

**Faculty Senate Minutes**  
**26 August 2016, 3:00-6:00 p.m.**  
**DSU Harrison Room**

Senators Present: Adamitis, Brash, Connable, Donaldson, Gerousis, Grau, Holland, Kennedy, Mulryan (arrives 4:05), Puaca, Shollen, Thompson, Timani (leaves 4:38), Waldron (arrives 3:33), Winder

Guest: Dr. Michaela Meyer, COMM

I) Call to Order: 3:06 p.m.

II) Guest Presentation by Dr. Michaela Meyer

A) Presentation

Dr. Meyer shared concerns about the current evaluation process. She began by providing background on an issue that President Adamitis had raised at the August all faculty meeting in response to faculty questions about how to interpret the “no recommendation” judgment by the Faculty Review Committee (FRC). Dr. Meyer, who has served as chair of the FRC, reported that the “no recommendation” option was part of a larger restructuring of the FRC that took place when the former College of Liberal Arts and Sciences moved to a three-college model. One important observation made at the time was that the FRC very rarely voted not to support a candidate, even when there was clear evidence that the candidate had not met minimum expectations for tenure and/or promotion. While it is natural for a faculty committee to *want* to support colleagues, supporting *all* candidates regardless of the strength of the dossier ultimately weakens the committee’s voice in the evaluation process and hence impedes real faculty governance. The expectation moving forward was that the FRC would, when warranted, make the hard choice not to support a candidate or to reappoint with reservations.

The restructured FRC comprised three tenured faculty from each college, plus one tenured faculty member appointed by the Provost for a total of ten members. The committee discussed options for breaking ties and ultimately determined that a tie vote would be allowed. At that time the EVAL-8 did not record how many members voted to support or not support a candidate, so “no recommendation” was added to the form as an option to indicate a tied vote. A few years ago, however, the EVAL-8 was changed so that the FRC is now required to indicate how many members voted for or against support, and how many abstained. The “no recommendation” option remained on the form and now can potentially indicate an outcome other than a tie. More specifically, it seems that “no recommendation” can mean there was insufficient information to make a decision and so multiple committee members

abstained. There are two issues here: (1) The *Handbook* allows all reviewing bodies to ask questions and request additional information, so a “no recommendation” based on lack of evidence should not be possible; the FRC should seek more information before rendering a decision. (2) The “no recommendation” option essentially leaves the University-level decision to the administration with no faculty input at that level.

The second issue Dr. Meyer raised concerned promotion to full professor. Part of the philosophy behind the DRC’s and FRC’s membership criteria is that the reviewers are faculty who have already achieved the rank sought by candidates, hence the requirement of tenure. While this philosophy works well for decisions regarding tenure and promotion to associate professor, it does not for decisions regarding promotion to full. Realistically, we do not have enough full professors to populate a university-level committee that reviews candidates for full professor, let alone individual DRC’s. So how do we stay true to the spirit of our philosophy in the case of promotion to full?

A third issue is the timing of the FRC reviews, which tends to coincide with the academic advising period, a very busy time for most faculty. Moreover, negotiating the logistics of coordinating a meeting schedule for ten faculty members can be quite challenging. What can we do to ensure that the FRC has sufficient time to meet? Problems of scheduling could prevent the FRC from asking for clarification when they need it, which would avoid a “no recommendation”—that is, the committee may not have enough time to develop their questions, obtain feedback and re-evaluate.

Finally, the *Handbook* allows DRC members to come from outside the candidate’s college with permission of the Provost, which makes good sense for candidates whose work spans multiple disciplines. However, there is a perception that the administration does not want to approve DRC members from outside the candidate’s college.

## B) Senate Discussion

The Senate began by discussing the philosophy behind having an FRC and the relationship of the DRC to the FRC. In general, the thinking was that the DRC’s recommendation should carry heavy weight, especially in the area of research, since the DRC members have background in the candidate’s discipline. The FRC then functions as part of a check-and-balance system. Its primary task is not to reduplicate the work of the DRC, but to evaluate the DRC’s recommendation against the standards for tenure and/or promotion articulated in the University and

relevant Departmental EVAL-4's and the evidence provided in the dossier. In other words: Did the DRC follow procedures and uphold their own written standards? In addition, while DRC evaluations may address institutional need, the FRC should evaluate candidates based on performance only; institutional need falls under the purview of the Provost in consultation with the Dean. Finally, the FRC should render a decision, because not making a recommendation means that the faculty has no voice at the University level in the process, as noted earlier.

