

Christopher Newport University
Board Room of the David Student Union
September 19, 2014
3:00PM – 6:00 PM

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

1. Call to Order:

The meeting was called to order at 3:04. President Adamitis introduced Cynthia Perry, CNU Chief of Staff. Because the state of Virginia has mandated some funding cuts, Chief of Staff Perry was invited to present a budgeting overview session to the senate.

Chief of Staff Perry began by saying that many people have asked her in the past how the University can continue moving forward with our building projects even in times of economic stress and have wondered why we cannot redirect some of the building funds toward academics. The answer is that we have two distinct budgets, operating and capital, and the state forbids transferring funds from one budget to the other. In other words, funds from the state that have been allocated to our capital budget must be used for their intended purpose (buildings). Moreover, if we do not use these funds by the end of the fiscal year, the money must be returned to the state; CNU cannot reallocate it.

Next, Chief of Staff Perry gave a presentation on the operating budget and presented this report, which includes 1) student enrollment figures; 2) slated and past tuition and fees plus room and board charges; 3) summary of University revenues; 4) summary of University expenditures; 5) listing of Educational and General (E&G) programs; 6) E&G program revenues and expenditures; 7) listing of Auxiliary enterprise programs; 8) Auxiliary revenues and expenditures; and 9) plans and priorities that President Tribble has already shared with the University community.

The University allocates resources based on a 6-Year Plan approved by the Board of Visitors that outlines the institution's goals and priorities (see p. 1 of the report). These include 1) expanding full-time instructional faculty to 300; 2) increasing instruction by full-time faculty to 85%; 3) increasing classes with less than 20 student to 55%; 4) achieving 90% freshmen retention rate; 5) achieving 80% 6-year graduation rate; 6) increasing STEM degrees to 25% of degrees conferred; 7) increasing the number of PLP and Honors students in freshmen class to 500; 8) increasing out-of-state enrollment to 15% of freshmen class; 9) sustaining minority enrollment; 10) increasing the residential population to 80% of the student body; 11) completing the Campus Master Plan by 2020; 12) reducing dependence on state funding through tuition, out-of-state recruiting and gifts; and 13) becoming recognized as a Phi Beta Kappa institution.

The University's operating budget (see p. 1. of the report) derives from two sources of revenue: general funds (GF), which come from state tax dollars, and non-general funds (NGF), which are comprised of tuition, comprehensive fees, room and board fees, sales and services, commissions, federal work study and gifts, grants and contracts. The current breakdown of the two funding sources is 22% GF and 78% NGF. This marks a significant change from our funding prior to the 2008 economic crisis, when the state provided approximately 70% of our

GF. Consequently, as compared to eight years ago, we are now much more heavily reliant on tuition and gifts as sources of revenue to support our operating budget.

GF and NGF combined support the operating budget, which includes the following University programs

Educational and General (E&G) includes activities to support instruction, research, public service, academic support, and program support services. In addition to instructional faculty and operating costs for academic departments and academic administrative offices (e.g., deans, provost), the E&G fund supports the library, information technology services, advising, admissions, registrar, counseling, financial aid, career services, human resources, public relations, building/grounds maintenance and university police.

Auxiliary Enterprises include self-supporting goods or services to students, faculty and staff. The major activities supported are athletics, student life and health services, residential and dining services, DSU operations, Ferguson Center, Freeman Center and fields, parking, and student programming and organizations.

Student Financial Assistance (Student Aid) includes activities to provide financial assistance to students.

Financial Assistance for E&G Services (Sponsored Research) includes activities to provide resources for educational and general services primarily through contracts.

Please note that the GF may be used for Educational and General (E&G) and Financial Aid only (e.g., not Auxiliary Enterprises).

Student enrollment (see p. 2 of the report) drives the operating budget, because it sets the amount of funding we receive from the GF and determines the amount of funding we receive through student tuition and fees in the NGF. Projected total enrollment for AY 2014-15 had a fall headcount of 5206. In order to achieve that number, the Office of Admission was asked to set freshmen enrollment at 1200-1250 and this year's actual count came to 1228. The long-term goal is to maintain a consistent freshmen enrollment of 1200-1250, which will provide stability for the overall student enrollment and therefore enable informed long-term academic, economic and building planning.

