Faculty Senate Minutes
Jan. 21, 2005
3 p.m. SC 214

Vice president Knipp called the meeting to order at 3 p.m.

Senators present: Berry, Cartwright (4:15 arrive; depart 5:45), Doughty, Doyle (dep 5:45), Grau, Hicks, Kidd, Knipp, Schwarze, Underwood, Vachris (arrived 3:15 from class), Whiting, Wymer (arrived 4 p.m. from class). Also present: SGA Rep Christina Eggenberger. Senators absent: Purtle, Wheeler. Guests present (until 4 p.m.): Retention Planning Team: Bobbye Bartels, Lisa Dave Doughty (dual affiliation), Lisa Duncan Raines, Donna Eddleman, Nicole Guarjardo, Katey Morlino Howerton, Peter Knipp (dual affiliation), Krista Leighton, Maury O'Connell, Michelle Reed, Gerry Roeder, Carol Safko, Tracey Schwarze (dual affiliation), Richard Summerville, Clara Thurman, Anita Tieman, Bob Winder.

A motion was made and approved to suspend the Order of Business to hear Senator Doughty present data and recommendations from his Senate Committee on Retention (agenda item II.A.) in conjunction with the meeting of the university's Retention Planning Team. The Senate's committee has been absorbed into the larger Retention Planning Team effort, now facilitated by Noel Levitz consultant Charles Schroeder.

Senator Doughty presented the following information: CNU's year-to-year retention rates and graduation rates are lower than those of its peer institutions. The aim of the committee was to figure out reasons behind this problem and to devise solutions to address it. (Senator Doughty's full presentation is available: www.cnu.edu/facsen/04_05/misc/retention.ppt)

It seems our retention issues are three-fold, involving
a) non-performing freshmen;
b) freshmen who do not return for other reasons;
c) upper class students who leave

Possible risk factors for student non-continuance at any institution (according to the research):
- First-generation college students are more likely to leave than those whose parents attended college
- Students who leave never connected with the university (first six weeks are critical)
- Institution was not their first choice school and they transfer elsewhere
- Quality of their high school preparation makes transition to college work difficult
- University does not deliver on students' expectations
- Different studies at different schools produce different causes

Why do students leave CNU:
- We really don't know
- The university conducts many student surveys, but none are specifically targeted at retention. We need more data.

Non-performing freshmen
Based on information gleaned from some of these surveys, however, the committee surmises there might be workload adjustment issues for many of these students:
- Students self report they spent 5 or less hours/week on homework in high school
- This statistic was confirmed by a CLAS Dean's office survey—students felt "unprepared" for the workload and its difficulty here

The question then becomes, can we reduce the problem of non-performing freshmen with a preemptive strike? Perhaps there should be more academic orientation during Welcome Week.

Performing freshmen who leave CNU
We don't know which of these are our biggest problems, though we do have a bit more data here.
- These students may not be making a connection with the school
- CNU may not be their first choice (true for 34.1% of our students)
- They may be first generation college students
- They may have financial issues

The Senate committee designed a survey that could be administered during orientation or the first week of classes and a followup administered near the end of first semester. We could then track these students to find out who leaves, and look for an "exit profile." This effort should give us focused data on our particular problems.

Upperclass students who leave
- They may never connect with the university
- CNU may not be their first choice
- They may be dissatisfied with CNU's goods and services delivery

The Noel-Levitz Student Satisfaction Inventory administered in Fall 2004 was weighted (inadvertently) toward juniors and seniors. This survey measures performance "gap" issues, by identifying how important particular issues are to students, and then measuring how well the institution performs in those given areas. Small gaps (between importance to students and what they actually experience) are good.

Good news (Areas in which CNU has small gaps between importance of an issue to students and what they experience):
- Course content
- Knowledgeable advisors
- Excellent instruction in major field
- Knowledgeable faculty
- Quality instruction
- Safe campus
- "I am able to experience intellectual growth here"

It seems faculty are doing a fabulous job in terms of what is important to students and their actual experiences at CNU.

