

CNU Faculty Senate Minutes
18 November 2011
DSU Madison Room

Senators Present: Puaca, Adamitis, Pollard, Connell, Bardwell, Martin, Hall, Carpenter, Zestos, Selim, Wang, Weiss

Guest: Deb Moore

Absent: Barnello, Von Burg

I. The president called the meeting to Order 3:04

II. The minutes of the 10.21.2011 meeting were approved by vote. While minutes are generally affirmed after an electronic approval, this month insufficient responses prevented electronic approval. Senator Bardwell moved to approve the minutes and Senator Selim seconded. The Secretary discussed several minor modifications to the minutes submitted originally. After these were resolved, the senate voted

Vote: Unanimous. The minutes were approved.

III. President Pollard submitted **this report** (1) to the Senate. He then made orally the following observations. During the current review cycle, faculty up for second, fourth, tenure, and promotion reviews have expressed concerns that the FRC (Faculty Review Committee) or the deans of the three colleges did not provide rationale when they differed from the DRC (Department Review Committee) report. The confidentiality of the reviews made it impossible to know specifically if the FRC or the deans did not report, subsequent inquiry revealed that the deans of all three colleges provided the necessary comment to the candidate. According to President Pollard, this happened in five of the reviews. President Pollard reported that in four of the five cases the candidate made requests to the FRC to provide the required feedback. The Provost fairly granted candidates an extension to prepare responses once the rationale had been provided.

Background: In academic year 2010-11, the Senate passed a handbook change that required the FRC and Dean to report their rationale when their review differed from the DRC [please see the *University Handbook* 2011-2012, Section XII, 8, g. "Step-by-Step Procedure for Peer Review", Step 10, p. 116]. This change allowed the candidate to respond, as is their right, in advance of the review heading to the Provost. While the changes placed additional burden upon the FRC and deans to provide rationale, the Senate argued that it was in the interest of a fair review to provide candidates every opportunity to respond during the review and to know the alleged deficiency identified by the dean or FRC. Apparently, these changes were not communicated sufficiently to the FRC chairperson. The Provost took responsibility.

The Senate discussed concerns that the fall reviews may be flawed because they did not follow administrative guidelines and expected process. Furthermore, the dean and FRC are supposed to review cases independently following the review and response from the

candidate at the department level. Therefore, the FRC and dean should not know how each other reviewed any particular dossier – they should only see the DRC report and the candidates' response to the DRC if extant. This year, because of the communication issue, the FRC response in certain cases to reviews in which they did not concur with the DRC were not done independently of the review by the dean as they should have been. The Provost, according to President Pollard, has graciously worked with all constituencies to clear up the problems with the 5 reviews in question. Senators also asked that the administration communicate the review process more clearly to the FRC and deans to ensure that all might follow the proper steps – DRC to candidate (who is given an opportunity to respond), to FRC and appropriate dean who review the dossier independently to candidate (who is given an opportunity to respond) to Provost who makes a recommendation based upon the three reviews and any candidate response and finally to President Tribble who makes a recommendation to the Board of Visitors.

President Pollard also reminded faculty to inform their liaison departments of the approaching deadlines for appeals and the need to contact DRCs should a review require an appeal

President Pollard discussed briefly the recent decision by President Tribble to provide a bonus to all full-time faculty employed prior to June 30, 2009. Some discussion ensued regarding the origin of the bonus funds. Some felt it was local foundation money that President Tribble allocated for this purpose. Others felt it was state money, in that the Board of Visitors had to approve the disbursement of funds. All on the Faculty Senate acknowledged and appreciate President Tribble's leadership in securing the bonus for faculty.

IV. Although official Chairs' Reports were on the agenda, the liaisons to the three colleges reported only that their chair's meetings were dominated by the mundane business of the schedule for the spring and fall 2012 semesters and had nothing further to report of substance.

V. Department and Liaison Reports

Senators who serve as liaisons to the various standing committees of the University reported the following.

The FRC, according to Senator Zestos reported that they had significant work this semester dealing with the fall review cycle. Once they had completed their work, however, the issue of responding to the five reports that differed from the DRC reports prompted additional unsuccessful attempts by the chairperson to reconvene the committee to write the responses. In light of the short time frame, FRC members delegated to the chairperson of the FRC the authority to write the responses in the name of the committee.

