

**Christopher Newport University**  
**Board Room, David Student Union**  
**March 20, 2015**  
**3:00 PM – 6:00 PM**

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

I. President Adamitis called the meeting to order at 3:05

II. President Adamitis asked if everyone had an opportunity to look at the minutes from the February 17 meeting. Since some Senators needed additional time, we decided to give Senators a few additional days to review the February minutes. The February minutes will be voted upon electronically.

III. Due to today's extensive agenda, the President's report will be set aside until the April Faculty Senate meeting.

IV. Committee updates

A. Committee updates from the February Board of Visitors meeting

1. Finance and Audit (Senator Brash)

The finance committee reported that the University is doing well financially. The University is above budget. As with every year, there were a number of financial audits that were conducted at the University. According to Senator Brash, the audit of department charge cards is of greatest interest to faculty. The audit showed several incidents of incorrect usage. Because of this, there will be more oversight and training for anyone who uses a departmental charge card. Senator Brash conjectured that this will probably lead to some form of new training for department chairs on the use of department charge cards.

Another issue that was addressed at the meeting was the disabling of email accounts for individuals who leave the University. Senators were concerned that losing email accounts will likely lead to some hardship on such individuals. Senator Brash asked IT services if there is something that can be done to extend service in such situations. According to IT services, department chairs may make a request to IT services to have email service extended indefinitely in such cases. According to President Adamitis, if a department chair anticipates that a department member will be leaving the university, that chair should notify Nannette Bouknight. Nannette will begin the paperwork to other enterprises such as CNU library services to make certain that a faculty member keeps their privileges at least until the end of their contract period, if not longer.

President Adamitis, on behalf of fellow faculty, asked Senator Brash if the auditing of the study abroad program had been discussed. Senator Brash believes that the finance

committee does have plans to do such an audit, however, such an audit may take place in the future.

## 2. Academic Affairs (Senator Grau)

Among a number of other topics discussed at this branch of the BOV, progress in the Luter dean search was conveyed. The advertisement for the Luter dean position was distributed at the meeting. The proposed salary for this position was also mentioned.

For faculty interested in the Summer Scholars program, the program is an eight week, in-residence, summer program for students and faculty to collaboratively work on a faculty-derived research question. The Summer Scholars program funded 25 of the 39 submitted faculty applications. Each of the 25 different faculty who submitted an application had an application approved.

Both the new parental leave policy and the lecturer proposal were discussed at this subcommittee meeting. Reaffirmation of the business degree was announced. Lastly, there was some discussion of faculty waiting to publish until the last few months of their tenure process.

Senator Jelinek asked, "Because of its relevance to PBK, was diversity of faculty a topic of discussion?" Because much of the meeting occurred during closed session, Senator Grau could not answer this question for certain. President Adamitis did announce that CNU has a new diversity director, his name is Ben Cowman. Mr. Cowman started at CNU in August. He is interested in working with faculty on diversity outreach. Ben has formed a working group which is composed of faculty and staff to work on this issue. If anyone would like to be included in this working group they should contact Senator Adamitis. The working group will help to clarify the benefits of diversity on our campus and all that is entailed by it. Senator Thompson felt that the concept of diversity needed to be considered more broadly to include such things as religious diversity on campus. There will be a number of upcoming events related to diversity. Existing diversity groups on campus include, the study abroad program, HOLA, Global Captains, Club Italiana, the Asian Studies Program and a few others. The Faculty Senate has hosted the committee on Religious Dialogue and Diversity, chaired by Professor Redick. A new student equality and diversity council has also been formed. Next year, we can expect to hear more from some of these groups. Unfortunately, it remains true that many faculty are not aware of all that is taking place in the area of diversity at CNU. By doing a quick survey of Senators, it is clear that we as a University must do a better job of communicating these endeavors. Senators agreed that department chairs should be doing more to keep faculty aware of these issues. President Adamitis volunteered to put together some information, announcing many of the things going on at CNU regarding diversity, and give this to Senators at our April meeting.

Safe Zone training began in the fall semester. Any community member who is interested in being a support person for the LGBTQ community should participate. This will require two training sessions in which issues that this particular group face will be discussed. During the

training, the trainee receives resources and guidance. For one, you will learn how to counsel and help students from the LGBTQ community. Safe Zone training will continue to be conducted on a regular basis. Senators expressed their concern that more departments should involve Safe Zone in the future.

