

Faculty Senate Minutes
18 November 2016, 3:00-6:00 p.m.
DSU Board Room

Present: Adamitis, Brash, Connable, Donaldson, Gerousis, Grau, Holland, Kennedy, Puaca, Shollen, Thompson, Waldron, Winder

Absent: Timani

I) Call to Order: 3:05 p.m.

II) Presentation by Dr. Michaela Meyer, QEP Director

In February the President announced that Undergraduate Research Literacy would be the focus of our next Quality Enhancement Program (QEP), and in March the Provost's Office appointed a QEP Planning Team comprising nineteen university community members. The larger committee formed four subcommittees, each of which met on a weekly basis throughout the fall semester: Definitions, Assessment, Budget, and PR. Their recommendations at this point are as follows:

Definitions

(text excerpted from the attached powerpoint presentations prepared by Dr. Meyer)

"Information Literacy is a set of abilities requiring individuals to 'recognize when information is needed and have the ability to locate, evaluate, and use effectively the needed information'" (Association of College and Research Libraries).

"Undergraduate Research is an academic inquiry conducted by an undergraduate student which employs discipline-specific methodologies and results in a product notable for its originality, rigor, and/or creativity" (CNU Council for Undergraduate Research).

"Undergraduate Research Literacy is a skill-set that emerges as students learn to recognize, locate, evaluate, and synthesize information necessary to conduct a discipline-specific academic inquiry and produce work notable for its originality, rigor, and creativity." (QEP Strategic Planning Team Hybrid Definition).

Assessment

(text excerpted from the attached powerpoint presentations prepared by Dr. Meyer)

Student Learning Outcomes

SLO #1 – students will be critical consumers of information/research as defined by

demonstrating the ability to (a) access, evaluate, and synthesize information (i.e., information literacy); (b) differentiate, comprehend, and use primary and secondary information/research; (c) demonstrate conventions of academic writing including assessment and use of sources, and aims and practice of argument (i.e., written communication literacy); and (d) determine the reliability, validity, accuracy, authority, timeliness, point of view or bias of information/sources/research/creative work.

SLO #2 – students will have the knowledge and skills necessary to conduct research/create new knowledge as defined by demonstrating (a) the ability to conduct discipline-specific research; and (b) the ability to disseminate information/results appropriate to discipline-specific practices.

Measures

- 1) CLA+
- 2) Discipline Specific Exit Survey
- 3) Embedded Measures (ENGL 223 & Discipline Specific Capstone)

Discussion

There was concern that the assessment plan had too many objectives. When developing the major assessment plan, departments had been instructed not to use and/or or a/b/c lists for individual student learning objectives, yet this plan does. Dr. Meyer indicated that the Office of Assessment is involved in the process and that we will follow best practices.

Budget

The projected expenses include a QEP director, administrative support, office expenses, marketing, assessment, student project support (Summer Scholars, Spring/Fall Scholars, Scholarships, Student Travel) and Faculty Project Support (Research/Creative Activity Materials, Faculty Travel, Adjunct Cost for Course Release, Summer Stipend). Total projected funding for next year is \$286,824.00, with the goal of increasing support for student and faculty projects each year for a period of five years for total projected funding of \$622,452.48 in 2022-2023. The most significant expenses include the QEP director and student project support. The attached powerpoint contains a detailed 5-year sample budget.

Discussion

The Senate discussed the budget for some time, focusing especially on the QEP Director. The salary listed on the sample budget is \$105,000.00, and the position on that document is titled “Faculty Director,” so Senators wondered whether this was a faculty position. The figure provided for the salary includes benefits, so the base salary would

be around \$70-75K. The position will be administrative, but faculty members would be eligible for it. The Director's job would be to liaise with the faculty, Undergraduate and Graduate Research Council (UGRC) and a variety of administrative offices to oversee student and faculty project support, assessment and PR. Given the added cost of the salary and the current budget shortfall, some Senators wondered whether adding a Director position was necessary. Would it be possible for the UGRC or a faculty member with course releases, or a combination of the two, to oversee undergraduate research? The QEP committee thinks that a dedicated position is necessary to move forward with all component of the proposed QEP plan.

4:05 p.m.: Mulryan arrives

PR

Students submitted ideas for a PR slogan, where were reviewed by the committee and focus groups. The winner is: Research Lens.