The International Studies Advisory Committee (ISAC) report by Senator Connell, indicated that ISAC is engaged with a thorough review to organize and categorize the study abroad options offered through CNU by its faculty. The committee will also offer several catalog

changes according to its chair, Dr. Falk of the History Department. In sum, however, the committee has spent much of the semester laying the groundwork for categorizing and ordering possible study abroad offerings and has made a mission statement that privileges the most academically oriented programs which offer credit through the University while overseas.

The Program Review Committee (PRC) reports liaison Senator Martin, that the three departments it is reviewing this year are Interdisciplinary Studies, Fine Art and Art History, and Chemistry. Although Teacher Preparation was scheduled for review, the administration felt that it could go forward on the strength of its graduate review conducted last year through the Graduate PRC and expressed that in future, these reviews will be coordinated.

University Assessment and Evaluation (UAE) reports that it has an upcoming meeting on 29 November in which they will finalize the evaluative survey tool. Expect a University survey in the early spring semester, probably in January. Senator Bardwell promised a report to the senate in February.

Senator Adamitis reported that some departments in Arts and Humanities that are not represented on the Senate continue to feel underrepresented. Some discussion from the senate suggested that now that the senate is considering expanding representation to include faculty on restricted appointments, the time might be right for moving to a new kind of representation, perhaps having each department represented on the Senate. Some Senators noted that the meetings are open and all departments could send a representative. Others argued that such a time commitment would be of greater value if the faculty who attended were given the service credit that accompanies service on the senate.

The English department reported that it has completed its curricular review. Pending approval by the curriculum committees, the department will, in the Fall 2012 semester, have a more streamlined curriculum with fewer concentrations and the opportunity for majors to choose an open and general English major. The film concentration will be eliminated as will the Journalism concentration. The English department is poised to offer again a 200-level survey course that it once offered before its current curriculum was adopted.

VI. Old Business

1. The Senate discussed the revised statement on Academic Freedom and Responsibility.

Background: the 2010-2011 Senate, in conjunction with University Counsel William Thro and Professor Ronnie Cohen drafted amended language to the existing statement: in the University Handbook. This revised language was precipitated by recent federal court decisions that threatened the principle of academic freedom. The Senate saw the need to update the language to clarify the necessary freedom for University faculty to speak. At the Board of Visitors meeting on 30 September 2011, although the subcommittee on Academic Affairs recommended it to the general board, the BOV expressed concerns with the new language. Senators Pollard, Bardwell, and Connell, along with Professor Cohen spoke with the Rector of the Board John Conrad about this matter on 4 November.

President Pollard reported that after the meeting with the Rector, the SEC and Professor Cohen were confident that they had communicated the reason for the new language. Senator Bardwell and Professor Cohen, furthermore, were able to explain in legal terms that the fourth circuit court of appeals in Virginia had recently confirmed the need for academic freedom in the terms expressed by the new handbook language. The Rector has read the fourth circuit case and has expressed to the president of the Senate his intent to report his understanding of the court case and his support or reasons for not supporting the new Academic Freedom language.

2. Handbook Committee:

Section XII of the University Handbook with the goals of adding sections on 3-Year contracts and conversion from restricted to probationary status and revising sections on evaluation to include references to the University EVAL-4. The senate considered in October handbook changes to Section XII, 2, b, 5; Section XII, 8, f, 1 and 3; and added a new segment under Section XII, 2, d. Following the discussion from October, the Senate continued.

The Senate questioned the adequacy of maintaining the 3-year contract and conversion language exclusively on the website maintained by the Provost. Some agreed that the website provides adequate access. Others felt that because the conversion and 3-year contract process is in reality a hiring process and not a promotion process that it belonged in the handbook.

Senators also discussed the changes in Section XII, 8, f., 3 which refers to the expectations of restricted faculty with full-time contracts at the rank of Instructor and Lecturer. The new draft language introduces a service and research component to the assessment of these two ranks. Some senators wondered if this was appropriate, arguing that if the primary purpose is for them to teach, holding them to a service and research requirement is asking a great deal. Others suggested that this language was intended to synchronize the expectations laid out in the faculty workload proposal forwarded by the Provost 13 September 2011 which would evaluates restricted faculty 60% in teaching, 15% in research and 25% in service.