### 3. Student Life subcommittee (Senator Manning)

The theme of the meeting for February was athletics. CNU sponsors 23 varsity sports (10 male, 11 female, 2 co-ed); approximately 600 students compete each year. CNU ranks third in the Learfield Sports Directors' Cup and has the highest overall winning percentage (229-99-4 overall record; .696 winning pct.) of the Division II/III and NAIA schools in Virginia. NCAA participants for Fall 2014 include women's cross country, men's and women's soccer, football, and volleyball. With regard to academic performance, 18% of student-athletes were on the Dean's List in Fall 2014, 49% had a GPA of 3.0 or higher and the current overall GPA for student athletes is 2.91.

The Athletics department pays careful attention to the student-athlete experience. In particular, they monitor student-athlete compliance with behavioral expectations of the CNU community. Mr. Brooks shared the discipline statement that all athletes sign, which is essentially a 4-strikes policy.

### **Admissions**—Information pulled directly from the BOV report

"The fall 2015 freshmen enrollment goal is 1225. Admission and scholarship applications are both keeping pace with this time last year, and we are on track to enroll another excellent class. March 15 will be our final notification date for Regular Decision applicants, as well as for those who were initially deferred through Early Decision and Early Action. We offered admission to more Early Action students on the January 15 notification date than last year, while maintaining preferred academic profile standards. It will therefore be more competitive than ever to gain admission to CNU through the final Regular Decision round this year."

### **Enrollment**

Mid-year retention for the Fall 2014 freshman class indicates that 95% returned for spring semester, which is the same as last year. Student Success Initiatives include Signing Day (991 students participated), peer tutoring through the Center for Academic Success (over 2,700 student individual and group tutoring sessions this past fall semester), outreach to students through the Center for Academic Success (3,133 individual students with over 8,200 interactions with students this past fall semester).

In fall 2014, students had 1,346 contacts with employers (26% increase from fall 2015); 583 organizations posted jobs, participated in campus interviews or the career fair, or hosted information sessions or site visits. The Career Center staff had 5,292 contacts with students (2,669 individual students) (13% increase from fall 2015; 115% increase from the past three years.)

Customized class schedules and learning communities are currently being built for the new Fall 2015 freshmen. There is a pilot program for Intensive Learning Communities in which the core advisor will teach one of the class sections in the learning community.

#### 4. BOV University Advancement subcommittee (Senator Martin)

There are two more years remaining in the Capital Campaign. To date, the campaign has raised \$40.7 million of the \$42 million goal. Of particular interest to faculty is the newly created Lighthouse fund. The Lighthouse fund is a special endowment being created to help students who encounter any sudden financial need. Students cannot apply themselves to the Lighthouse fund. They must be nominated by someone on campus. Nominations are to go to the Provost's office.

#### B. Elections Update

The ballot for University standing committee seats is almost ready to go out to faculty. The University has purchased a Qualtrics account which will be utilized for the construction of the ballots. Vice President Manning is waiting on a few more nominations. There is the existing handbook proposal to combine the FRC and the FGC into one committee. Given that the vote remains to be completed on this proposal, Senator Manning suggested that we should hold off on making our election ballot indicative of this combination. The deadline for nominations to committees has passed.

#### C. Academic Standing Committee Updates

There is a Title IX working group of which President Adamitis is a member along with the three University lawyers as well as Cindi Perry, Lori Westphal and Michelle Moody. Their task is to come up with a comprehensive policy related to Title IX. There are multiple challenges. For one, there are no established best practices to follow. At both the Federal and the State levels policies governing universities are still in development. CNU must have some policy in place by July. It will be difficult to obtain as much faculty feedback as the working group desires given this July deadline. Michelle Moody and Maureen Matsen will present an update at the April Senate meeting with the President and Provost on Title IX at CNU. An open session with the working group on Title IX is planned for the time period between finals and graduation. Any faculty may attend. This will be a good opportunity to obtain more information on potential new policies for handbook inclusion.

Additional training related to Title IX will take place next academic year. Also in the weeks to come, information will be disseminated regarding the 1990 CLERY act. The CLERY act requires publication of an annual security report, crime logs and statistics, and timely notification of crimes on or near college campuses. The working group hopes to create simplified guidelines for faculty at CNU on CLERY and Title IX. This will include resources available to faculty and under what circumstances faculty are to report offenses to Michelle Moody.