Bad news (Areas in which CNU registers larger gaps between importance of an issue to students and what they experience):
- "I can register for the classes I need w/ few conflicts" (Biology labs and preferential registration policies were cited as issues here—PLP or Honors freshmen are perceived as bumping graduating seniors who need classes to get out the door)
- "The amount of student parking is adequate"
- "Tuition is worthwhile investment" (Note: rising costs might be the problem here, given that students appear to be very satisfied with the quality of their academic experience)
- "There is a good variety of courses here"
- "The institution shows concern for students as individuals"

- "Parking lots are well lighted and secure" (parking, not safety is likely to be the problem here, as students indicated they feel the campus is safe)
- "Security staff respond quickly to emergencies"
- "I seldom get the run around when seeking information"
- "Personnel involved in registration are helpful"

<u>Other points from Noel Levitz consultant Charles Schroeder</u>, who made a two-day visit to campus last semester to talk with faculty, staff, and students:

- Doing more with less doesn't work as well with service/staff personnel as it does with faculty. Faculty often compensate by working additional hours at home, and this is not an option for offices that must maintain normal working hours.
- "Students first" is hurting us, as it is perhaps misperceived by students to mean "students are always right." "Student-centered" might be a more effective characterization of the campus ethos.
- Do students leave because of parking or the speed of emergency response? No, but it could push them toward the tipping point, if dissatisfaction exists in other areas.

Recommendations from the Senate Committee on Retention (being rolled into new Retention Planning Team):

- Begin administering freshman survey during orientation, and a companion survey near end of first semester. Track students over 4 years
- Hold an "adjustment to college" special session during orientation or first week of classes, in which students would meet in small group discussions with faculty.
- Emphasize importance of students connecting with campus/larger community
- Emphasize importance of parental support
- If learning communities improve student retention as we believe they will, increase participation in this program as rapidly as possible. Early data will be available after Spring 2005 session starts.
- Solve the course availability problem as quickly as possible. It may be expensive to solve, requiring more faculty, and more sections. Consider changing preferential registration so freshman can't bump seniors needing courses to graduate
- Review 'service sector' of the university for 'efficiency as perceived by students'—are these areas understaffed? Operating with inefficient processes? Do they need to streamline their information flow?

Conclusions:
Retention needs concerted multi-year effort to yield data for continual improvement, but there are things we can do immediately. Two to four years down the road we will have specific information on specific problems.

The Retention Planning Team departed and the Senate resumed its agenda.

I. PRESIDENT'S REPORT. Vice President Knipp indicated that he will be in the chair until President Purtle returns. She hopes to be back in February.

- The Board of Visitors' meeting will take place Feb. 10-11. Committees will meet Feb. 10. Senate representatives are reminded to attend.

- Elections: <u>Senate Elections need to be held by March 31</u>. Last year we held elections in separate meetings by area. Committee elections also need to be held (the <u>Handbook</u> does not specify a date). These elections were organized by the Senate and conducted by paper ballots in individual departments. The concern with holding committee elections in this way as that it nullifies the ability to nominate from the floor. In order to protect that capability, if committee elections are being conducted by paper ballots, then the Senate facilitator should 1) broadcast email solicitations for nominees. 2) make known these names (i.e., announce the slate) and leave open a period of time before the ballots are created to provide an opportunity for "nominations from the floor." The Senate Elections Committee filters slates only with regard to establishing a candidate's eligibility.

  The Senate Elections Committee will consist of:
  Doyle (LA) (chair)
  Whiting (S&T)
  Kidd (SSPS)
  Vachris (BUS)

- Meetings with President Trible: Every other month for full Senate and monthly for Executive Committee, 1st or 2nd Fridays at 3 p.m. Senator Knipp will schedule and let us know.

- Resolution status: Faculty Ability to Broadcast Email (2004-05-05) and Faculty Preparedness in Appropriately Responding to Student Depression (2004-05-02) resolutions were passed on by the Provost into appropriate areas. Senator Schwarze noted that the creation of the General Faculty Group was apparently in progress.

- Budget advisory committee: Of the candidates nominated by the Senate for this vacancy, President Trible has selected Dr. Shelia Greenlee. Dr. Jean Filetti will chair the committee.

- Distinguished Professor Nomination for Prof. Harold Cones: This action is currently at the peer group level. The Senate needs to provide a written recommendation on the nomination. The Senate subcommittee will reconvene to evaluate dossier and produce this statement by the Feb. 18 Senate meeting: Doyle (chair), Wymer, Doughty, Cartwright.