3. Dossier Organization: Administrative Response

The Senate discussed the administration's response to the Senate proposal from academic year 2010-2011 regarding the necessary content of dossiers presented by candidates for second, fourth, tenure, and promotion reviews. The draft response, which was forwarded to the Senate on 10/12/2011, proposed substantial changes to the dossier format proposed and passed by the Senate.

Background – during academic year 2010-11, then Senator Michael Lewis chaired a senate subcommittee to refine the content of the dossier which administrators and evaluators had concluded was excessively long. In that document produced in 2011 and

finalized by the Senate, Senator Lewis's committee recommended, emphasizing the importance of the dossier for retention, tenure, and promotion; that each faculty member be given a strict guideline for the "core binder" and then be allowed to submit all materials they felt were relevant that might allow them to demonstrate with documentation any statements made in the eval-6. Please see the proposal [here 2](#).

The discussion focused on the following issues

The response made no mention of the electronic dossier which, now that the institution uses Digital Measures for annual reviews, should be part of every discussion we have on dossier construction. Electronic dossiers seem to promise unlimited expansion of material. The important work of the Senate done by Michael Lewis and his committee was to try to define exactly what should go into a dossier. The Senate also discussed that it is now unclear who administers Digital Measures for the University and if there are support staff who might be able to manage the electronic dossier. Some senators objected to any move towards an electronic dossier noting that Digital Measures seems unnecessarily cumbersome and unreliable, noting that in summer 2011 the Digital Measures system was inaccessible through the University computer system for a significant time.

Senators noted that in the administrative response, there was no place to include relevant service materials. These might include work generated by a candidate as part of their service to the University or some extramural activity.

Others commented on the limitations placed on some more prolific faculty who might need additional space to include scholarly production than one binder would allow.

The SEC is committed to revisit the issue of dossier content and will draft a counterproposal expressing faculty concerns. The major issue seems to be that faculty rightfully see the dossier as their tool to make the best case possible for renewal, tenure, and promotion at periodic increments during their careers and therefore should have the right to produce relevant documentation to make their strongest case possible. Administration sees the dossier as too large and unorganized to evaluate effectively and too bulky to store and transport during the evaluation cycles in the fall.

The Senate also made the case that the administrative response seems to focus on only one kind of teaching evaluation material, the IDEA student surveys. Senators discussed the possibility of including some kind of teaching portfolio which would provide balance and reward thoughtful and innovative teachers.

Senator Adamitis attended an IDEA sponsored workshop in Texas recently in which she heard Peter Seldin speak. He is author of numerous books on teaching assessment at the University level including:

Changing Practices in Faculty Evaluation. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1984.

The Teaching Portfolio: A Practical Guide to Improved Performance and Promotion/Tenure Decisions. 4th edition. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 2010. (with J. Elizabeth Miller and Clement A. Seldin) the Tribble Library has the First Edition.

Successful Use of Teaching Portfolios. Boston: Anker Press, 1993

With J. Elizabeth Miller, *The Academic Portfolio: a Practical Guide to Documenting Teaching, Research, and Service*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 2008.

The Senate discussed the prospect of inviting Peter Seldin to campus. If this, however, is challenging to schedule, the Senate thought of several alternative routes to achieve the same or similar ends.

One senator thought that a ‘webinar’ of some kind might be set up that would considerably reduce travel costs and might be more convenient for faculty as well. Although it is unclear that Seldin might agree to such a format, the prospect that it may reduce costs makes it worth inquiring about.

Others thought that we might organize some faculty work groups to read his works and lead discussion of based upon his published ideas. This would also include expanding our library holdings to include several copies of his most recent materials that might be placed on reserve for faculty to consult. Perhaps the Faculty Development committee might take on this task as part of its work when it is created.

4. Committee Reports

The senate addressed committee reports out of order. They followed the department Liaison reports above.

5. 3-3 Transition application process

President Pollard mentioned that the application process was underway and that in the spring we might expect a report from the various colleges on the prospects for transition.

6. 3-year contract reports

Senators from various departments reported having served on Department Review Committees for transitioning current faculty from year-to-year renewable contracts to 3 year term contracts. Others, in departments where significant faculty wish to transition to this kind of contract report much satisfaction with the process so far. The senate will continue to engage with its liaison departments to hear reports on these longer term appointments. The potential for term appointments to increase in size relative to the size of probationary and tenured faculty needs to always be monitored. At this point,

however, it seems faculty who have worked for the University for years on annual contracts see the potential for a longer term contract as a net benefit.