The IDEA committee has created a document to help all evaluators in their work. The document offers clear guidance on how one can interpret IDEA information. It will be another aid in guaranteeing consistency of evaluation across the University. President Adamitis will send this document to all Senators in advance of the April meeting.

There is the perception among many faculty that the IDEA results are the sole means of evaluating teaching performance at CNU. The IDEA committee is considering what other instruments that we, as a faculty, would like to include as part of teaching evaluations. After this is determined, the IDEA committee plans to address the follow up issue as to how these potential extra instruments would be weighted.

The LLC recently put forward language, for possible handbook inclusion, that attempts to guarantee that future student assessment results be kept separate from faculty evaluation. In three places within Section XII of the CNU Faculty Handbook, the LLC suggests including one additional sentence. "Data collected for assessment purposes cannot be used for faculty review". The LLC rationale for this is as follows: As part of the process of developing assessment plans for the Liberal Learning Core Curriculum, questions have arisen regarding the appropriate use of randomly collected assessment data. In order to reassure faculty who teach in the LLC that the data collected will only be used anonymously and in aggregate form, the LLC requests additions to the *CNU Faculty Handbook*, Section XII, "Instructional Faculty Personnel Regulations." The LLC also would like similar language to be incorporated into the new adjunct handbook. Senators commended the LLC for being so proactive in this action.

## **V. Old Business**

### **B. Handbook Proposals**

The Provost, Vice-Provosts, and the Deans reviewed the suggested handbook changes for this year. They have conveyed to the Senate a few questions. During this academic year, the Senate has been working on streamlining academic standing committees at CNU. To prevent a faculty member from having multiple votes on curricular matters, the Senate agreed that it would be better to update handbook language so that no faculty member may serve on multiple curricular committees simultaneously. The question that has arisen is whether the University Degrees committee should be subject to this policy. In particular, the question put to the Senate is whether or not the UDC is a curricular committee. At least one Senator had been on both the UDC and another curricular committee at the same time. This Senator provided a number of examples of how the UDC does hold sway with curricular decisions. Undoubtedly the majority of the UDC's work involves reviewing student's petitions concerning undergraduate degree requirements and making recommendations thereon. However, over the years, the UDC has become one of the foremost committees to envision and identify curricular deficiencies and problems. If a committee member is free of other curricular allegiances they are more likely to be open to identifying curricular deficiencies. After much discussion by Senators it was felt that the UDC should be considered a curricular committee and that the proposed handbook language is appropriate. In particular under Section XVIII University Governance, part 3 (Standing Committees of the University-Membership) the

University Handbook should read, “no member may serve on more than one of the following standing committees at the same time: any college curriculum committee, Undergraduate Curriculum Committee, Undergraduate Degrees Committee, or Liberal Learning Council.”

The administration had additional suggestions regarding wording for the Council on Health Professions Preparation (CHPP). Our current language states that this committee reports to the Vice Provost for Research, Graduate Studies and Assessment. The administration thought that it would be more appropriate to have this committee report to the Dean of the College of Natural and Behavioral Sciences. Their reason for this is that the faculty who serve on this committee are more directly related to that particular college. After discussion, no Senator had any concerns about making this change to handbook proposal #4. Another suggestion by the administration was to end term limits for members on the CHPP. Members of this committee undergo substantial training. This change was approved by Senators. However, Senators want this committee to continue to follow the two year election cycle. This will allow for faculty to naturally rotate off of the CHPP if it is necessary for them to do so.

The Provost has voiced that he would prefer to keep the IDEA committee as being a Provost appointed committee. We did not receive further word as to why he wanted the IDEA committee to be formed in this way, so the SEC will ask his reasons at the next SEC/Provost meeting. Provost Doughty is also suggesting that one of the appointees to the FRC committee continue to be made by the Provost instead of the Faculty Senate.

President Adamitis was sent a revised version on the wording for the Honors faculty to be included in the faculty handbook. It was suggested by the administration that the first sentence of section 14 on the Honors faculty is to instead read as, “The Honors Faculty, recommended by the Director and appointed by the Vice Provost for Undergraduate education, assists...” This change was deemed appropriate by all Senators.