- <u>Handbook</u> changes: The deadline to get changes to the <u>Handbook</u> Committee was last Friday. Anything from the Senate needs to be finalized at today's meeting.

II.   COMMITTEE REPORTS

   Governance (Underwood/Doyle)—<u>Handbook</u> changes were suggested by various university committees at the Senate's invitation. Major changes include:

   - Undergraduate Academic Status Committee: add the Director of Academic Advising as non-voting member to UASC (suggested by the UASC)
   - Leadership Studies Council will be replaced by the Leadership Department. Academic content will go through the UCC. (suggested by LSC)
   - Academic Technology Advisory Committee: stagger members' terms instead of having them all expire at once (suggested by ATAC)
   - Faculty Grievance: make all members tenured, and increase membership to 8 total (suggested by Faculty Grievance)

The Senate unanimously approved the following items to be submitted to the <u>Handbook</u> Committee:

p. 148

c. The Undergraduate Academic Status Committee (UASC) shall consist of seven faculty members

(two from Liberal Arts, two from Science and Technology, two from Social Science and

Professional Studies and one from the School of Business) elected by the faculty of each area; one

faculty member selected by the Senate; and the Registrar and the Director of Academic Advising (non-voting). The Provost is an *ex officio*

member of the committee. The committee:

1) recommends to the Faculty Senate standards for undergraduate student retention, dismissal,

placement on probation, reinstatement, and for all other matters relating to undergraduate

academic performance;

2) considers all appeals, pertaining to the academic status of undergraduate students and makes

appropriate recommendations to the Provost; and

3) considers the requests of undergraduate students who wish to carry overload courses and

makes appropriate recommendations to the Provost.

_____

p. 146

~~f. The Leadership Council (LC) shall consist of the Associate Provost (Chair), seven faculty members~~

~~(two from Liberal Arts, two from Science and Technology, two from Social Science and~~

~~Professional Studies, and one from the School of Business) elected by the faculty of each area; two~~

~~faculty members (not from the same area) appointed by the Provost; four students, each appointed~~

~~for a term of one academic year, by the Provost; the Director of Admissions (non-voting); and the~~

~~Provost (non-voting). The Council:~~

~~1) reports to the Provost;~~

2) administers the classes and scholarships of the Leadership Programs;

3) oversees the curriculum of the President's Leadership Program and the leadership minor;

4) recommends to the Faculty Senate changes in the Leadership Programs.

_____

p. 147

Recusal: Change XI.10.b to:

If the grievance is properly before the FGC and remains unresolved, the Chair selects, by lot from among the membership of the FGC, a Faculty Grievance Panel (FGP) consisting of three members. If any member of the FGP is a member of the department of the faculty member filing the grievance or if the FGP member feels that he or she has a conflict of interest, that member must state that and be removed from the panel and another committee member will be chosen by lot. The party defending against the grievance and the grievant are, in turn, allowed one (1) peremptory challenge to the membership of the panel, and each party is   allowed one (1) additional challenge for cause. Challenges for cause are decided by the unchallenged members of the FGC, and replacement of any member excluded from the panel is by lot from among the remaining members of the FGC. The FGP elects one of its empaneled members to chair the panel.

Timing: *Note: Some of Virginia's dates appear to be in effect already. The panel has 30 calendar days.*

Change XI.10.b.2 to:

The Chair of the FGC acknowledges in writing to the grievant and the person against whom the grievance has been filed receipt of the petition within five (5)working days of receipt.

Change XI.10.b.3 to:

Only if these requirements are met is a grievance properly before the FGC. The Chair of the FGC notifies the petitioner of the acceptance or rejection of the petition; this determination should normally be determined within 14 calendar days.

XVII.C.3.c now states:

c. The Faculty Grievance Committee (FGC) shall consist of eight tenured faculty members,two from Liberal Arts, two from Science and Technology, two from Social Sciences and Professional Studies and one from the School of Business and one faculty member selected by the Senate. The FGC serves as the source of members for any Faculty Grievance Panel (FGP). All members must be tenured.

III.   OLD BUSINESS
           A. Review of Sexual Misconduct Policy: Proposed Student Handbook Change.
           Second Reading. Available:
           www.cnu.edu/facsen/04_05/misc/sexual_harrassment.doc

Motion to Approve: Underwood/Kidd. **Vote: unanimous** (12-0).