The handbook committee is at work moving these procedures in the University Handbook. It was important to note that these procedures should not fall under the review of faculty in that section, but rather as part of the employment and hiring procedures for faculty.

VII. New Business

1. Reports from the subcommittees

i. On-Campus Child Care.

Senator Hall reported that the child care committee is hard at work. They have determined that no space is available on campus for a facility even if an external entity might be able to run such a program. The University building plan includes no space according to Bill Brauer and Cindi Perry. Senator Hall reported that the committee has made significant progress since engaging the upper administration. The question, however, remains will child care options become a benefit that faculty will expect, or is this something that will be seen as a mechanism for generating revenue. Logically, faculty families already pay for child care and preschool by and large. Presumably, the facilities and early childhood psychology and education students, could provide some synergy with the extant needs of a growing young faculty. So the question becomes what are faculty willing to pay for and can the University either find an affiliated space that will take advantage of University resources and faculty need and at what price to faculty and the University. Senator Hall proposed a feasibility study where costs (including any subsidy to faculty/CNU Community), prices, and resources might be assessed.

ii. Faculty Life (Carpenter)

Senator Carpenter reported last senate meeting and is continuing to work.

iii. Restricted Faculty Representation (Barnello)

The issue of restricted faculty representation on the senate is taken up in the motions considered at this meeting subsequently. Senator Barnello had nothing further to add to the discussion.

iv. Chairs' Summer Stipend/Adjunct Pay (Pollard)

The Senate went out of order at 4:15 to consider a series of motions

The Senate returned to order at 4:46.

Senators considered the motion on the Chair's Summer Stipend and Adjunct Pay separately.

Adjunct Pay: Motion to raise adjunct pay (top of grade: PhD) to \$3500 per 3 credit course

Whereas CNU adjunct pay is lower than a selection of aspirant and non-aspirant peer institutions in Virginia (CNU \$2800; Hampden-Sydney \$4000; Longwood \$3500; ODU \$3900; William & Mary \$3500; VACC \$3000), adjunct pay should be raised to the more competitive level of \$3500 per 3 credit course.

The motion was put on the table by President Pollard. Senator Puaca called the question, seconded by Selim. The Senate offered no discussion.

The **Vote** was unanimous – the Senate adopts the motion.

v. Standing Committee on Faculty Development (Pollard)

The Senate then focused its attention on the Standing Committee proposal from President Pollard. The president handed out a draft proposal that was new and involved making the committee IDEA and Faculty Development focused. The membership of the committee should consist of tenured and untenured faculty. The committee's mission and authority give it the right to manage and regulate faculty development on campus broadly defined. The committee should report to the Senate regularly.

The discussion focused on several issues. Several senators felt that the label or brand of IDEA should not be included in the title of the committee. The flexibility to select a new teaching evaluation should always be assumed, and furthermore, if the committee is designed to encourage teaching development the criteria for assessing and evaluating teaching needs to move beyond the IDEA into other areas. Others suggested it might appear to be an extension of the IDEA taskforce. The Senate liked the idea that it should perhaps call itself the Faculty Development and Evaluation Committee.

The discussion turned to the composition of the committee. Some raised the question should the administration have ex-officio representation. The proposal as it now stands includes four administrators and six faculty representatives. Others argued that the committee should, because it has an assessment function, include representation from the office of assessment. Some suggestion was made that the committee should be a liaison between the faculty and administration and therefore should be independent without administrative representation. The language from the proposal as it now stands includes one representative from each dean and the provost designee as ex-officio members.

The senate also made the suggestion that the committee should include restricted faculty among its membership.

The Senate also considered the function of the committee. In addition the duties which have been articulated before, the Senate suggested the Faculty Development committee

might provide oversight to the faculty sections of the handbook, and should amend and revise the UE-4.

vi. Religious Tolerance (Bardwell)

Senator Bardwell provided a report on the Religious Tolerance committee and she provided some materials that were included in the packet handed out to senators. Those are found [here \(3a\)](#) and [here \(3b\)](#). The committee is in the process of holding a series of campus-wide meetings to discuss the proposed role of a Chapel on a public University campus. To determine standard practice in Virginia, the committee, in conjunction with senior administration has begun to cull data from eight campus that are public and have a chapel to determine policy regarding scheduling, sectarian symbols, mission, and function. Some senators asked questions regarding the natural state of the chapel when it is not being used. Others asked about whether there might be events in this space that students and faculty would either be required or feel compelled to attend.