In order to function properly, the system just described must rely on DRC's to recommend non-reappointment or reappointment with reservations, when warranted. Otherwise, the DRC's authority is diminished, and other reviewing bodies will assign less weight to all recommendations coming from that department, which will ultimately have a negative effect on positive recommendations coming from the department. However, such decisions can be quite difficult to make at the DRC level, as the DRC members work most closely with candidates on a daily basis, unlike FRC members or administrators, who will quite likely not have to interact with the candidate after making an unfavorable decision. Anecdotal evidence presented at the meeting suggested that our DRC's have a strong tendency to vote in favor of the candidate, even when problems are evident. So how can we ensure that the system is working?

#### C) Senate Action Plan

The Senate will form an ad hoc committee to address these issues, with representation from each college/school; some members should have prior experience on the FRC. The committee should provide recommendations on the following:

- (a) the philosophy governing the process and the roles of each reviewing body
- (b) whether to allow an outcome of "no recommendation" from the FRC
- (c) procedure and standards for promotion to full professor

The Senate noted that the Departmental EVAL-4's will play an important role in resolving some of these issues. The purpose of the DE-4 is twofold: (1) to point out which items on the University EVAL-4 apply to each discipline and how; and (2) to articulate departmental standards for promotion at all ranks and tenure. As per the 16-17 *University Handbook*, all reviewing bodies must consult the DE-4 when making judgments. Some Senators pointed out that not all departments have reviewed and revised their DE-4's recently, even though the *Handbook* requires departments to do so annually, and that the Deans do not typically remind chairs about the deadline for submitting updated DE-4's. It was suggested that the Senate

add *Handbook* language indicating that reviewing bodies should default to the University EVAL-4 when departments do not have an updated DE-4.

Waldron arrives at 3:33

### III) Approval of April and August Meeting Minutes

Only 15-16 Senators were eligible to vote. The minutes were approved with no amendments.

Vote in Favor: Adamitis, Donaldson, Gerousis, Grau, Holland, Kennedy, Shollen, Thompson, Timani, Waldron, Winder

Vote Against: None

Abstain: Brash

### IV) Reports

A) President's Report: On behalf of the faculty, the Senate wishes to thank Carol Safko for her invaluable contributions to the University. During her career at Christopher Newport, Carol Safko provided essential support for several academic areas, including institutional research and analysis, advising, *Handbook* and curriculum. We have all benefited from her expertise, as well as her outstanding institutional memory, and the University is a much better place for having had her here. We wish Carol all the best for her well deserved retirement.

#### B) April and June BOV Reports

1) *Academic Affairs*: The Provost reported that the university is on pace to achieve its goal of 279 faculty for next year, an increase of four from the previous year. At the pace of 4 positions a year, the university will complete its six year goal of a 300 faculty in 2021. The increase in faculty will result in 195 tenured/tenure stream positions and 84 Lecturer/Instructor positions, bringing the Lecturer/Instructor positions down to 30.1% NNT as opposed to 34.9% of total faculty, moving the university further toward the goal of 25% NNT and 75 Tenured/tenure stream.

The Commonwealth of Virginia has recommended a 3% increase to be effective in December 2016; initial contracts will be the same salary as last year (except in instances of promotions) and salary adjustment letter will be sent to returning faculty in the fall explaining the implementation of their raise.

The Provost also addressed achievements in the Luter School of Business

ranking (top 100 Undergraduate Business Schools according to Bloomberg Businessweek Schools, with high rankings in student rating and internships; see: <http://www.bloomberg.com/features/2016-best-undergrad-business-schools/>), individual student accomplishments, Study Abroad (CNU will soon be able to send students to the University of Glasgow each semester, rather than every other semester), and continuing efforts toward accreditation. Resolutions for Distinguished Professor for Mark Reimer and Emeritus Professor for Shumet Sishagne were passed by the Subcommittee for consideration by the Board of Visitors.