Tuition is the largest source of University revenue with GF second, room fees third, and comprehensive fees fourth (see pp. 3-4 of the report). By statute, the Board of Visitors (BOV) has complete authority on setting tuition. However, they do so in collaboration with President Tribble and the Budget Advisory Committee, who make recommendations regarding tuition and fees and internal funding allocations based on the priorities set in the 6-Year Plan. The report includes a chart detailing the breakdown of Tuition and Fees and Room and Board for full-time undergraduates for AYs 12-13, 13-14, and 14-15.

University expenditures are broken down into five categories, and the report provides details on revenues and expenditures in each area (pp. 5-11):

1. Educational and General (E&G): 44.0% FY14, 45.1% projected FY15

2. Auxiliary Enterprises: 50.9% FY14, 49.1% projected FY15
3. Student Financial Assistance: 3.8% FY14, 3.9% projected FY15
4. Sponsored Research: 0.65% FY14, 1.0% projected FY15
5. Unrestricted Contributions: 0.5% FY14, 0.8% Projected FY15

As noted earlier, GF covers only E&G and Student Financial Assistance, and Auxiliary Enterprises are self-supporting. However, even though the state does not contribute to Auxiliary Enterprises, it controls all of its procurement and how that money is spent; the same holds for Sponsored Programs. At this point, Senator Brash noted that faculty frequently ask why Sponsored Programs must follow state rules. In particular, why must grant money be subject to state requirements, since this source of funding does not come from the state? The answer is that it is the reality of being a state school.

After reviewing the budget report, Chief of Staff Perry discussed the budget reductions recently mandated by the state. The state initially asked us to present a 5% budget reduction plan for next year and a 7% budget reduction plan for the following year. Since the state only contributes to the GF, the reductions apply only to the GF, not the entire CNU budget. These cuts would amount to 1.3 million and 1.8 million dollars, respectively. However, instead of requiring that all universities cut their GF budgets by 5%, Governor McCaulliffe assigned different cuts to different schools, with a 3.3% average overall for higher education. Schools with high in-state enrollments received a lesser cut, while those with high out-of-state enrollments received higher cuts, in some cases over 6%. Chief of Staff Perry indicated that this is the first time in her memory that the state targeted its reductions in this way, as opposed to issuing an across-the-board cut. CNU has been designated for a 2.3% cut, for an overall \$600,000 reduction in funds this year; the 2.3% cut will remain in effect next year as well. CNU's plan for offsetting this loss includes moving the Dean of Students position plus administrative support for this office from E&G into Auxiliary Enterprises, holding back on some equipment requests and leaving some currently open positions unfilled. Thus, at present, there are no planned reductions to the academic side.

Senator Nichols asked about the trends in state support for CNU. Chief of Staff Perry stated that these funds have consistently been going down for the past several years. In 2002, 30% of our state funding was suddenly removed. State funding then increased until 2008 but began steadily declining at that point and continues to do so now. Chief of Staff Perry also cautioned that funding cuts will need to be looked at again in November. If revenues into the state coffers decline, then our cuts will need to be reexamined.

Senator Nichols asked about the schools that suffered a higher percentage cut. In particular, did a critical percentage of out-of-state students trigger higher cuts in some university budgets? The answer is 'yes': All universities in Virginia are supposed to target a no more than 25% out of state student population.

2. President's Report.

Faculty Senate President Meeting with President Tribble

President Tribble supports the Faculty Senate agenda and commends our attention to increasing communication between the faculty and administration as well as our plans to increase

efficiency in university governance. He also reiterated his willingness to meet with the Faculty Senate throughout the year and looks forward to working with us.