To get a measure of the faculty, Senator Bardwell and her committee are working with the office of University Assessment and its director Deb Moore to distribute a survey to faculty in January. They have also identified 19 objectives that the committee is actively working on with the administration, the ministers on campus who serve the students, and with members of the committee.

2. The Motions from the subcommittees, were taken up out of order, beginning at 4:15. The senate resumed order at 4:46 with the Chairs' Summer Stipend and Adjunct Pay motions, noted above.

i. Subcommittee On Restricted Faculty Representation Report (Barnello)

The Senate began by taking up the discussion of allowing restricted faculty (those not on probationary or tenure track appointments or who are tenured) to serve on the Senate. Senators engaged in a robust discussion of this issue. That discussion generally went as follows.

Some senators reported that in discussing this in their department they found broad support. Luter faculty in particular found that their restricted faculty would appreciate the opportunity to serve. Other colleges found no restricted faculty who did not like this idea or found any appreciable problem with potentially having representation of some kind. Some senators pointed out that service on the Senate is a large commitment in time and energy and with the low weight generally assigned to service, some restricted faculty might find this to be overly onerous for the amount to which service contributes to their overall evaluation of performance.

Senators also considered that the handbook now mandates that 4 senators from each college must be tenured and that leaves only one seat for probationary and restricted faculty. Probationary faculty, it seems, might see service on the Senate as an opportunity

to enhance their prospects for tenure and thus might lose opportunity competing with restricted faculty.

The Senate in October considered adding a friendly amendment to adjust the handbook language to alter the proportion of tenured to non-tenured faculty from 4 of 5 to 3 of 5. The other proposal considered at this meeting was to expand the size of the senate to 18 adding one seat which could be restricted or probationary to each college. The bulk of the discussion revolved around the resolution of these two issues. Advocates for expanding the senate argued that keeping 4 tenured members from each college opened up opportunity for a growing faculty that will reach 300 in the next decade. Indeed, the faculty has grown substantially since the last increase of the size of the senate and should continue to grow. Others expressed concern that tenured faculty provide backbone to the senate and with a senate that could be 40% untenured by the 3 of 5 proposal, senators might not have sufficient confidence to raise necessary objections and to recommend policies unpopular with the administration. Increasing the size of the Senate might also make possible broader representation in smaller departments that have traditionally been underrepresented on the Senate.

Advocates for keeping the senate at 4 of 5 and preserving the size argued that an overly large senate might be less collegial or given to factionalization. Others expressed concern that we are already expanding the number of service opportunities for faculty increasing its service burden. Expanding the senate, therefore, might make finding committed senators difficult. Others argued that the reasons offered to expand the senate were unnecessary at this moment.

The Senate, after a healthy debate, considered several motions.

First, the Senate voted to in the motion to allow all full time faculty members to serve on the Senate. Senator Puaca voted to call the question and Senator Martin seconded. The discussion included the friendly amendment to the language all “full time instructional faculty” to be included among the eligible. This eliminates the problem of part-time faculty being allowed to serve.

The motion reads, “All full-time members of the Instructional Faculty are eligible to serve in the Faculty Senate.”

The Vote was unanimous – the Senate adopted the motion.

Senators will notify the administration of the recommendation and put it on the agenda for the 1 December 2011 all faculty meeting so that faculty can vote on the constitutional change as mandated by Senate by-laws.

The Senate then considered the motion to increase the size of the faculty senate from 15 members, five from each of the three colleges, to 18 members, six from each college. Senator Hall forwarded the motion seconded by Senator Connell. Some discussion followed. Several senators felt that an increased Senate might make possible smaller

department representation. Others supported it because busy schedules sometimes makes it difficult for all senators to attend all meetings. Others felt that Senators should be voted upon and argued against departmental representation. Some strongly objected to the idea that a larger Senate would make more acceptable missing meetings.

The Vote was then taken

In favor: Connell, Bardwell, Hall, and Wang

Against: Zestos, Adamitis, Pollard, Puaca, Martin, Puaca, Selim.

