

**Faculty Senate Minutes**  
**March 18, 2005**  
**3 p.m. SC 214**

Senators present 3/18: Berry, Cartwright, Doughty, Doyle (left 5:15), Grau, Hicks, Kidd (left 4:10), Knipp, Purtle, Schwarze (arrived 3:10), Vachris, Wheeler, Whiting. Senators absent: Underwood, Wymer. Guests present: Katie Grace (Acting SGA Secretary of University Affairs) and Mehreen Farooq (SGA Senator). Senators present for 3/25 continuation: Cartwright, Doughty, Grau, Hicks, Kidd, Knipp, President Purtle, Schwarze, Underwood, Whiting.

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

**I. Minutes.** Approval of the 2-18 Senate meeting (Available [http://www.cnu.edu/facsen/04\\_05/minutes/2\\_18.doc](http://www.cnu.edu/facsen/04_05/minutes/2_18.doc)) and the 3-11 Working Session minutes (Available [http://www.cnu.edu/facsen/04\\_05/minutes/3\\_11.doc](http://www.cnu.edu/facsen/04_05/minutes/3_11.doc)) having been handled via email and distributed to the faculty, was acknowledged by the Senate.

**II. President's Report**

**A. Handbook changes:** President Purtle reported that the Provost had adjusted the Senate's language regarding 5-year limits on restricted positions. The Senate had reaffirmed the present 2004-05 Handbook's language that requires time limits on restricted positions, but allows exceptions to the limit to be made upon the initiative of the department chair. The Provost has adjusted the Senate's language, removing the time limits on restricted positions and making reappointment of restricted positions "at the discretion of the university" vs. the more precise language supported by the Senate ("at the initiative of the department chair"). The Senate received no explanation for the adjusted language/policy, but President Purtle indicated the change is going into the new Handbook as the Provost has indicated. Senators suggested that the Senate take up the issue in September as a proposed change initiated by the Senate to the Handbook Committee.

**Other Handbook issues. Change in Grievance Procedure:** The Senate had recommended that the petitioner be notified of the acceptance or rejection of the petition within 14 days, rather than within one week, as the Handbook now provides (XI.10.b.). The Provost removed the extension inserted by the Senate because there is a total limit of 30 days on the entire grievance process, so the Senate's extension of time at one step created a problem for the overall time limit.

**B. Retention Planning Team:** President Purtle reported that five distinct sub-teams have been established in the effort to raise CNU's graduation and retention rates, all chaired by faculty members. The five teams are examining learning communities (Senator Doughty, chair), advising (Dr. Jay Paul, chair), early identification of at-risk students (Dr. Nicole Guarjardo, chair), the content and consistency of messages from CNU (Dr. Chair Jacobs, chair), and quality of campus services (Senator Schwarze and Dr. Bob Winder, chairs). The team's coordinated action plan will be finished by April

15. Consultant Charles Schroeder will return to CNU March 24-25 to offer a Learning Communities workshop (March 24, 12:15-12:45) and a Quality Services Workshop on Friday, March 25 for staff.

**C. Slate of Candidates.** The Executive Committee needs to meet very soon to appoint a nominating committee to produce the slate of candidates for the 2005-06 Executive Committee. President Purtle cannot participate in this meeting. One representative from each of the university's divisions must be on the nominating committee. Vice-President Knipp will schedule this meeting.

### III. Committee Reports

**A. Retention Teams** (Senators Doughty, Schwarze). Senator Doughty reported his sub-team's preliminary plans for broadening the use of learning communities at CNU. The goal is to include one-half of CNU freshmen in learning communities in Fall 2005. As proposed, there may be two types of learning communities, one involving PLP students (all PLP students will participate in learning communities), and one involving non-PLP students. Students in a learning community will have 2 or 3 common classes (these may be in ENGL, MATH, BIOL, PSYC, COMM, THEA, ECON, and HIST) and shared living arrangements. Students will be able to select their learning community, based on their interests—they will be presented with a list of pre-set course groupings and asked to rank their top three choices.