SEC Meeting with Provost Doughty, Vice Provost Kidd and Deans Colvin, Guajardo and Underwood

The SEC met with the administration one week after our August meeting to review the agenda for the year and begin moving forward on a number of action items. A summary of the discussion follows:

- *Sponsors for Curriculum*: Approved. Carol Safko has already updated the forms and posted them online. She will add sponsors to forms already submitted, so that faculty will not have to resubmit materials. College committees that meet virtually should include the sponsor in their virtual discussions or invite her or him to a chairs meeting to address questions. President Adamitis will work with the department chairs and chairs of the relevant committees to get the sponsor process underway.
- *AR Form*: The request, originating from the Council of University Chairs (CUC), to provide the actual weighted score rather than a rounded score for overall performance was not supported. The primary reason was that the review season was already in progress, so it was too late to introduce a change, though there was also some concern that not rounding would result in lower morale. The CUC can discuss this idea further and propose it again for next year, if appropriate.

Discussion: At this point in the President's report, Senator Barnello proposed that evaluatees write in their own weighting at the top of EVAL forms. Senator Busch clarified that indeed any faculty can request an individual specific weighting on the three categories of teaching, research and service. To date, the filling in of weights has been done by department chairs. **Action item: Determine a policy designating who is responsible for filling in the weights on EVAL forms.** President Adamitis suggested that we ask the CUC and the Provost for additional guidance on this matter.

- *Departmental EVAL-4s*: In order to provide clarification regarding disciplinary and/or departmental differences in the areas of teaching, research and service, the Senate had proposed using the Departmental EVAL-4 as a "translation" of the much more general UE-4 that would serve as an educational tool for all involved in the evaluation process. At our last meeting, Senators expressed some concerns about moving forward with a charge to the CUC to revise the departmental EVAL-4's, since this would be a time-consuming undertaking and we did not know whether the administration would support it.
- Jana is happy to report that the Provost and Deans do support this initiative. However, they cautioned against included quantitative requirements for tenure, e.g., X publications, pages, etc., for scholarship. At this point, we should move forward with the charge to the CUC and give them a deadline, so that the Deans and Provost will have time to review the revised departmental EVAL-4's and discuss them with the chairs and Senate. Please note that we will also need to update the *Handbook* so that the departmental EVAL-4's must be included in all levels of review, and we'll need to add the departmental EVAL-4 to the dossier

checklist. **Action Item: Give the CUC a deadline of March 1st for preparing a draft of the departmental EVAL-4.**

Discussion: Senator Timani requested that this information be provided to the faculty in the near future. Senator Busch pointed out that the Senate envisions that Department EVAL-4s will only be used as guidelines. Senators still favor each candidate making their own case about the quality and appropriateness of the journals in which they are publishing, etc. Senator Busch noted that the University EVAL-4 values peer reviewed publications positively, though he did question how peer reviewed publications factor into our evaluation systems as compared to other kinds of products. This should be clarified in the department EVAL-4. Senator Timani then raised the point that in certain instances faculty might be uncertain as to where information exists on the quality of journals or other publication venues. Senator Busch stated that this would be a good question to ask the Provost. Senator Hasbrouck followed that, in the academic business disciplines, lists exist such as the BEALL that indicate what does not classify as peer reviewed. Senators indicated that it could be a slippery slope if we list which journals are the preeminent in a field, in that it changes expectations toward that of a Research 1 institution and is akin to a hiring list.

There were a number of other items that Senators believe should be included on a Department EVAL-4. The following were discussed: 1) What is a normal teaching load in the department? 2) Indicate a normal number of prefixes over which faculty in a department teach. 3) In the area of service, a department EVAL-4 should include the number of majors (degrees, not students) in a department. The reason for this is that the service needs may vary greatly from one department to another. 5) How many teaching preparations are average in a discipline? 6) The types of teaching should be mentioned as it is sometimes more difficult teaching at the lower level. 7) What is the average number of supervised student theses that is expected of a faculty in a department?

Finally, many senators questioned the current level of value that is being given to core advising. We will revisit this at a later faculty senate meeting.