Abstain: Carpenter

The motion failed.

The Senate then considered new proposed language for the handbook which would state that 4 of 5 members of the senate from each college must be tenured and that one can be restricted or probationary. The motion proposed and the question called by Puaca and seconded by Bardwell. Some discussion focused on changing the language to state that 3 of 5 should be tenured. Advocates supported the flexibility afforded by requiring only three be tenured suggesting that it would likely have no effect on the actual composition of the Senate in most cases. Others voiced concerns over the potential weakening of the Senate such composition might afford. Others suggested we should figure out if 4 of 5 gives adequate representation to restricted and probationary faculty in the coming election and revisit the change next year should there be a problem.

The Senate voted to adopt the language, "4 of 5 members must be tenured and the non-tenured member may be either probationary or restricted."

In Favor: Zestos, Adamitis, Bardwell, Connell, Selim, Wang, Martin, Carpenter, Pollard

Opposed: Weiss and Puaca

Abstained: Hall

The motion passed.

ii. Adjunct Pay: Motion to raise adjunct pay (top of grade: PhD) to \$3500 per 3 credit course

The Senate then considered the motion proposed by the SEC to support the increase in Adjunct wages. The SEC, earlier in the fall 2011 semester, examined closely the issue of adjunct pay. The all-faculty meeting in August raised this issue as a concern for Chairs who had trouble finding qualified adjuncts or who lost adjuncts that performed well to schools that paid more competitive rates. As a result, the Senate considered the following motion.

Senator Pollard called the question, seconded by Senator Bardwell. There was no additional discussion. The Senate therefore moved to vote on the motion.

Whereas CNU adjunct pay is lower than a selection of aspirant and non-aspirant peer institutions in Virginia (CNU \$2800; Hampden-Sydney \$4000; Longwood \$3500; ODU \$3900; William & Mary \$3500; VACC \$3000), adjunct pay should be raised to the more competitive level of \$3500 per 3 credit course.

The motion passed unanimously

3. Faculty Development Grants

The Senate went into closed session at 4:49PM to consider faculty development grants. Senator Hall, whose FDG was under consideration, left, as did all guests.

The senate then heard the report from the Faculty Development Grant Committee and the Sabbatical Committee.

At 5:10 the Senate returned to open session

Senator Bardwell called the question seconded by Senator Wang. The senate voted to accept the recommendation of the FDG Committee

In favor: Puaca, Adamitis, Pollard, Connell, Bardwell, Martin, Carpenter, Zestos, Selim, Wang

Absent: Hall

The Senate adopts the recommendation of the FDG Committee.

The Senate then proceeded out of order to consider the Sabbatical applications and went back into closed session at 5:12

Senators Zestos and Wang left the room because their applications for Sabbatical were being considered by the Senate. Senator Hall returned.

The Sabbatical Committee, owing to the tight constraints on time and the size of the task, postponed the vote on their choices. The senate will vote electronically to adopt the recommendation in advance of the 10 December deadline to report the Senate rankings to the Provost.

The Senate returned to open session at 5:16 and all guests and Senators Wang and Zestos returned.

4. Discussion of the Proposals from Provost Padilla at the 11/11 meeting

i. New paragraph in successful 2 and 4-year review notices

Background. At the 11/11 meeting between the Provost and the full Senate the Provost provided Senators with a new document he plans to use to notify candidates who have

successfully completed their 2nd and 4th year reviews. The language of this document, appended in the minutes, contains a new paragraph which reads:

“while the outcome of this reappointment review is positive, its outcome is not predictive for the outcome of the next review. Each review is a discreet administrative decision that takes into account earlier reviews as information to be assessed in the context of performance and current priorities. Thus, the decision to reappoint should not be regarded as an explicit or implicit guarantee or commitment for future reappointments.”

The Senate at that meeting in earlier in November raised a number of objections. The senate in 2010-11 raised the issue of transparency in reviews with the Provost following the December announcement of tenure decisions. Senators were concerned because, although administration priorities are clear in the need to decide on the University needs and priorities long term is solidly in their hands, faculty should reasonably expect that if they are meeting and exceeding the expectations for performance outlined in the University Eval-4, that they should be able to expect a positive outcome in their tenure decisions.

