

**Faculty Senate Minutes**  
FRIDAY, AUGUST 28, 2015, 3PM  
Board Room, DSU  
Full Faculty Senate Meeting

**In Attendance:** Jana Adamitis, Linda Manning, John Nichols, Harry Grau, Hussam Timani, Bob Winder, Chris Kennedy (left 3:46), Betsy Jelinek, Jessica Thompson, Rachel Holland, Costa Gerousis, Lynn Shollen, Edward Brash (arrived 3:16) **Absent:** William Donaldson

The Faculty Senate meeting was called to order at 3:05. Faculty Senate President Adamitis welcomed the Senators to the 2015-2016 academic year and asked faculty to introduce themselves. Adamitis continued by presenting **Ben Cowman**, Assistant Director for Diversity Initiatives, who is part of the Office of Student Activities. Further information on the Diversity Initiatives described below can be found here: <http://cnu.edu/studentactivities/diversity/index.asp>

### **Diversity and Inclusion Initiatives**

Ben Cowman described various diversity and inclusions initiatives within the student environment. While his program is not responsible for similarly focused Admissions Office efforts, it is attentive to issues of retention. Cowman described two programs: the Student Diversity and Equality Council (SDEC) and the Peers for Inclusion, Empowerment, and Respect (PIER).

One is the **Cultural Plunge Program** which is a self-directed effort to expand a student's cultural awareness through various campus programs and events. Attendance at a series of Cultural Plunges can lead to the achievement of a **Global Competency Certification**, which recognizes participants who attend global competency via workshops on cultural self awareness, patterns of cultural difference and global citizenship alongside other events. While the Global Certificate is geared mostly to students, **Safe Zone Certification** is available to students, faculty and staff, and is invested in aiding the LGBTQ+ communities on campus.

In response to a question about student participation in the plunge program. Cowman reported that last year 100 students had at least one experience, though few did all, because, in part, the experiences are organized by tiers of complexity. This year the program has been streamlined to permit more participation.

Cowman continued that another program, **Breakthrough CNU** addresses first generation college students. During Getting Started Week, 76 students participated in forums to address the college experience, with follow up events scheduled throughout the semester.

PIER also provides workshops on various topics, such as class, LGBTQ+, Gender and Religion, of varying lengths, from small groups or large groups, inside or out of a class. A chart that describes such programs can be found here:

<http://cnu.edu/studentactivities/diversity/pier/inventory%20sheet.pdf>

These programs are open to faculty involvement – in classrooms or via department events; faculty can assist in programming, or the Diversity Initiatives program can help faculty connect with speakers or help coordinate speakers.

The Faculty Senate expressed support for Cowman's initiatives for diversity programming on campus; at 3:25 Ben Cowman leaves.

### **President's Report:**

**Annual review proposal:** The faculty have reported dissatisfaction with the current AR model, especially the requirement that Deans "norm" their scores to a 3.0. Not only is norming statistically unsound, but it also means that performance targets vary from year to year. Chairs also expressed concerns about rounding to a .5, which forces them to give the same rounded score to faculty whose raw scores differ by .4/.45, a difference that they find meaningful. Last year, the Faculty Senate charged the Council of University Chairs (CUC) with proposing an alternate model that would make performance expectations transparent and allow us to distribute merit pay fairly without having to norm. The CUC agreed on a new model, and Senator Kennedy, Chair of MATH, wrote the proposal over the summer. He was able to use raw AR scores submitted anonymously by the chairs to test the model and included that data as an addendum to the proposal.

At this point, Senator Kennedy explained how the new model rectifies the concerns outlined above, in addition to concerns about AR score inflation, merit pay compression and equity across colleges that had been articulated by the Deans and Provost:

**1. The summary evaluative score:** Rounding to .25 rather than .5 addresses the problem that the chairs perceived regarding differences in performance.

**2. Norming:** In the new model, Chairs and Deans will evaluate faculty based upon college-specific rubrics to be written by the Deans and tweaked by the chairs to reflect individual disciplinary practices. The completed rubrics will then be shared with all faculty prior to evaluation. While the new model will not force a mean of a 3, the rubric will be written in such a way that the mean would naturally fall somewhere around a 3.0. Deans will then determine the raw mean and the raw standard deviation to determine a z-score, which measures how many standard deviations an individual faculty member's score is above or below the mean.