Proposed handbook change #4 included some minor wording changes to the Prestigious Scholarships Committee (PSC). The Faculty Senate suggested change has the CNU Fellowships coordinator being appointed by the Faculty Senate. The administration’s view is that the appointment to the CNU Fellowship Coordinator should come from the Vice Provost for Undergraduate Education. Given that the PSC is more a student-oriented than a faculty-oriented committee, the Senate’s view was that having the coordinator being appointed by the Vice Provost for Undergraduate Education seems appropriate. Moreover, the administration seeks to have no term limits for members of the PSC and Senators agreed with this recommendation. However, the Senate suggests that members of the committee continue to undergo the usual two year election cycle.

Discussion next turned to the Undergraduate Curriculum Committee. President Adamitis asked Senators about their feelings on the UCC having term limits. The learning curve required to serve on the UCC makes this a legitimate question of concern. Without any term

limits, a member could in theory remain on the committee indefinitely. The final decision among senators was to allow three consecutive two year terms on the UCC.

### **Senate Recommendation:**

The Faculty Senate recommends that all committees need some form of training.

Additionally, one of the changes that we as a Senate could recommend is that all university standing committees begin to create guiding documents for the workings of their committee. For example, in the UCC, a checklist could be crafted that would guide a committee member through the steps of considering a proposal. Such guidelines could then be passed along to new members upon joining a committee and lead to an overall improved committee performance.

Next the faculty senate took up consideration of the administration's rebuttal of our wording change to the UCC handbook language. The context for the senate making a change was that the UCC committee itself recommended to us that department chairs not be allowed to serve on the UCC. The administration suggested that we reconsider this suggested change. The language does seem redundant to senators since the curriculum committees are already composed exclusively of department chairs. Senator Hasbrouck suggested that we allow for department chairs to serve on the UCC with the advice that they excuse themselves from any item that would be considered a conflict. All Senators decided to keep the proposed language as we have fashioned it.

The Provost has also suggested changing the name of the University Assessment and Evaluation Committee to the University Assessment Committee. This prompted discussion of whether or not the UAEC should be a Faculty Senate appointed committee or Provost appointed committee. Due to other matters to be discussed, the Senate decided to come back to the wording on the UAEC at a future meeting.

## **V. Old Business:**

### **A. Lecturer Proposal**

We would like the proposal to include language that Instructors at CNU can negotiate their years of service as Instructors at CNU toward the length of teaching requirements written for Master/Senior Lecturer status. Fortunately, the Provost has reiterated that it is not the intention of the Lecturer proposal to ever shift positions away from Instructors. In the future, the Senate will conduct a discussion about how best to reward individual Instructors (beyond Emeritus status) for their long-standing good service to the students of CNU.

Before approval of the Lecturer proposal, faculty senators discussed that a strategic plan must first be agreed upon. Many concerns voiced at the town hall meeting addressed the tenure /lecturer ratio at CNU. The Senate agreed that proactive strategic planning would

greatly alleviate these concerns. Such strategic planning should be collaborative between faculty, department chairs and the deans.

**Senate Resolution:**

A five year plan for academic years 2015 through 2020 will be created which will indicate how to proceed with the following:

- a) a planned move toward a 75-25 institutional ratio;
- b) potential promotion of lecturers who wish to apply for conversion based on institutional need and individual performance in the short term;
- c) determine how multi-year contracts will be staggered amongst departments, over the long term, as per the proposed Handbook language;
- d) meet institutional goals regarding class size; and
- e) limit adjunct usage to an institutional average of no more than 20%.

Part (e) spurred a question from Senator Thompson as to what does the 20% specifically refer? Is it that, no more than 20% of all classes be taught by adjuncts, or, that no more than 20% of the CNU students be taught by adjuncts? As Senator Thompson pointed out, if many adjuncts are teaching large classes, then a large percentage of students are encountering adjunct instruction. The consensus among Senators on this question was that, as is customary, the 20% would refer to classes. Senator Thompson countered that from a best pedagogical standpoint, the 20% should refer to student exposure. On the other hand, Senator Brash mentioned that pedagogical best practices probably depends upon the discipline of the class as well as the specific subject being taught. Senator Busch asked if the 20% mentioned in part (e) includes part-time faculty. Senators voiced their belief that it should.

Motion to approve the above Senate Resolution: Senator Adamitis

Seconded: Vice President Manning

Vote to Approve: unanimous

It was questioned whether we should add language to the resolution to also report adjunct usage both by the number of classes taught by adjuncts as well as by the number of students affected. No further discussion on this followed.