Senator Schwarze discussed the progress of the sub-team for student services. This group is looking at 'sticking points' in university policies, places where such policies might adversely affect students in unnecessarily cumbersome ways. Among the areas this team is examining: integration of billing procedures (currently when students receive their bills, there is no indication of financial aid, scholarships, or departmental awards, so it is difficult for students to know exactly how much they owe), policies regarding holds on student transcripts, parking fines, IT services, ability of student organizations to access their funds.

**B. Elections Committee** (Senator Doyle)—Senate and committee elections will be held in person, by division. There are nominees from all divisions for all open positions. School of Business elections will be held March 22; Science and Technology elections will be held March 23; Social Sciences and Liberal Arts elections will be scheduled ASAP.

### IV. Continuing Business

**A. Resolution 2004-05-07 Over-scheduling of Getting Started Week.** 2<sup>nd</sup> reading. Amended to read, "THEREFORE, the Faculty Senate of Christopher Newport University recommends that the number of hours required *and/or expected* for incoming faculty to attend meetings and other functions during "Getting Started Week" be reduced to 20 hours or less." **Moved/seconded. Vote: Passed unanimously.** Available: [www.cnu.edu/facsen/04\\_05/resolutions/7.html](http://www.cnu.edu/facsen/04_05/resolutions/7.html)

**B. Proposed Academic Calendar.** Available :

[www.cnu.edu/facsen/04\\_05/misc/calendar.html](http://www.cnu.edu/facsen/04_05/misc/calendar.html). The Provost has asked for the Senate's recommendation regarding the new calendar. Discussion: Senators expressed their concerns regarding the proposal; several who attended the faculty brownbag meeting with Provost last week shared concerns expressed there as well. In the Senate's view, the following problems exist with the current proposal.

- Science lab scheduling—teaching and logistics issues: removing another Monday and Tuesday from the class calendar will cause science labs to lose not just two days but two additional weeks of laboratories each term because lab set-ups and lab performance require week-long blocks of time (observations, measurements, etc., are dependent upon students' ability to return to the lab experiment at the next class period—one week later, rather than two weeks).
- Shortening winter break—faculty require this time for professional development and preparation for spring classes
- Some students in this proposal might actually have their exam preparation time shortened, rather than lengthened, by starting exams in the same week that classes end (e.g., classes end on Tuesday, and exams begin on Thursday. A student unlucky enough to have this schedule would have only one day to prepare for the exam, instead of the two weekend days currently afforded).
- Assessment day is likely to become a 'party day' for students—perhaps we could institute an assessment center and schedule a two-week period during which students must report to complete such instruments as are required. Some assessment measures might also be completed via technology.
- Adding the extra Monday to spring break and following it with an assessment Tuesday (on which no classes will be held) will create a culture of days off in the spring term. These days should be spread throughout the semester, and spring break might be moved back a week.
- The proposed calendar will lengthen faculty members' time under contract to CNU. Appropriate compensation should be offered if such a calendar is enacted.

**Motion to floor/seconded:** The calendar should not to be implemented in its proposed form. The proposal requires additional deliberation by university constituencies such as faculty at the department level, the registrar, and students, to resolve issues such as but not limited to the following : the negative impact on science labs, diminished time for faculty professional development, diminished time for course preparation before the spring term, reduced time for students preparing for exams, and extended time under contract for faculty without additional compensation. **Vote: Passed unanimously.**

**C. Sense of the Senate Resolution 2004-05-14.** At this point, because Senator Kidd needed to leave, the order of business was suspended to consider a resolution expressing our appreciation for the actions of Dr. Eric Duskin and Professor Octavius Pinkard. Available: [http://www.cnu.edu/facsen/04\\_05/resolutions/14.doc](http://www.cnu.edu/facsen/04_05/resolutions/14.doc)

**Motion to floor/seconded. First reading waived. Vote: Passed unanimously.**

#### **D. Certify Weighting Criteria for Scoring Faculty Development Grant**

**Applications.** Available: [http://www.cnu.edu/facsen/04\\_05/misc/FDGrev.xls](http://www.cnu.edu/facsen/04_05/misc/FDGrev.xls). The Senate discussed Senator Whiting's proposal for weighting the scoring criteria in faculty development grant applications. It was decided that these weights should be published so that faculty will know how best to prepare their applications—the relative weights of each category will be transposed onto the scoring sheet, which is available for downloading on the web site with the rest of the grant application. It was also suggested that Senator Whiting create some directions for the spreadsheet.