This model addresses several problems: The z-scores can be compared across colleges, so that merit pay may be allocated equitably. That is, no college will suffer loss of merit if its raw mean is lower than the others. By using a fixed evaluation rubric, we can avoid inflation, e.g., the tendency of scores to creep upward over time; and, if we *do* see inflation, we can simply adjust the rubric accordingly. By

using the z-score effectively, we can avoid merit pay compression; and the next steps here are to determine (a) how we will divide the faculty into “bins” based on their z-scores and (b) how we will allocate merit pay to each “bin,” e.g., by flat dollars or percentages. Because the existing data from the past few years has been artificially normed to a 3, we cannot use it to help us determine bin width now, so clearly we will need to find another way to best determine bin width.

Senators raised several questions about the proposal:

- *Distribution:* As noted earlier, the chairs anonymously submitted raw AR scores so that Senator Kennedy might test our new model. The scores were not normally distributed across standard deviations, but we cannot draw any conclusions from this fact because we do not currently use rubrics. Some Senators also noted that the fact of distributing faculty into “bins” tied to different merit pay increases has never been at issue. Rather we have objected to the methods for such distributions.
- *Rounding:* Some Senators wondered why the CUC did not propose rounding the individual scores for teaching, research/creative activity and service to a .25 along with the final summative score. The chairs did not see a need for more discrete numbers at those levels, as it would be too difficult to make meaningful distinctions. It would be possible, though, to avoid rounding even the final summative score to a .25; we could simply give the raw summative score. If we choose to do so, we must understand that using the z-score method would require rounding at some point in order to create meaningful bins for merit pay distribution.
- *Norming:* Is distributing merit pay according to a raw mean fair, or is it tantamount to norming? It would be fair if we are doing it according to a rubric.
- *Process:* The Council of University Chairs has to vote on the proposal, then it will go to the Senate for a vote. If it passes, the proposal will move to the Deans and eventually the Provost.
- *Timing:* We cannot implement anything this year because we must give the Deans enough time to develop the rubrics and Chairs enough time to review them. Moreover, faculty should be notified regarding expectations before their evaluations. Therefore, the earliest possible implementation date would be September 2016.

Kennedy leaves at 3:46.

### **Strategic planning:**

**Adamitis:** During the discussion of the lecturer ranks streams proposal last year, some faculty expressed concern that implementation would create a viable alternative to tenure and eventually lead to a reduction in our number of tenure-stream lines. To address this concern the Senate proposed that department chairs develop 5-year strategic plans that would demonstrate how they might help move our tenure-track/renewable contract ratio from the current 68/32 to 75/25 while

still supporting institutional goals. These include the quantitative benchmarks set out in the Six-Year Plan, namely the achievement of 300 faculty, 85% of courses taught by full time faculty, and 60% of classes capped under 20. The next step will be to construct and then look at departmental strategic plans, followed by the Senate writing a resolution that can be sent up to the administration.

There was some concern that it would be difficult to achieve all of the goals set out in the Six-Year Plan, coupled with the increase to a 75/25 tenure-track/renewable contract ratio at the same time. As a first step in addressing this concern, the Senate could invite the Provost to explain how he determined the quantitative benchmarks for the Six-Year Plan and discuss their implications regarding staffing and curriculum. The Senate's strategic plan empowers the deans and chairs to rely upon both quantitative and qualitative measures – and to consider disciplinary best practices, while balancing responsibilities to core and the major. General discussion developed with regard to how the achievement of this Six-Year Plan might affect CNU's curriculum, such as a department's commitments to the liberal learning core as well as to its major courses; the issue of "curricular bloat" also arose, a term which some senators considered ill-advised given previous efforts that streamlined CNU's curriculum. Some Senators reported concerns about how the desire to reach the target for 19-cap classes is affecting scheduling decisions. For example, some departments teach the same course with some sections at 40 and others at 19, in order to meet the 19-cap quota while also satisfying student demand. Thus the students taking the section with a cap of 19 are receiving a better academic experience. Does the benefit of small class sizes trump this kind of inequity among sections?

Adamitis suggested that departmental strategic plans should look at academic best practices by department, curricular contributions inside and outside the core, and faculty specializations, relying on Institutional Research for data on full-time and adjunct usage, enrollments, etc. Every department might not be able to hit all of the goals targeted in the 5-Year plans in exactly the same ways, so the plans will enable us to start a discussion among chairs and deans on how these goals will be achieved across colleges or the university in a way that is academically sound.