- *IDEA*: President Adamitis has contacted the committee regarding their charge to research and report on best practices for incorporating student evaluations into summative and formative evaluations and will attend their next meeting (TBA) to discuss the charge further.
- The *Committee on Committees* has been formed and will meet in the very near future. At this point, President Adamitis would like to thank Carol Safko and Lorraine Hall for working with the Senate to ensure that the committee roster aligns with the *Handbook*, that all committees are populated appropriately and that all committees have chairs. An updated committee roster will be posted to the Provost's website soon. President Adamitis would also like to thank Linda Manning for running elections, so that we could fill vacated seats and address some *Handbook* violations.
- *Liberal Learning Core Changes*: President Adamitis attended last week's Liberal Learning Council meeting and charged the group with making recommendations for revising the curricular process by the end of the semester, so that we may avoid the confusion we encountered last year in the future, thereby ensuring that

the faculty has a strong voice in the curricular process. The LLC also raised the question of requiring periodic faculty reviews of the Core and may make recommendations on that issue as well.

- *FMLA and Lecturers*: We are expecting *Handbook* proposals from Provost Doughty and Quentin Kidd soon. At that point, we can schedule open meetings to solicit faculty feedback.

The Senate next went out of order to hear a report by Senator Hunter.

11. Child care subcommittee

The child care committee meets on a monthly basis. The goal of the subcommittee is to propose a plan offering child care options for faculty, staff, and students, by partnering with existing agencies, holding temporary, camp-type options for “hot days” (days when university faculty are required to be on campus, but Pre-K-12 schools are not in session), and providing an online list of babysitters. The committee believes that having a child care facility on campus will not be possible in the near future, so it is looking at other options. The major suggestion of the committee is the creation of camps for the “hot days” when there are pressing needs for child care. The subcommittee reports that there has been resounding support from administrators and faculty for the idea of camps. Camps might look like Professor Lambert’s Camp Invention or the athletic camps that occur on campus. In the near term, the subcommittee will be focusing on the camp idea. Vice President Brauer has provided the committee with information on nearby facilities such as a Riverside’s child care facility on Canon Blvd. Other questions that will be addressed by the subcommittee include finding out what our neighboring universities do. The committee will be sending out a survey sometime in the future asking for CNU faculty and staff input. If senators have anything that they would like to include in the child care survey, they should talk with Senator Hunter or Professor Rodden or Professor Valdez. As an incidental benefit, Senator Busch added that camps could be revenue producers for the University.

Senator Hunter leaves at 4:40

4. Acknowledge Electronic Approval of April Minutes

Only Senators on last year’s senate may vote.

Call to Question: Senator Manning moved to acknowledge the electronic approval of the April minutes.

Senator Busch seconded.

Vote to approve: unanimous

5. Approval of August 29 Senate Meeting Minutes

Minor changes to the minutes were discussed.

Senator Brash moved to approve the August 29 senate meeting minutes pending minor changes.

Senator Grau seconded

Vote to approve: **Adamitis, Manning, Martin, Grau, Brash, Nichols, Holland, Barnello, Hunter, Timani, Jelinek, Thompson, Winder, Hasbrouck approved**

Abstain: Senator Busch

6. Endowment Agreement

Senator Grau followed up on two questions posed during the August meeting. The first question was: What manner of faculty dependent scholarships exist at other universities? Senator Grau gave a number of examples including the following: Virginia Tech (VT) has 2 types of these faculty dependent scholarships, and both are merit-based. VT awards about 8 to 12 per year and has granted approximately 120 in the past 15 years or so. Old Dominion University (ODU) has a merit-based scholarship for dependents of full time faculty and full time administrators. The University of Virginia created such a scholarship through a half-million dollar donation by a former President of the University. The second question researched by Senator Grau was about how to word the faculty senate responsibilities in the faculty dependent endowment agreement.

The Senate will table this discussion at this time until we have the endowment agreement that Senator Grau included last time in the senate agenda.