Some senators continued to express concerns over the paragraph arguing that the senate under President Carlson did not ask for this clause. Rather, it seemed to be articulating concern over the administration weakening the force of documents which guide faculty work (e.g. the Departmental Eval-4 and the University Eval-4). The Senate expects to continue this discussion after soliciting additional views from the University faculty.

ii. New proposed penalty for unsatisfactory performance in scholarship

The Senate then took up the second proposal given by the Provost at the 11/11 meeting.

Background: The proposal as aired by the Provost involved teaching load reductions and scholarship. The provost argued before the Senate that in the Annual Review process, faculty who performed unsatisfactorily in Professional Development/Scholarship faced no consequence. He expressed concern that outside constituencies or even the Board of Visitors might see this as a deficiency in faculty evaluation. In lieu of changing the handbook to read that an Unsatisfactory evaluation in scholarship would provoke an unscheduled review, he proposed that such faculty might be reassigned to teach a 4/4 for a 3 year term.

The Senate considered briefly this proposal. The comments were as follows.

Senators expressed confusion over the idea that adding teaching responsibilities would spur scholarly production.

Senators wondered if the University might be better served by making this not a punitive step but rather a choice. Faculty, the few who might fall in this category, might choose to

teach instead of devoting their time to research. This removes the stigma of reprimand but satisfies the Provost's need to encourage equitable workload distribution.

Senators also made the point that those who do not produce after tenure are also denied merit pay generally. There is, in many years, therefore a denial of monetary compensation for lack of scholarly production – something that the Provost might communicate if asked.

Senators also expressed concern that without definition of what constitutes unsatisfactory performance, such a policy opens avenues which may make vulnerable faculty who now produce satisfactorily in scholarship. Increasing the amount of scholarship required, in other words, is possible under this proposal.

The Senate ended its discussion by asking President Pollard to request a policy statement from the Provost to clarify his intent and to explain what happens after the three-year term of 4/4.

5. Sabbaticals : were considered out of order above.

6. Accelerated Committee Elections

The Senate spoke briefly on this issue, but generally senators have not heard any significant complaints about the proposal to move forward the election for 2012-2013 University standing committees.

Background: The Provost asked the senate to consider moving forward the election cycle this year to reduce the workload in finalizing committees for the coming academic year.

7. Teaching Award Committee

The Senate discussed briefly the teaching awards which the senate will give out this year. The process has been pushed back past the review cycle to reduce the burden on department chairs. The senate will take this up in the spring semester.

8. Electronic IDEA

The Senate continues to monitor Electronic IDEA that was conducted this fall for the first time for the majority of faculty. According to the office of assessment, the final response rate was 72% for electronic across the entire University and 87% for paper. Only 10% of the sample reported less than a 70% response rate. While this is a significant drop, it was better than expected.

The assessment office director, Deb Moore, happened to be in attendance at the meeting and offered her insights and explained her plan for discussion of IDEA in the spring. First, Deb will survey the faculty on their experiences in January. Faculty will, after getting the results, be able to give voice to their experiences. The administration of the electronic form was better than expected with very few glitches.

Deb will prepare a report to address any faculty concerns.

The Senate discussed the experience briefly. Some raised questions about the nature of the electronic data and if there might be some way to assess if it skews data because students are outside of the classroom. Deb was asked if she might compare classes assessed in previous years with the paper form versus those assessed electronically. The senate will continue to engage Deb and the office of assessment and we were pleased that she was able to attend the meeting to report on the data.

The Senate also asked Deb about the kinds of data that electronic IDEA provides beyond the evaluation of teaching performance. The senate resolved to inquire further about institutional uses of IDEA data.

9. IDEA Conference Report

i. Possible invitation to Peter Seldin to speak to faculty

Senator Adamitis and several department chairs attended in November a conference in Texas sponsored by IDEA. She has provided her notes from this meeting [here \(4\)](#). The emphasis of the meeting is on the literature which has emerged over the past 25 years on teaching evaluation and evaluation of University faculty. Dr. Peter Seldin, who is an internationally recognized expert on faculty evaluation led sessions attended by Senator Adamitis, and she reported on some of his findings.

10. Other

President Pollard announced that the all faculty meeting is scheduled for 1 December in Anderson auditorium from 12:15-1(it actually ended up being moved to Gaines Theater).

The President asked for a motion to adjourn, and it was provided by Senator Puaca and seconded by Senator Weiss.

Adjourned at 5:57 PM