Implementation

(text excerpted from the attached powerpoint presentations prepared by Dr. Meyer)

The proposed plan is as follows:

1. Office of Undergraduate Research and Creative Activities

- Will be responsible for long term follow through on implementation and assessment of QEP (key from last review cycle).
- UGRC will serve as the faculty advisory board for this office – ideally the research component will be faculty led, with the office providing administrative support for university initiatives.
- Hire full-time faculty director of this office to provide administrative support.
- Current Implementation Ideas sheet could be a starting agenda for this office and the advisory board.
- Creation of this office needs to occur in year 0/1.

2. Library Information Literacy Program

- Expand the library's role in helping establish information literacy best practices in our undergraduate classrooms.
- Increase holdings and library resources.
- Assess faculty perceptions of the role of information literacy in their disciplines by surveys and focus groups in year 2. Implement findings in year 3 and beyond.

3. Faculty Development Program in Undergraduate Research

- Workshops, CET, etc.
- Pilot programs on campus to help faculty lead undergraduate research effectively.
- Creation of these programs can be ongoing, with some starting in year 0/1.

4. Faculty Compensation Plan

- Provide ways to compensate faculty through “credits” (potentially similar to structure in place for graduate education) at the undergraduate level.
- Create plan for this by year 2 to be implemented in year 3 (at latest).

5. Develop Undergraduate Research Funding/Opportunities

- Combine university resources to support travel into a central account.
- Task the Office of UGRCA and faculty advisory board with locating, pulling together all programs on campus that currently offer funding.
- Audit funding resources and determine a fair and equitable plan for distribution of funds among consumables, start-up funding and travel funding.
- Create plan for this by year 2 to be implemented in year 3 (at latest).

III) International Studies Advisory Committee Report by Dr. Todd Goen, ISAC Chair

Last spring the Senate developed some recommendations for enhancing study abroad as part of the discussion of the Six Year Plan. The ISAC reviewed the Senate’s recommendations and provided a memo offering their thoughts on the Senate recommendations. Dr. Goen reviewed the memo with the Senate at the meeting. The full text of the memo dated 15 October 2016 is below:

Per the request of Faculty Senate President Adamitis and the Faculty Senate, the ISAC considered the Faculty Senate Recommendations on Study Abroad at its regular meeting on 7 September with continued discussion of these ideas at its regular meetings on 5 October and 2 November. Many of the recommendations contained in this document align with the current work of the ISAC. Indeed, the ISAC began discussions of a number of items outlined in these recommendations during the previous academic year and continued discussion is on the ISAC’s agenda for this academic year. As part of this process, Goen, the ISAC chair, met with Vice-Provost Kidd to discuss the feasibility of these recommendations given administrative priorities and funding. This memorandum addresses the ISAC’s view on each part of the recommendations.

Part I: Educational Experience and Authenticity

As the ISAC discussed each of the recommendations contained under this heading two consistent themes emerged through which the committee believes the Faculty Senate must examine the future of study abroad. First, study abroad is one of the four pillars of the institution. Yet, there seems to be no clear vision for what this pillar should be. In short, the committee finds itself asking the question: What is the function of study abroad at CNU? The Senate recommendations offer suggestions for the future of study abroad at CNU. Overall, the ISAC is in agreement with many of the recommendations offered by the Senate. However, the ISAC is uncertain as to whether these recommendations fit into the institutional goals for study abroad. There needs to be a clear articulation of this pillar to ensure all constituents engaged

with study abroad (faculty, administrators, students, and staff) have a clear understanding of the purpose of study abroad at CNU. The committee is hesitant to move forward with these ideas without a clear plan/direction for the future of study abroad. As such, the committee conducted a review of the missions and goals of a number of CNU's peer and aspirant institutions and is currently in the process of developing a mission/goal statement for study abroad at CNU. The ISAC intends to provide the Faculty Senate with a proposed mission and goals by the end of this semester, and Vice-Provost Kidd indicated there is administrative support for such a mission/goals statement.