7. BOV reports

Student Life Committee (Manning): The information was the same as presented to the faculty during the getting started week. Send any questions to Senator Manning.

Academic Affairs Committee (Grau): Senator Grau reported on initiatives completed by the academic affairs committee including the CLA and NSSE assessment results. These were administered to 150 students. Some exams were not counted because these students exited very early during the examination period. It is a longitudinal study, where the exams are given to freshman and seniors. CNU scored well on effective teaching practices. Senator Grau has more documents from the meeting, if anyone is interested.

University Advancement Committee (Martin): Existing progress on the Comprehensive Campaign is quite positive with \$37 million of the \$42 million dollar goal already reached. Groundbreaking for the Alumni House is provisionally set for October. Because of the Alumni House, alumni giving is exceeding past year's levels of giving.

Finance Committee (Brash): A positive picture of the University's finances was presented at the BOV Finance committee meeting. The state is only slightly changing its percentage levels on the SWAM vendor policy. At this meeting it was reported that the Business Office is going to institute intensive training for anyone who employs students on campus. If mistakes are made in which the number of hours a student is employed exceeds the maximum, moving forward, the

Business Office may need to take the student workers away from the employer. **Action Agenda to the Provost: the manner of recording student hours needs to be reviewed.**

8. Senate Composition from Departments

Senator Brash asked the Senate to discuss whether the policy for Senate membership should be changed so that no college may have two members from the same department. His rationale is that such a membership roster would lead to broader representation. Many Senators rebutted that the placing of more restrictions on faculty senate membership would only worsen our ability to get faculty to serve on senate. Senator Grau stated that, to his recollection, there has never been a senate without an occurrence of two members from the same department. In the past, Senator Grau was part of a survey sent out to all faculty asking for their opinion on this matter. The result of the survey was that faculty did not want such forced broad representation. Senator Manning added that we are about to add a fourth school or college at CNU and so we should wait for that to occur before we explore faculty senate membership requirements. **Action agenda for this Friday's meeting with the Provost is to ask more about this issue.**

9. Philosophy of Faculty Senate regarding budget cuts

The document, Philosophy of the Faculty Senate 2014-2015, was presented. The goal of the document is to ask the question: "What happens if the faculty at CNU are asked to do even more with even less?" Much discussion ensued centering predominantly on the following two sentences. "The Faculty Senate understands that the temporary rebalancing of faculty to average 20-30% restricted appointments was brought on by economic exigency, and should be abandoned with the abating of the emergency. The Faculty Senate furthermore encourages the administration to convert such appointments to tenure-track lines as when appropriate." Some Senators wanted to simply strike these two sentences. Senator Winder asked if the faculty has conceded this point of a 20-30% restricted faculty. Several senators said that this should be one of the most important issues for this year's faculty senate. Senators asked that we question the Provost about whether or not the 70-30% split is the precedent for the future. Senators agreed that we should learn about the Provost's position on this matter. However, given that this is the faculty senate's philosophy, the question was raised as to why the Provost should enter into the wording of this document. President Adamitis asked that we table this document until we receive the upcoming proposal from Vice-Provost Kidd on contracts and titles for restricted faculty.

10. Faculty Excellence Awards

At the August meeting, the Senate noted that the current faculty awards (Excellence and Adjunct) unintentionally exclude part-time faculty. The recommendation of the committee is that part time faculty be included in with full time faculty for the purpose of deciding awards

Senator Jelinek moved

Seconded Senator Brash

Vote to Approve: : **Adamitis, Manning, Martin, Grau, Brash, Nichols, Holland, Barnello, Timani, Jelinek, Thompson, Winder, Hasbrouck approved**

Abstain: Senator Busch

New Business:

Senator Manning learned that the BOV is working on an endowed minority scholarship for CNU students. If they can raise \$25000 for this purpose, the amount will be matched by a generous donor. Senator Manning encouraged us to give to this scholarship fund. Lastly, we will look at how part-time faculty are being evaluated.

Meeting was adjourned at 6:04