- 2) *Advancement*: The meeting focused primarily on the current campaign and Six-Year plan. Specific points are as follows: The University is seeking to increase endowed professorships. The Lighthouse Fund helps with retention. We give more scholarships, with 106 new ones offered just last year. Parent giving has increased to over \$5 million, and alumni giving has increased.
- 3) *Finance*: The main points raised at the meeting were that we would have a very tight budget in 16-17 and we received very strong pressure from the state to cap our tuition increase at 3%.
- 4) *Student Life*: Dean Rob Lange reported on the increase in applications, particularly out of state applications, as well as the highly competitive efforts of recruiting out-of-state across the nation. Currently 6-9% of the student population is out of state, with a goal of 15% in the future. The Class of 2020 is still being formed, with an estimated size of 1225-1275 depending upon acceptances, which are still ongoing. Increases in funding for President Scholarships have resulted in a 45% yield rate among incoming students; last year it was 23%. Lisa Duncan Raines reported an increase in current first year student retention heading into the fall semester; last year, CNU retained 90.47%; this year, currently, we have retained 90.84%. Over the last ten years, CNU has increased its first year retention rate by 12%; its GPA average by 12%, its first semester Dean's List by 73%, its 6 year graduation rate by 25%, its 5 year graduation rate by 26% and its year graduation rate by 33%. Summer internships (via a survey with a 60% response rate or 757 students) were held by 85% of those surveyed, with nearly 77% of those reporting that this was at least their second internship or job.
- 5) *Buildings and Grounds*: Greek Village will open this fall.

#### Senate Discussion

Some faculty members have commented on the fact that the number of new faculty introduced during Getting Started Week significantly exceeds the number of growth positions we have. Is retention a problem? Who is leaving and why? On a related note, faculty members also have concerns about failed searches. How many searches have failed over the past few years? Why? How much time and money are being expended on failed searches? If there are problems in these areas, how can we address them?

The Senate will ask the Provost for data by rank and college regarding growth lines, replacement lines, and searches.

C) Academic Standing Committee Reports

**All academic standing committees report to the Senate on matters of policy and procedure.** Therefore, all committee recommendations must be reported to the Senate in a timely fashion. Committee chairs should send email updates to the Senate President on a regular basis, or copy the Senate President on meeting minutes.

- 1) *Institutional Review Board*: The IRB reviewed 68 proposals in AY 15-16. Faculty are reminded that the IRB review process needs to be completed before the project requiring IRB approval actually begins.

V) Appointment of Departmental Liaisons

A) College of Arts and Humanities

- 1) ENGL: Timani
- 2) FAAH: Holland
- 3) HIST: Puaca
- 4) MCLL: Adamitis
- 5) MUSC: Holland
- 6) PHIL/RSTD: Timani
- 7) THEA: Adamitis

B) Luter School of Business: Donaldson

C) College of Natural and Behavioral Sciences

- 1) MATH: Kennedy
- 2) MBCH: Grau
- 3) OENB: Thompson
- 4) PCSE: Gerousis
- 5) PSYC: Brash

D) College of Social Sciences

- 1) COMM: Connable

- 2) ECON: Winder
- 3) GOVT: Adamitis
- 4) LAMS: Shollen
- 5) MLSC: Shollen
- 6) SSWA: Waldron

#### VI) Appointment of Liaisons to Academic Standing Committees

President Adamitis will serve as the contact person for Academic Standing Committees. As noted above, Committee chairs should send email updates to the Senate President on a regular basis, or copy the Senate President on meeting minutes.

#### VII) Appointment to Faculty Senate Standing Committees

##### A) *Handbook*: Shollen (Chair), Connable and Grau

*Charge*: Liaise with the standing committee, review proposed *Handbook* changes, and make recommendations to the Senate.

##### B) Faculty Development Grants (FDG's): Donaldson (chair), Gerousis, Timani, Winder

*Charge*: Evaluate applications and make recommendations; convert to an electronic approval process; consider a recommendation to move the FDG process to the college-level.

##### C) Sabbaticals and Faculty Excellence Awards (FEA's) and Sabbaticals: Waldron (chair), Brash, Kennedy, Puaca

*Charge*: Review the application process for FEA's; develop rubrics; set limits on reapplication. Evaluate applications for FEA's and sabbaticals and make recommendations; convert to an electronic approval process.

Mulryan arrives at 4:05 p.m.

##### D) Elections: Kennedy (Chair), Donaldson, Holland, Waldron

*Charge*: Conduct elections for seats on academic standing committees in February.

