

Senate Subcommittee on Objective 2 (Enhance and sustain core aspects of Faculty life at CNU, including exemplary teaching and learning, significant scholarship, and meaningful service).

Informal “minutes” taken at our March 18, 2009 meeting:

1. “Work with provost...center for innovative teaching excellence”

2a (Enhance Faculty Teaching) We think pressing the administration for something like this at a time when budgets are about to be cut would not be appropriate. However, we can **relay our interest** so that it could be considered when money becomes available. Last semester we thought that additional teaching innovations could be realized if **IT sponsored workshops on the use of Blackboard**. This has happened, though we take no credit for it.

- Determining the impacts of ULLC section requirements on **department course offering** may not be necessary now since there is already committee work being done to consider combining ULLC 100 with English 123. Additional Provost proposals currently being examined has or would cut course offerings in a number of departments (egs. Math, BCES), in the Liberal Learning Core, and certain degree requirements (BA English, Modern Foreign Languages, Philosophy, Sociology-Social Work, BMusic, BS Business Administration), and cuts in the Leadership minor requirements.

2b (Enhance resources for faculty scholarship and intellectual growth) We still think that **finding additional resources in this area will be very difficult** given the state of the budget. The Library budget has been cut to the core. The core is \$500,000 needed to maintain journal subscriptions and on line resource. Library resources can certainly be improved, but we continue to meet SACS and SCHEV standards (which are unspecified and vague). The addition of the Mariner’s Museum Library holding technically adds to our resource, but probably no one on campus has any use for their specialized resources. We also know that the **Sponsored Programs office is understaffed**, making it difficult to support what we currently have let alone trying to significantly increase grants and awards. Faculty would like this office to both find appropriate grants and aid in developing the grant proposals, but they lack the staff and the mandate. We **could suggest that this office be given more resources** so that in the future additional resources might be allocated in this direction.

2c (Enhancing and defining faculty service) How to encourage more equitable distribution of service jobs is a difficult proposition. We **should not automatically place new faculty into intensive service jobs** since we want to have the best and most experienced people in important positions. In addition, **the two year evaluation for new tenure track faculty** focuses on teaching

performance. These faculty should not be put into service jobs that could adversely affect that evaluation. We could **ask the department chairs** for appropriate recommendations and work from there.

2d (a new task—Course Caps) What has happened here? Have they been increasing? By how much and over what time period? Last fall the Provost reported that going to the 4-3 would cause course enrollments to increase by about one student per class. This week (17Mar09) he reported that he expects they will increase by three students per class in the fall 2009 semester. Going to the 4-3 effectively means that we would need to increase faculty by 12.5% if the number of course offering stayed the same. But faculty numbers are not projected to rise. However, other Provost-driven initiatives will drop the number of courses we will offer while raising course caps. At the same time, the expectation is that students will still be able to graduate in four years. All of this will mean that Faculty work loads, even with the 4-3, will increase in many departments.