<b>Category 1: Intrinsic Merits of the Investigation</b>	<b>Factor Weight</b>
Innovative research/teaching	0.5
Contribution to discipline	0.25
Research products, papers, presentations—feasibility	0.2
Adequacy of facilities	0.05

<b>Category 2: Relevance to Faculty Development Priorities</b>	<b>Factor Weight</b>
Professional Development	1.0
Instructional Development	0.8
Dissertation Grants	0.6

<b>Category 3: Appropriateness and Realism of Costs</b>	<b>Factor Weight</b>
	1.0

#### **Overall Evaluation**

Category 1 (Merit) score comprises 60 percent of total score

Category 2 (Faculty Development Priorities) comprises 30 percent of total score

Category 3 (Costs) comprises 10 percent of total score

Under this formula, the maximum score for a professional development grant application will be 5.0; the maximum score for an instructional development grant application will be 4.7; the maximum score for a dissertation development grant will be 4.4.

**Motion to approve/seconded. Vote: Passed unanimously.**

**E. Faculty Hiring Policies.** Senators Schwarze, Wheeler, Kidd, Hicks, Berry, Doyle, and Whiting introduced Resolution 2004-05-13, "Faculty Hiring Policies" to the floor. Senators debated the resolution and friendly amendments were offered and accepted. The amended resolution is available: [http://www.cnu.edu/facsen/04\\_05/resolutions/13.doc](http://www.cnu.edu/facsen/04_05/resolutions/13.doc)

Second reading/vote will be April 15. The Senate also agreed to create an ad hoc committee to collect data regarding the Spring '05 searches in order to discover, by graduate school, how many first-choice candidates were contracted by CNU and how many first-choice candidates were lost and why. Senator Vachris will chair this committee; Senators Wheeler and Grau will assist.

## V. New Business

**A. Resolution 2004-05-11 Electronic Submissions of Senate Business.** First reading. Available: [www.cnu.edu/facsen/04\\_05/resolutions/11.html](http://www.cnu.edu/facsen/04_05/resolutions/11.html)

**B. Resolution 2004-05-12 Shifting the Class Drop Deadline Forward.** First reading. Available: [www.cnu.edu/facsen/04\\_05/resolutions/12.html](http://www.cnu.edu/facsen/04_05/resolutions/12.html). Discussion: Many high demand courses (such as science labs) fill on paper, but students don't show up to class on the first day, and/or fail to officially drop the course sufficiently in advance of the add/drop deadline (presently the same day—Friday of the first week of classes), so seats that could be filled by students who need the course go unfilled. This proposal moves the drop date to Tuesday instead of Friday, and creates a window in front of the add deadline, which remains Friday. The idea is to get an earlier count of available seats that can then be filled by students who need the course, and allow those students to add by the end of Week 1, while still preserving instructional integrity. Moving the drop date to Tuesday will handle approximately 95% of students, although those with classes that meet only on Wednesday, Thursday, or Friday will be at a disadvantage, having not had a chance to attend their classes yet before being asked for a drop decision. An alternative solution might be to leave the drop date at the end of week 1, but to extend the add period into the second week. The problem with this is instructional integrity—students would then be adding courses nearly three weeks into the course. Can special permission be used here to allow students to add?

**C. Curriculum: Review and Recommendations Regarding Descriptions, Learning Objectives, and Methods for Accomplishing these Objectives for the Six Areas of Inquiry.** Although this document was completed in October and a Dec. 17 deadline was given to faculty using this document to create course proposals, the Senate did not receive the document for recommendations and approval until Jan. 19. The Senate had also explicitly asked to see this document after reviewing the structure of the new curriculum last spring. Several senators noted places in which the document could be strengthened, and were loathe to rush through their review. Therefore, the Senate decided to schedule a special session to review the document on Friday, March 25, 3-4 p.m. Concerns with the document should be sent via email to all senators before that session.