#### VIII) Unfinished Business: Six-Year Plan

*Background*: Last year the Faculty Senate began a discussion of the Six-Year Plan with the administration and will continue to consult about the plan this year. We identified a few areas on which to focus:

##### A) Study Abroad

A Senate subcommittee recommended the following:

- 1) increase attention to semester and year-long study;

- 2) offer 6-credit summer study abroad programs targeting freshmen and sophomores;
- 3) provide academic recognition for study abroad; and
- 4) provide additional administrative support for the Study Abroad Office so that we may move forward in pursuit of our goals.

#### Senate Discussion

The Senate agreed that we need to make study abroad processes and procedures as administratively smooth as possible for both students and faculty, which will be essential for maintaining and increasing participation. Department chairs should endeavor to be as flexible as possible regarding course approvals for study abroad, and advisors should assist students with scheduling semester or year-long study appropriately. We should also provide support to faculty who are advising students on study abroad, so that they may be as informed as possible. Finally, we should increase our affiliations with institutions abroad and provide support for internships abroad.

4:38 p.m. Senate Breaks  
Timani leaves

4:51 p.m.: Senate Back in Session

#### B) Diversity

The Senate appreciates the increased attention the University has given to diversity initiatives, most notably by forming a Council on Diversity and Inclusion. At the spring meeting with the President and Provost, the Senate presented our thoughts on why diversity and inclusion are essential for a liberal arts education, as well as some suggestions for increasing diversity on campus. As a next step, the subcommittee will draft a statement on the academic importance of diversity and inclusion that we can share with the Council. We'll then suggest that the Council use it as a basis for a University-wide statement that could also help inform their strategic plan.

The Senate was saddened to hear that Ben Cowman, the Assistant Director for Diversity Initiatives, took a position at another institution over the summer. We appreciate the work that he did here and wish him well in his future endeavors. Katie Wellbrock, Associate Dean of Students, and Dominic Burkett, a graduate student from the College of William and Mary, will be working with the SDEC council to keep our diversity and inclusion initiatives moving forward until we can complete



a search for a replacement. Senators pointed out that an increased focus on diversity should strengthen our next PBK application.

Finally, in the context of diversity and inclusion, the Faculty Senate would like to commend Dr. Lori Underwood, Dean of the College of Arts and Humanities, for her invocation and benediction at Freshmen Convocation during Getting Started Week. The passages chosen appropriately addressed the importance of spiritualism within an academic environment and recognized the diversity of beliefs within our campus community by omitting direct or indirect reference to specific religions. The Faculty Senate respectfully requests that Dr. Underwood continue to offer this same invocation and benediction at future convocations.

#### C) Strategic Planning

The Senate recommended in 14-15 and 15-16 that department chairs develop 5-year strategic plans, in which they place quantitative data within the larger contexts of academic best practices by discipline and the University's mission. The Senate provided a template for such a plan, the bulk of which has now been embedded into the appendix of the new Program Review Guidelines. It was not clear to the Senate whether the appendix was mandatory, so we will seek clarification from the Provost's Office.

At this point, the Senate turned its attention to the Delaware Cost Study, which the Provost described during Getting Started Week. There was some confusion as to whether this study was state-mandated or not and how the data would be used and by whom, so the Senate will seek clarification on these issues. The data required by the study, which may be accessed [here](#), is heavily quantitative, focusing on how many student credit hours are taught by faculty in each rank within each discipline. The study also requires information about the direct costs associated with instruction, e.g., salaries and benefits. The Senate voiced concerns about presenting quantitative data that targets direct costs outside of a qualitative context that addresses the University's mission and academic best practices by discipline—especially in the midst of a budget shortfall. Our first step is to get more information about the study, and then we can begin addressing these concerns.

#### IX) New Business

##### A) Budget Advisory Committee Memo: 1<sup>st</sup> Reading

The Senate reviewed last year's BAC memo, which identified priorities for years when we have sufficient funding to move forward on our goals.

B) Faculty Development Grant Schedule for AY 16-17

The subcommittee will propose dates.