Second, the ISAC has a number of concerns regarding the feasibility of the Senate recommendations given the current state of resources directed toward study abroad. The ISAC's general concern is the study abroad pillar is largely an unfunded mandate to increase the number of students studying abroad. While the committee firmly believes many of the Senate recommendations would move the university closer to the goal of the mandate to increase the number of students studying abroad, *all* of the Senate recommendations require university resources to ensure their success. The ISAC is uncertain as to whether or not the university has resources to dedicate to these recommendations. If the institution does not have the capacity to direct resources to these recommendations, the ISAC is uncertain as to both their viability and feasibility. The ISAC is willing to undertake planning for some of the changes recommended by the Senate, but is not prepared to institute these changes until such time as there is sufficient funding to guarantee their success. Vice-Provost Kidd indicated it is unlikely there will be additional funds to devote to these initiatives in the coming two years, which the Provost echoed in his 8 November All Faculty Meeting.

The ISAC believes a PR campaign to promote study abroad is an excellent idea and would be glad to oversee its development. The committee believes the campaign should begin targeting students for study abroad prior to their first semester (e.g., Setting Sail) to maximize the opportunities for students to study abroad. We would like to see a campus-wide initiative with different message strategies for different populations. While faculty should play a significant role in promoting study abroad (both institutionally and departmentally), we think there are a number of opportunities for faculty and students to partner as part of this campaign. Further, we recommend collecting data with regard to current students' thoughts/perceptions regarding study abroad prior to undertaking such a campaign as much of the committee's information is anecdotal. Additional data are necessary for strategic messaging and the success of such a campaign. The ISAC plans to begin work on this project in Spring 2017.

The committee fully supports a wholesale revision to summer study abroad. Indeed, many members of the committee have discussed this idea for the past few years. The ISAC has a number of ideas with regard to what this might look like (e.g., summer institutes, minors offered abroad, etc.), and how such a revision might inform a PR campaign designed to enroll more students in study abroad. Further, a

number of opportunities exist for internships abroad. If such a revision is to occur, the *ISAC believes faculty should be the drivers of a deliberative process to develop an effective summer study abroad program that is both attractive to students and meets the institutional mission of study abroad.* The committee agrees with the Senate recommendation to shift the focus of CNU's study abroad initiative away from major specific programs to programs addressing the core curriculum (foundations and areas of inquiry). However, there are some institutional barriers to such a redesign the ISAC believes must be addressed prior to commencing work toward this goal. First, there is a lack of clarity with regard to what courses can(not) be taught abroad. Committee members remember a time when university administrators would not permit area of inquiry courses to be taught abroad. Current administrators do not seem to hold the same view, but we are uncertain as to what the rules are. There needs to be a clear articulation of what is (not) permissible with regard to study abroad course offerings before any attempt at revision. Second, this recommendation will require significant resources for both the design and implementation of such a change. Vice- Provost Kidd was very receptive to the idea of a summer institute. The ISAC is moving forward to begin tentative plans for a summer institute. The initial work will be a proposal for administrators with regard to a vision and detailed plan for such an institute. However, success of such a plan is contingent on funding and institutional support, which Goen clearly indicated to Vice-Provost Kidd. Early planning is also necessary to address some of the concerns regarding rules/policies, etc. The Vice-Provost indicated a clear willingness to work with the committee on such a proposal. The ISAC intends to be deliberative with regard to this proposal to ensure its success and utility as a model for future programs, acknowledging the earliest possible date for such a program to begin would be summer 2019.

The Global Diversity Distinction program has great merit as does the work to obtain membership in a study abroad related honors society, Phi Beta Delta (PBD). The committee has a number of ideas for the development of a Global Diversity Distinction program that would fit the university's mission. However, a variety of institutional resources would need to be directed toward the program. The committee believes program design is critical to the success of such an initiative, but it is willing to undertake such an endeavor provided the resources to do so. The ISAC explored membership in PBD during the last academic year, but decided against applying for membership as CNU does not meet the membership requirements. While the university needs to make improvements to study abroad and support for international faculty to strengthen its application for PBD membership, the major concern of the ISAC is the lack of support and programming for international students on campus. This is a significant component of international education overlooked at CNU. While there are some institutional resources in support of exchange students, there is no support for the bulk of international students at CNU. Further, the campus resources associated with recruiting and enrolling international students at CNU are so decentralized the ISAC had trouble determining the offices and personnel who perform these tasks during its review of the PBD application last academic year. The ISAC would gladly

spearhead both of these initiatives provided the institutional resources existed to ensure their success. However, Vice-Provost Kidd indicated resources are not available at this time to support these initiatives; thus, the ISAC is not pursuing activities related to them.

