a life-long position but could also just as easily be cut? The Senate appreciates this viewpoint and strongly believes that the University should at a minimum retain the tenure-stream lines we have now and ideally increase their number in the future. However, the Senate sees the ranks streams not as a threat to tenure, but rather as a way to recognize colleagues for good work. Should some future administration wish to reduce or eliminate tenure-stream lines, it will attempt to do so regardless of the nature of our lecturer contracts. Any attempt on its part use lecturer ranks and/or contracts to justify such a move would be regarded as entirely specious by the faculty.

Senator Busch moved to place the handbook proposal #1 on the table
Second: President Adamitis

The senate will return to this proposal during the 2015-2016 session. The Senate does support the lecturer policy. However, the Senate does not want to implement the policy until we have the

associated evaluation standards in place. We are holding proposal #1 until next year.

Handbook proposal #2 on Teaching Loads was supported by the Senate. It recognizes that we give the probationary faculty a 3-3 load. In the proposal we are removing the mention of senior lecturer and master lecturer under section 5 until the Lecturer rank-stream proposal passes. Senator Busch also noted a minor indentation problem in the typing of *Handbook* proposal #2.

Handbook change #3 -- no additional changes required.

Handbook change #4. This proposal clarifies reporting lines for committees, assigns most appointments to the purview of the Senate, reduces seats where appropriate, and adds the possibility of a third term to the IRB, IACUC and UCC, all of which have steep learning curves and/or require specialized training. The Provost requests that he appoint 50% of the faculty on the CISS and PRC committees. The Senate sees no problem with having the CISS and the PRC committees appointed in this manner.

Handbook changes #5-11 -- no additional changes required

President Adamitis moved that Handbook change #2 through 11 be approved
Seconded: Vice-President Manning
Vote in favor: unanimous

As a note to the CNU *Handbook* committee: Anywhere Faculty Grievance Committee appears or Faculty Hearing Committee appears these words will need to be changed to simply the Faculty Grievance and Hearing committee.

 9. Parental Leave Policy

The parental leave policy was first introduced in AY 14-15 last year and now has revised wording. President Adamitis asked if there are any comments or concerns on the proposal.

One Senator questioned whether or not section 2.2 is enforceable. In particular section 2.2 states that to use this policy a faculty member must be the sole caregiver of the newborn or newly adopted child for at least twenty hours during the work week between the hours of 8 a.m. and 7 p.m., Monday through Friday. This policy is not intended for parents whose newborn or newly adopted child is cared for more than half time by either a spouse/partner and/or a childcare provider.

Senators questioned whether there should be included a cutoff age as it is currently listed in the policy. Senators suggested that section 2.3 does not fit in with the policy statement and should be removed. Section 2.3 of this faculty parental leave policy obfuscates more than it serves to clarify. Senators requested some additional time to review this policy. It was noted that in the event a person needs more than a semester for medical leave, section 4.3 will present a problem. A vote on this parental leave policy will take place before the next P&P meeting.

10. Final Examination Schedule and Policy

Senator Nichols presented a revised draft of a final examination policy to be considered here at

CNU. Senator Nichols researched what other universities are currently doing with regard to final examination policies. According to Senator Nichols, the strictness of CNU's final examination policy lies somewhere in the middle of all schools' policies. The purpose of this investigation was to better clarify CNU's final examination policy. This draft clarifies that final assessments will be decided upon by the professors.

Senator Winder and Brash left at 6:15
Because of a lack of a quorum, a continuing discussion on the final examination schedule and policy draft was delayed until August.

11. Child Care
The Faculty Senate Child care subcommittee evaluated child care options for faculty, staff and students. Information from previous subcommittees, in consultation with administration, on use of and the feasibility of on-campus child care facility has indicated that there is no need for a center. Instead there is a need for viable options for childcare.

Many faculty members have expressed a need for child care options on "hot days" such as during our first week of school, spring break, summer and times when other schools are not is session. Furthermore, some faculty members have expressed interest in quality day care at an affordable rate. Faculty members have also expressed interest in after school care. This may take the form of either reputable babysitters or after school programs.

The Faculty Senate child care subcommittee designed a survey to identify what avenues faculty have used in the past, specifically, what centers, programs or other options have been successful, and which options faculty and staff would recommend be included in our list of options. This information will be compiled into a database available to new and current employees at CNU.

The following represents some of the highlights from the child care survey. Ten facilities have provided child care services for faculty reporting in the survey. Yearly costs of child care at these sites range from $3000 to $12150 per year. All of the faculty who responded to the survey would recommend the facilities to a friend and would use the centers again. The list of these sites will be made available to the CNU community in the future.

Meeting was adjourned at 6:30