C) 16-17 Senate Goals

1) Curriculum: *Handbook* Proposal Working Draft

The Senate spent a good deal of time working on a draft of the *Handbook* language for the curricular revisions. The primary topics of discussion were as follows:

- (a) *Faculty Sponsors*: The Senate wishes to keep the current faculty sponsor model in place, so that sponsors may attend meetings of reviewing bodies and respond directly to questions and/or recommendations. This should be specified in the proposal.
- (b) *Task Forces*: The Provost, Academic Deans and Department Chairs may create Task Forces to develop curricular proposals. The expectation is that such Task Forces would address either interdisciplinary programs or proposals for disciplines that we do not have but wish to add. The Senate recommended specifying that Task Forces must be chaired by a faculty member and that faculty must comprise the majority of members.
- (c) *Communication between departments and reviewing bodies*: The proposal allows four kinds of recommendations by reviewing bodies: approve, approve with conditions, return for clarification and/or revision, and deny. The sponsoring faculty group may respond to these recommendations in multiple ways: agree to the conditions, provide clarification and/or revision, submit a rebuttal, or withdraw the proposal, as appropriate to the recommendation. The question here is: At what point does the sponsoring faculty group respond? To each reviewing body, or just to the EPC? The most efficient point at which this communication should take place—especially for interdisciplinary programs—is at the EPC level. The EPC serves as a reconciling body, so their first task would be to review the recommendations of all lower bodies and integrate these into one comprehensive recommendation, adding their own conditions, requests for clarification/revision, etc., as appropriate. The sponsoring faculty group would then respond to the EPC in writing and send the faculty sponsor to the relevant EPC meeting to answer questions and negotiate details, if needed.
- (d) *Approve with Conditions vs Return for Clarification/Revision*: There was some confusion about the difference between these recommendations, because both result in a revised proposal. In a nutshell, “conditions” are revisions created by the reviewing body, while the sponsoring faculty group bears responsibility for clarification/revision. This explanation makes sense, but we need better terminology for the *Handbook*, so as to avoid confusion.

(e) *Role of the Senate*: In the current system, a sponsoring faculty group may request an opinion from the Senate at any time in the curricular process; issues regarding policies and procedures should also be reported to the Senate. In the proposal, the Senate serves as a tie-breaker for the EPC, so that decisions regarding curriculum may remain primarily in the hands of the faculty; the Senate retains its role as arbiter of policies and procedures. There was some discussion about whether sponsoring faculty groups should be able to request an opinion from the Senate in the new process, but it would be problematic for the Senate to render an opinion on proposal for which it could potentially have to break a tied vote on the EPC. The Senate will return to this issue in September.

## 2) Title IX Issues

(a) *Grievance and Hearing Procedures*: The Senate will form an *ad hoc* committee to review *Handbook* policies on grievances and hearings, which have not been examined in well over a decade, if not longer. The goals are twofold: (1) to ensure that we are still in compliance with best practices; and (2) to ensure that these procedures are appropriate for adjudicating Title IX issues.

(b) *Transcript Notations*: The state now requires universities to put a notation on the transcript for students undergoing the Title IX process. In the past some students under investigation were transferring to different institutions before the process ended, and without a transcript notation the other institutions had no formal way of knowing that these students had potentially violated Title IX. In some instances, the inappropriate behavior continued at the new institution. The transcript notation addresses this problem. In addition to requiring the notation, the state also requires that institutions have a process for removing it when appropriate. We are now handling transcript notation removal on a case-by-case basis. The Senate's job now is to develop a formal process for doing so in consultation with the administration.

## 3) Evaluation

The Senate identified three areas for improvement: (1) standards for promotion to full professor; (2) the "no recommendation" judgment at the FRC-level; and (3) Departmental EVAL-4's. Please see section II above for discussion. We also received a request from a faculty member to consider reducing the years of service required to be eligible for promotion to full professor.

D) *Associate Director of Academic Technology Search*: The search committee asked the Senate to identify qualities in the ideal candidate. The Senate identified the ability

to communicate effectively with a faculty possessing highly varied levels of technical skill as very important.

As we were out of time, the next two items on our list will be addressed at the September meeting.

E) Hillow Emeritus Resolution  
We will vote in September.

F) Bardwell Memo

G) Vote Scheduled for September Meeting  
1) Memo to the Budget Advisory Committee

H) Reports Scheduled for September Meeting  
1) Departmental Liaisons  
2) FEA Committee: Present Proposal for FEA Application changes  
3) Academic Standing Committees

6:08 p.m.: The meeting adjourned.