Part II: Administrative Support

The ISAC wholeheartedly supports the Senate recommendations with regard to improving administrative support for study abroad at CNU. As all voting members of the ISAC are faculty with previous experience leading study abroad, the committee is intimately acquainted with the challenges consistent understaffing in the study abroad office presents to the development of a vibrant study abroad program at CNU. Further, this directly impacts students' abilities to study abroad. For example, the study abroad office provided less advising for students who wanted to explore their options for education abroad last year to ensure it was able to meet the institutional requirements of the internal audit. Further, it is problematic to ask an office to perform a task and not provide the office with the requisite tools to do so. Some of the recommendations for increased administrative support are policy level concerns, which leads the ISAC to conclude there needs to be a greater institutional focus (i.e., a focus beyond the study abroad office). For example, the lack of Banner access for the study abroad office is the result of a policy designed to protect student records that is actually having an adverse impact on students with regard to study abroad. While the Senate works to address challenges such as these, it should conduct a review of the current campus infrastructure connected to study abroad to ensure there are no other policies adversely impacting student enrollment in education abroad programs.

The ISAC notes the Senate's recommendation for administrative support focuses on the study abroad office. While this is the most critical office to receive additional support, expanding administrative support for study abroad requires attention to the institution as a whole. Moving forward with the initiatives in part one will require additional support for the study abroad office, but it will also require additional support for other offices on campus. For example, an increased number of students studying abroad in semester long exchanges will require more work on the part of the registrar's office as well as housing and financial aid. The development of a Global Diversity Distinction program would require additional administrative support from some portion of the institution as well. The Senate needs to explore the needs for administrative support across the entire institution in addition to its focus on the study abroad office. Strategic planning with regard to study abroad would provide greater insight into these needs as well as offer recommendations for how to achieve administrative support for all aspects of study abroad.

The ISAC notes the IDST recommendation is already in progress.

Overall, the ISAC supports the Senate Recommendations on Study Abroad, and is willing to undertake the planning, execution, and development of some these

recommendations given current financial and administrative support. However, the ISAC needs guarantees of additional institutional support and resources to ensure the success of all of these initiatives. The ISAC believes the Senate should advocate for additional resources given study abroad is one of the institution's pillars, and one which will be unsuccessful without additional support. The committee thanks the Faculty Senate for the opportunity to provide feedback on these recommendations, and will respond to any questions or concerns the Senate has regarding its feedback.

The Faculty Senate thanks the ISAC for these thoughtful recommendations and will take them all under advisement.

Break: 4:50-5:00 p.m.

IV) Open Letter to Campus Community: Dr. Danielle Stern

Dr. Stern reported that students had approached faculty with concerns about the divisive nature of the presidential election. At an informal gathering, they vented their frustrations and fears and were upset that Christopher Newport had not issued a statement supporting its commitment to diversity, inclusion and non-discrimination, as other universities were doing. President Tribble did, in fact, publish such a statement on behalf of the University that was shared with all faculty and students later that week. In response to the student gathering, some faculty in attendance drafted a letter addressing students' concerns that they intended to publish in the *Captain's Log*. After word spread about the letter and several other faculty members expressed an interest in signing, the authors decided to provide all faculty should have an opportunity to endorse the letter. Given that this letter would be circulated to all faculty members, Dr. Stern thought it appropriate to inform the Senate about it.

The Faculty Senate could not endorse the letter, because Senators did not have time to consult with their constituents first. However, the Senate agreed that President Adamitis could email the letter to the faculty on behalf of Dr. Stern and several Senators offered comments on the text. The primary concern was that the letter should avoid political partisanship and instead focus on reaffirmation of our commitment to non-discrimination and the open exchange of ideas. Multiple faculty reported that the tenor of their classes had changed after the election and that students did not want to engage in open discussion out of fear—some because of the way they had voted. It would be important, therefore, for the letter make it clear that its message was intended for all students. Some Senators thought that having a university-wide diversity statement would have helped and even perhaps obviated the need for a letter, but the one that the Senate is developing is still in progress. The conversation then turned to the future, as

at least some of the issues at stake during the election will likely remain at the forefront of U.S. politics. Some wondered where these issues are covered in the curriculum, because we need to ensure our students are informed about them from multiple perspectives.

V) Approval of October Meeting Minutes

Motion: Adamitis moved to approve the October minutes. Kennedy seconded.