#### **Dept. Eval 4s**

Departments are again encouraged to develop or revise their EVAL-4s as a disciplinary translation of University standards of evaluation. This is particularly of importance with regard to the lecturer rank stream proposal, as we need to put evaluation criteria in place before implementation.

Senators then discussed how standards for lecturer promotion and multi-year contracts would differ from promotion standards for tenure-stream faculty. The University EVAL-4 clearly indicates how we value different activities as an institution, so there is no need to create a separate set of valued activities for lecturers. The differentiation between tenure-stream faculty and lecturers would primarily concern how we *apply* the University EVAL-4. More specifically, we need to decide how research would factor into lecturer evaluations, since we emphasize

teaching and service for these positions. Once we make a decision, the *Handbook* language addressing the Departmental EVAL-4's as well as the Lecturer rank streams will have to be revised to ensure that we have transparency and fairness with regard to lecturer evaluations. Department that have already completed their revision of the Departmental EVAL-4, should hold onto it until the Council of University Chair's meeting, and then the Chairs and Deans will review them.

### **IDEA best practices**

The IDEA Committee briefed the Senate last semester on best practices for using IDEA in faculty evaluation, and the Senate has already sent their recommendations to the chairs. The IDEA committee recommends that student evaluations can be used for up to 50% of a teaching evaluation, and they have now volunteered to make recommendations regarding what the other 50% should be.

### **BOV reports**

#### **Academic Affairs:**

**Nichols:** The Provost was tasked by the Subcommittee to consider salaries with regard to gender equity. The Provost produced a breakdown of salaries by discipline and gender and demonstrated that gender equity did exist across all ranks and disciplines. The Subcommittee also considered the status of CNU with regard to other institutions within Virginia; based upon enrollments and available incoming first year student data, it seemed that CNU had made strong progress in its admission goals and was well-positioned in comparison to similar institutions of higher education across the state, to maintain and build upon that progress.

#### **Finance:**

##### **Adamitis**

Our external audit for the fiscal year 2013-2014 was ongoing at the time of the meeting, but to date no significant problems have been detected.

Looking forward to 2015-2016: The University presented the following goals in the Six-Year Plan (2016-2022), which will help guide budgetary planning:

- expand full-time faculty to 300
- increase class with enrollments under 20 to 60%
- increase instruction by full-time faculty to 85%
- achieve 90% freshmen retention rate
- achieve 80% 6-year graduation rate
- increase STEM degrees to 30% of degrees conferred
- increase PLP students in the freshman class to 400
- increase HONR-only students in the freshman class to 50
- increase out-of-state enrollment to 15% of the freshman class
- achieve minority enrollment of 20% or more of the student body
- increase the annual number of students studying abroad to 500
- increase the percentage of graduates with "Service with Distinction" to 30%
- increase the number of students engaged in undergraduate research

- increase the size of the library's collection
- decrease dependence on state funding through private fundraising and a successful comprehensive campaign
- recognition by Phi Beta Kappa

One ongoing challenge is that the state now provides only about 30% of the Educational and General budget, in stark contrast to the 70% provided about a decade ago. This decrease in funding means that we must rely much more heavily on tuition and fundraising to advance our institutional mission. As a way to move forward with need-based scholarships and supporting the pillars of a liberal education, the Board approved a \$200 planned increase to tuition each year for the next four years that will provide an additional \$4 million to support the following key areas: Undergraduate Scholarships, Undergraduate Research, Study Abroad, and Service Learning.

The Senate discussed whether this raise in tuition would affect applications. We consistently hold 4<sup>th</sup> place among Virginia schools for tuition and fees, and we will likely continue to do so even with this increase.

4:35-4:51 Break

### **Departmental Liaisons:**

College of Arts and Humanities

ENGL: Nichols

FAAH: Timani

HIST: Adamitis

MCLL: Adamitis

MUSC: Holland

PHIL/RSTD: Timani

THEA: Holland

Luter School of Business: Donaldson

College of Natural and Behavioral Sciences

MATH: Kennedy

MBCH: Grau

OENB: Thompson

PCSE: Brash

PSYC: Grau

College of Social Sciences

COMM: Manning

ECON: Winder

GOVT: Waldron

LAMS: Shollen

MLSC: Shollen

SSWA: Waldron

Appointment of Liaisons to Academic Standing Committees

Appointment to Faculty Senate Standing Committees

*Handbook*: Kennedy (Chair), Adamitis, Grau

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

Faculty Development Grants (FDG's): Thompson (Chair), Shollen, Timani, Donaldson

*Charge*: Develop rubrics for the FDG's; make recommendations for the weight that rank should carry in FDG rankings. Evaluate applications and make recommendations.