Senators pointed out that we left the last P&P meeting with a clear message that there will be collaboration between chairs and deans on the above issues. For the final P&P meeting of the year, our plan is to invite the deans. This will help to solidify this message that the strategic plan must be collaborative. Faculty will then feel that they have a voice in planning. We hope that this will lead to a more proactive approach for planning of our institution's future.

Once again, President Adamitis asked if there were any more suggestions for inclusion in the strategic plan. President Adamitis also asks if this strategic plan will be strong enough to make faculty feel comfortable with the 75-25 ratio. One major benefit of the senate resolution



will be its providing ongoing constraints. For example, in the future, department chairs will be able to refer to it when they are asked to do things such as going beyond a 20% adjunct usage.

#### Discussion of Senate Resolution:

Senator Thompson asked if our senate resolution should also include some type of ongoing evaluation of our efforts. Many Senators also asked about the rationale behind having 57% of classes having 19 or fewer students. If we place more students in small classes does this not mean that the other 43% of classes will be expanding in class size? Moreover, could this goal have the unintended consequence of more pronounced adjunct usage? Based upon this discussion, it was put forth by Vice-President Manning that the CISS should conduct additional research on adjunct usage. The response from Senators was that it could overextend the CISS's current charge by too much. Undoubtedly, having percentages regarding student exposure to adjuncts would be valuable information to have. A number of Senators countered that it has not been established that tenured/tenure track faculty always produce a better learning experience than an adjunct. Senator Holland implored that we not become too overreaching in our goals. Senators expressed what seemed to be uniform agreement that (a) through (e) was enough.

Senators next asked, "Has every department had a chance to complete their department EVAL4?" Consensus among Senators was that a few departments had more work to do on their Departmental EVAL4. Regarding the Lecturer Proposal, the Faculty Senate believes that the University should not proceed with the proposal until all departments have submitted their department EVAL-4. For the departments who are behind in their department EVAL4 submission, this will probably not happen until the fall.

**For our April meeting, Senators should review the language for tenure review in the Handbook and make certain that the language includes some reference to Department EVAL4s.**

The Senate next looked very carefully at the wording on the lecturer proposal that is to go into the handbook. One Senator voiced disapproval at the mention of expecting research from a lecturer. This language is included in the revisions to Section XII, 8., f., 3) b). Specifically under each description of the lecturer ranks there is the following sentence. "Research and service are expected of faculty holding the rank of lecturer." This Senator's opinion is that we should expect no research from lecturers. Senators countered that if we have a segment of the AR in which we evaluate research we must include the research requirement. Furthermore, given that some lecturers teach at the 400 level, it seems that they should be engaging themselves in some form of scholarship. Senators countered that scholarship keeps all teaching fresh.

All agreed that we should strike the word research from the Lecturer proposal and replace it with the language used elsewhere, that is, “maintaining a relevant basis of scholarly proficiency in their field.”

Senators then questioned what exactly is meant by maintaining a relevant basis of scholarly proficiency in their field? What kinds of products do we want to see coming from such faculty? It was suggested by one Senator that we could, as a Senate, insist that all departments write out their expectations as a part of their departmental EVAL4s. For example, in order to be promoted to Senior Lecturer, a department would expect certain products. Senator Hunter agreed that without such, there will be no differentiation between a lecturer and a tenure track professor. Senator Nichols pointed out that department EVAL4's descriptions of scholarship need to be very specific. We should encourage departments to not just produce watered down versions of the tenure stream language. This prompted the question of what happens when different departments have very different expectations of scholarship on their department EVAL4s. This was easily answered by the fact that the department EVAL4's are supposed to be a translation of the University EVAL4 and so this should never occur.

At the completion of the Senate's discussion of the Lecturer proposal, a new topic was raised. The question remains as to how do we determine reappointments for one year contract faculty? We will need each department to come up with more specific evaluation standards for lecturers. Senator Hasbrouck questioned the specifics of how lecturers are to be evaluated. He asks if there will be a need for lecturers to complete dossiers in the future? For that matter, lecturers might be unclear as to what constitutes a dossier. At present we will follow the procedures on evaluation that we already have in place for the three year contracts.

At April's meeting we will finish the handbook language. Also we will discuss the final examination schedule and policy.

6:30 Motion to adjourn: unanimous.