Vote in Favor: Adamitis, Brash, Connable, Donaldson, Gerousis, Holland, Kennedy, Shollen, Thompson, Waldron, Winder

Abstain: Grau and Puaca

VI) Reports

A) President's Report

- 1) Faculty Statement on Diversity:
- 2) Website Updates:

B) Academic Standing Committee Reports

- 1) ISAC (see Section III above)

VII) Unfinished Business

A) Pass-Fail Option for Study Abroad Programs

Time was running short, so the Senate moved out of order to VII B. The Pass-Fail issue will be discussed in the spring.

B) Revised Budget Advisory Committee (BAC) Memo

The Senate decided at an earlier meeting to combine the older version of the memo concerning budget reductions with the newer version of the memo outlining priorities for funding growth. A combined document was presented for a first reading, and the Senate will vote in January.

C) Faculty Development Committee

- 1) Recommendation on changing FDG procedures: The Senate will review this recommendation in January.
- 2) Recommendations for Fall FDG Awards

5:55 p.m. Kennedy moved to go into closed session, and Grau seconded.

5:59 p.m. The Senate exits closed session.

Motion: Puaca moved to approve the subcommittee recommendations, and Waldron seconded.

Vote in Favor: Unanimous

D) *Handbook* Language on Curriculum: Senate Vote

The feedback from the Provosts and Deans included a recommendation for adding an appeal process for decisions made by the Curriculum Review Committee. The relevant text in the *Handbook* proposal is as follows:

(a) Appeal of a CRC Denial

- (i) In the instance that the CRC votes to reject a proposal, the minority may choose to request an appeal to the full CRC and Provost under specific circumstances:
 - (i) A full college delegation (i.e. dean plus faculty members) who are members of the voting minority with the support of the sponsoring department may request an appeal; or
 - (ii) Five members of the voting minority with the support of the sponsoring department may request an appeal.
- (ii) In either of these circumstances, a representative of the minority requesting the appeal (hereafter the requesting party) informs the chair of the CRC within ten (10) business days of the original vote with the names of the minority requesting the appeal.
- (iii) The appeal process is as follows:
 - (i) The requesting party writes a rebuttal to the CRC in conjunction with the sponsoring department.
 - (ii) The CRC and Provost meet to hear the appeal of the requesting party. The requesting party along with appropriate faculty sponsors present the appeal for consideration.
 - (iii) Alterations to the appeal may only be made with consent of the CRC. During the appeal meeting, any member of the CRC may request a CRC vote on any alteration.
 - (iv) The Provost determines the outcome of the appeal, providing one of the three options.
 - 1. Approve the original appeal as presented by the requesting party.
 - 2. Approve a modified appeal with the consent of the CRC.
 - 3. Deny the appeal.

The appeal by a full college delegation serves as a check against a “college block” and especially protects Luter, which will have only one faculty member and a Dean on the committee. The 5-member minority appeal addresses all other denials. Having 5 voting members on the minority differentiates this appeal from the full college delegation, which has up to 4 members; it also requires at least one-third of the committee participate in the appeal, which will help ensure the viability of the appeal. The Provost will decide appeals. However, the Provost must attend a committee meeting and discuss the appeal with the committee and representatives from the sponsoring faculty group prior to decision-making, which ensures allows

for open communication throughout the entire process. This provision, in addition to the requirement that justifications for all decisions must be provided in writing, safeguards transparency. The stipulation that the CRC vote on alterations to the proposal that emerge during the appeals process ensures faculty participation throughout the curricular process.

After reviewing the appeals process, President Adamitis asked whether Senators had heard objections to having the deans on the Curriculum from faculty outside the Undergraduate Curriculum Committee and the Department of Leadership and American Studies. Senators reported that they had not. One Senator pointed out that the Council of University Chairs had just met with the Deans, where the topic of power differentials between faculty and administrators was raised; the Deans thought that we could successfully negotiate this difference.

Motion: Puaca moved to approve the *Handbook* proposal on curriculum, and Kennedy seconded.

Vote in Favor: Adamitis, Brash, Connable, Donaldson, Gerousis, Grau, Holland*, Kennedy, Puaca, Thompson, Waldron, Winder

Vote Against: Shollen

*Holland voted by proxy.

VIII) Adjournment at 6:10 p.m.