**D. Virginia General Assembly Statute Change: Policies Addressing Textbook Sales and Bookstores.** Senator Schwarze noted that SCHEV has been tasked with interpretation/implementation regarding this legislation. Briefly, there are two parts: one prohibiting faculty members from receiving any sort of remunerations/compensation from textbook adoptions, and one requiring books lists for courses to be posted in enough time to allow students the opportunity to comparison shop for their texts. Available: <http://leg1.state.va.us/cgi-bin/legp504.exe?051+ful+HB1726ER>

## VI. Other.

**A. Plagiarism Policy.** President Purtle noted that in a recent honor case, a student was accused of plagiarism. The professor was not certain that the student had plagiarized.

For an honor conviction, a unanimous decision of the three students and two faculty members on the panel is required. The two professors and two students voted to convict in this case; a third student voted no and so the case was resolved in favor of the student. The question to the Senate is whether the conviction policy needs to be revised to prevent a single student from determining the outcome, especially in plagiarism cases. Do faculty want to have control over the plagiarism issue? Senators indicated that at schools with student-run honor councils, that students do in fact make those decisions.

**B. Books Stolen from Faculty Offices.** The Biology/Chemistry offices have had 100 or more textbooks stolen out of locked faculty offices. Faculty should check their bookshelves.

**C. Email Policies.** Senator Schwarze indicated she had talked with Maggie White about the email sent by Ms. White to those with system administrative privileges (i.e., people who can send “personal messages” or post announcements through the portal). The notice specified that “personal message” email is “reserved for business related issues (changes to eVA, changes to Business Office procedures) or emergency/mission critical issues.” Specifically excluded from this definition was email announcing “events, forums, faculty candidate presentations . . . those should all be going through the announcement channels.” Senator Schwarze indicated that she had disputed this definition of “CNU business” as excluding academic programs, issues, and events, and believed these to be appropriate uses of the portal’s ‘personal message’ email system. Ms. White said she would take convey this information to Dr. George Webb, head of IT Services. No Senate action appears needed at this time. It should be noted that this issue does not involve email sent from faculty to other faculty via the “group email” function of the portal.

**The Senate recessed at 6:25 p.m.** The meeting will resume Friday, March 25, 3-4 p.m., to discuss the Area of Inquiry learning objectives document.

**The Senate reconvened at 3:50 p.m. Friday, March 25.**

The Senate unanimously approved the following changes to the Areas of Inquiry document to enhance its clarity:

**Western Traditions, Learning Objective 3**, now reads: “*Situate (Locate and explain)* one or more of the historical . . .” Change to “*Place* one or more . . .”

**Global/Multicultural:**

**Description:** change three uses of “might” to “should” in paragraphs 1-2. At the end of the first paragraph, change “negotiation, resistance *and* assimilation . . .” to “negotiation, resistance *or* assimilation. . .” At the end of the second paragraph, change “survey the religious, philosophical, or political systems” to “survey the religious, philosophical, *economic*, or political systems . . .”

**Learning Objective 1** now reads: “*Interrogate. . .*” Change to “*Examine the interaction of . . .*”

### **Investigating the Natural World:**

**Description:** add a second sentence defining ‘natural sciences’: “Natural sciences study the physical world and its phenomena.”

**Laboratory Objective 2** now reads, “*Conduct analyses and evaluate data . . .*” Change to “*Conduct experiments, analyze data, and draw conclusions from scientific experimentation.*”

**Laboratory Objective 3** now reads, “*Present results and draw conclusions in both written and oral formats.*” Change to “*Present results and conclusions in oral or written formats.*”

### **Formal and Informal Reasoning:**

**Learning Objective 5** now reads, “. . . between languages (can include artificial languages, natural languages, or both).” Change to “between natural and artificial languages” (strike parenthetical).

**In addition to these changes, the Senate requests that the Liberal Learning Council examine whether the word “dominant” is necessary in Global/Multicultural Learning Objective 1, and whether some clarification of Learning Objective 5 could be offered, especially regarding the ‘structure’ of languages.**

Some senators also expressed concerns regarding the overall clarity of the document and its word choices; it was also noted that more consistency in style and structure would help readers to better understand the document's intended meaning.

The Senate adjourned at 4:10 p.m.