Faculty Excellence Awards (FEA's) and Sabbaticals: Holland (Chair), Gerousis, Waldron

*Charge*: Review the application process for FEA's; more clearly define materials to be included in the package (require IDEAs? include a prompt for the essay?); set limits on reapplication. Evaluate applications for FEA's and sabbaticals and make recommendations.

Elections: Manning (Chair, CSS), Adamitis (CAH), Donaldson (LUTR), Grau (CNBS)

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

Goals and Subcommittees for AY 15-16

Grievance and Hearing Procedures: Adamitis (Chair), Ronnie Cohen, Thompson

*Charge*: Review and revise as necessary the current grievance and hearing procedures.

*Deadlines*: November 1<sup>st</sup> Reading of Revised *Handbook* Language, January Vote

Instructional Faculty Personnel Regulations: Adamitis (Chair), Waldron, Winder

*Charge*: Review *Handbook* Section XII, except grievance and hearing procedures, for internal consistency and accuracy of information

*Deadlines*: November 1<sup>st</sup> Reading of Revised *Handbook* Language, January Vote

Curriculum: Shollen (Chair), Kennedy, Holland, Manning

*Charge*: Streamline the entire process for proposals; develop a faculty-driven

plan for reviewing and (when needed) revising the Core.

*Deadlines:* November 1<sup>st</sup> Reading of Revised *Handbook* Language, January Vote

Final Exams: Nichols (Chair), Brash, Gerousis, Grau

Charge: Clarify comprehensive assessments; address problems ensuing from make-up days; eliminate Saturday exams; ensure that students have sufficient time to study and faculty have sufficient time to grade.

*Deadlines:* November 1<sup>st</sup> Reading, January Vote

### **New Business**

**Follett**—Many faculty have reported that they have had to adjust syllabi because several students don't have books until weeks three or four, yet they have to assign grades by week three.

The Senate discussed the possibility of returning to an on-site bookstore. One reason that the University closed its original bookstore and contracted with Follett was that we were regularly losing money on it; now we acquire modest revenues through Follett. In addition, the state requires that schools publish their book orders well in advance of the semester so that students may explore a variety of purchasing options, and Follett allows us to meet this requirement. However, Senators thought that there might be other ways in which to meet our obligation to the state. Remaining questions include: What other schools use Follett? Are PBK schools using Follett?

**Civic and Democratic Engagement Area of Inquiry**– There is confusion about the scope of this Area, because several proposals for new courses have been denied. In Senate meetings two years ago, the parameters of this area of inquiry were described as open to various types of courses, but that doesn't not seem to be the case. We need clarification.

**Title IX** – The presentation during Getting Started Week was well received, and several faculty have requested follow-up sessions. Perhaps the Counseling Office could offer workshops focusing on how we can let students know that we cannot keep some kinds of information confidential without deterring them from reporting issues. Faculty also need more guidance on what must be reported. Perhaps Michelle Moody could lead a session at which faculty present scenarios and seek advice on how best to proceed. Finally, we need clarity on what options students regarding their participation in the process now that we cannot promise confidentiality.

The **Faculty Development** grant schedule should be available for Faculty Calendar, maintained by Lorraine Hall.



**Budget Advisory Memo** – The BAC memo was originally created in response to a budget crisis some years ago, so it is primarily reactionary in nature and focuses on prioritizing funding cuts. The AY 15-16 Senate will revise the BAC memo so that it becomes proactive rather than reactive. Instead of indicating what could be cut in a crisis, the memo will now prioritize new funding allocations. This year we will advocate for funding the Phi Beta Kappa initiative, which includes several components that benefit all faculty and students and align with our liberal arts mission, e.g., raising faculty salaries, undergraduate research and study abroad.

The **Lecturer proposal** will be re-sent to faculty senators. The Senate wishes to continue to recognize and advocate for lecturers and the good, thorough work they perform alongside tenured/tenure stream faculty and address fully the transparency of the evaluation process.

**Jelinek** moved to adjourn; **Manning** seconded.  
Faculty Senate Adjourned at 6pm.