B. Resolution 2004-05-06: Renumbering of MATH 105. Second Reading. Available:
 www.cnu.edu/facsen/04_05/resolutions/6.doc

Motion to Approve: Schwarze/Kidd. **Vote:** Passed with 1 abstention (Underwood) (11-0-1)

IV.   NEW BUSINESS
A. UCC business: Five curriculum proposals.

- **GREK 101, 102**: Motion to floor. Discussion. **Motion to approve**.
  Whiting/Underwood. **Vote**: Unanimous (12-0).
- **FYSM 100**: Motion to floor. Discussion. **Motion to approve**: Underwood/Kidd.
  Vote: Approved, with 1 abstention (11-0-1).
- **ITAL 101, 102**: Motion to floor. Discussion: Will these courses—and GREK 101,
  102—dilute the current Gen Ed requirements in this area? Is there enough student
  demand for these courses? **Motion to approve**: Kidd/Cartwright. **Vote**: Approved (7-3-2).
- **PSYC changes**: Motion to floor. Discussion: Streamlining of this degree is in the best
  interests of students and faculty. Senator Schwarze raised a procedural issue question:
  the CLAS curriculum subcommittee has passed this proposal on without a
  recommendation. According to the Handbook, pg. 32 (b), a recommendation is
  required from this level for making either major or minor curricular changes. Can that
  group relinquish its responsibility? The subcommittee itself has not reported to us.
  Motion: that the Senate approve this change contingent upon receiving a
  recommendation from the "Academic Level" of the college, as specified by the
  Handbook. **Vote**: Approved 9-3.
- **223**: Motion to approve these documents contingent upon receiving signatures, if
  required. **Vote:** Approved 9-3.

B. Senate restructuring proposals. Available:
www.cnu.edu/facsen/04_05/misc/senate_restructuring.doc

Discussion.

> Q : Which, if any of these, do we want to send forward at the general faculty
> meeting? A : Senators should query their departments.

> Q : There is a flaw in proposal 1's reasoning : smaller departments can in fact act in
> collusion to overrule bigger departments and elect their own Senators.

> Q : What is problem with current system ?
> A : Uneven representation.

> **Straw vote**: Should we change the means by which we represent the body? **Yes :** 3
> **No :** 6

Q : Perhaps this is a general faculty meeting issue ? Is there a better structure for ensuring/encouraging effective faculty governance ?

Q : The new plans might force departments into roles they are not interested in.

C. Over scheduling of "Getting Started" Week: Discussion and recommendations. First year faculty are overextended during that week, as are returning faculty, too. Perhaps we could spread the TSR conference throughout the semester? To see Senator Knipp's handout on the scheduling of this week, see http://www.cnu.edu/facsen/04_05/misc/startup.xls

V. OTHER BUSINESS
    A. ID admission to the Ferguson Center (Senator Underwood): A faculty member who works in the building was asked to show a CNU ID to gain admission to Ferguson Center and was turned away when unable to produce it. Is this a policy? If this is an academic building, why can't it be entered? Senator Underwood will check on this policy (if it exists) on behalf of the Senate.
    B. Standards for detail in Eval 4's (statement of departmental standards for tenure and promotion) (Senator Underwood): Some of these statements are vague, and some are specific. It is important for faculty members to know exactly what the expectations for tenure are in their departments. Discussion: the FRC had made such a recommendation (that these statements be made specific) and chairs were informed of this. The Senate may also need to push this issue and enlist the Provost's support. Perhaps the FRC can revisit the issue, and EVAL 4 standards could be put on a website so that would be easily available to every faculty member.
    C. Favored graduate schools—hiring guidelines (Senator Schwarze). The Provost has disseminated a list of top graduate schools in each discipline to the department chairs. When hiring, departments are being asked to make specific recruiting efforts in relationship to those schools. Departments are also being asked to produce justifications for hiring recommendations, especially if they are from schools that do not appear on the list. This item is only informational at this time, but if it appears that departments are having difficulty hiring strong, well-credentialed candidates whose background and experience suits them to CNU's needs simply because they possess degrees from schools not on the list, then the Senate may want to discuss the issue with the administration.