

**Faculty Senate Meeting  
Friday, December 5, 2003  
SC 214, 3:00 p.m.**

Senators Present: Virginia Purtle, Cathy Doyle, Lori Underwood, Rebecca Wheeler, Harold Grau, Peter Knipp, Gary Whiting, David Doughty, Quentin Kidd (late), Tom Berry (late), Robert Gray, Donald Hicks, Robert Winder

Visitors: Jeana Willis, SGA representative, Ron Mollick, Past Senate President Tim Marshall

Stenographer: Kathy Byars

The meeting was called to order by President Purtle at 2:00 p.m. All visitors were welcomed.

I. Minutes of the November 7, November 21, and December 2 minutes were approved by voice vote with four corrections to the November 7 minutes.

II. PRESIDENTS REPORT

- A Board of Visitors meeting was held on November 14, 2003. Most of all the business was held in closed session. A question was raised about whether something on campus should be named after an African American.
- Graduation will be on January 11 at 2:00 pm in the Freeman Center
- A national search for Director of Center of the Arts is going well.
- There have been 18 Strategic Planning meetings so far this academic year, with over 300 people participating. A one-day retreat will be held on January 7<sup>th</sup> to draft a document. A capital fund raising meeting will be held sometime in February/March once all the goals are in place.
- The Provost has approved all Faculty Development Grants. However, some of the monies will have to be dispersed in the next fiscal year. Robert Winder stated that we should look into the individual grants and see who needs their money this spring and who could wait until next fiscal year.
- The Provost has given a deadline to the UCC for making recommendations on the proposals from the Task Force on

Curriculum and Academic Life. The UCC should report to the Senate no later than 2/17/2004 and Senate should report to Provost no later than 4/20/04. President Purtle urged all Senators to read the proposals and be knowledgeable before they come to the Senate so that it can get through the Senate in a timely fashion.

- The Undergrad Academic Status Committee has indicated that the catalog is confusing in some areas related to the committee's work, and needs clarifying. These issues will need to be addressed by the Senate in the future.
- A committee to look at ways to improve the university's ranking in national publications will be chaired by David Doughty. The other members will include Senator Schwarze, Provost Summerville, George Webb and Senator Winder.

### III. COMMITTEE REPORTS

- A. BOV ACADEMIC AFFAIRS SUBCOMMITTEE – Senator Wheeler attended the BOV Academic Affairs Subcommittee meeting. Linda Gordon presented a report on Vision 2010. Board members were very pleased with the progress of the Strategic Planning. Board members asked about faculty concerns.
- B. BOV DEVELOPMENT SUBCOMMITTEE - Senator Gray attended the BOV Development Committee Meeting. Fund raising efforts were reported.
- C. FACULTY SENATE OF VIRGINIA – Past Senate President Marshall reported on the Faculty Senate of Virginia. Because the cost of hiring a lobbyist is so high, the Faculty Senate of Virginia urged all faculty members in Virginia to be more active in contacting their Virginia representatives.
- D. Ad HOC COMMITTEE ON POST TENURE REVIEW - Ron Mollick presented to the Senate a draft of a post tenure review schedule. Discussion of the proposals was moved to New Business by President Purtle.

#### IV. OLD BUSINESS

- A. SCHEDULE FOR DISTINGUISHED PROFESSOR – After very brief discussion of the schedule, Senator Kidd moved to forward the report to the Provost. Senator Doyle seconded the motion. All approved. The report schedule is:

##### ACADEMIC RANK OF DISTINGUISHED PROFESSOR

Step	Procedure	Schedule
<b>Initiation and Departmental Action</b>		
1	The person initiating a nomination for promotion to the rank of distinguished professor will inform the nominee and submit to the department chair of the nominee's department a letter of nomination accompanied by the nominee's current vita. The department chair will share the nomination, in confidence, with all full-time, salaried members of the department. Self-nominations will not be considered.	Friday of the 11 <sup>th</sup> week of the Spring Semester <b>March 27, 2004</b>
2	The department will review the letter of nomination and the <i>vita</i> , and will request supporting materials from the nominee. The nominee shall compile these materials into an orderly, organized dossier.	Friday of the 15 <sup>th</sup> week of the Spring Semester <b>April 23, 2004</b>
3	Candidate dossier due to the department chair.	Friday of the 6 <sup>th</sup> week of the Fall Semester <b>October 1, 2004</b>
4	If the department supports the nomination, the department chair will write a letter of support and forward this along with the nominee's dossier to the Faculty Senate before the November meeting of the Faculty Senate. If the nominee is the department chair, then the dean of the nominee's college or school replaces the department chair in the processes described in this section.	11 <sup>th</sup> week of the Fall Semester <b>November 5, 2004</b>
5	At the November meeting, the Senate will appoint a Working Group to nominate members for the nominee's Peer Group. <i>(The Faculty Senate may establish and promulgate deadlines each academic year for receipt of all nominations to be considered in that academic year.)</i>	November Meeting of Faculty Senate <b>November 2004</b>
<b>Peer Committee Action</b>		
6	The Faculty Senate will form a peer committee and designate its chair. <i>(The Senate debates and votes on the peer committee nominated by the Senate Working Group in November.)</i> This committee will be composed of five sitting distinguished professors. If insufficient numbers of distinguished professors are available, individuals holding the rank of professor will complete the committee.	December Meeting of Faculty Senate <b>December 2004</b>
7	The peer committee will meet and consider the merits of the nomination. In the course of this consideration, the peer committee will seek written commentary from the nominee's dean and from the Faculty Senate. The peer committee shall make such commentary a part of the dossier.	<b>January 2005</b>
8	Peer committee sends recommendation of award to Provost no later than March 1 <sup>st</sup> . If the peer committee affirms that the rank of distinguished professor should be awarded, it will forward that recommendation, with the dossier, to the provost.	<b>March 1, 2005</b>

Step	Procedure	Schedule
	<i>(Each academic year, any such recommendation must be received in the office of the provost <u>no later than March 1</u>, so as to make possible action by the Board of Visitors at its April meeting. Recommendations received after this deadline will be considered in the following academic year.)</i>	
<b>Administrative and Board of Visitors Action</b>		
9	The provost will consult as he or she might deem appropriate and make a recommendation to the president. The president, in turn, will make his or her recommendation to the Board of Visitors. For those positive recommendations requiring action by the Board of Visitors, a resolution is prepared for approval of the provost and president and action by the Board.	Prior to the April Meeting of the Board of Visitors <b>March/April 2005</b>
10	The Board acts on the resolution in step 9. If approved, the promotion becomes effective at the date specified by the Board of Visitors.	April Meeting of the Board of Visitors <b>April 2005</b>
If at any point [department, peer group, provost, or president] the action of the reviewing body or office is not supportive of promotion, then the review process will cease, and the nominee and those who have previously reviewed the candidacy will be so notified. In such an event, the nominee may not be considered again for promotion to the rank of distinguished professor until at least two complete (August to May) academic years have passed.		

B. ADDITIONAL NAMES FOR DECEMBER GRADUATION - were submitted by Rita Savage of the Registrar's Office. Senator Doyle moved to accept and Senator Berry seconded. All approved.

#### V. NEW BUSINESS

A. USE OF FACULTY AUTHORED TEXTBOOKS – Gary Green submitted a letter to the Senate urging the Faculty Senate to adopt a resolution calling for a University policy that disallows for-profit assignment of textbooks and other materials for the class that were authored by the professor. Sam Bauer spoke in opposition to the measure.

Senator Whiting suggested that senators talk with their departments about the issue.

Senator Wheeler asked that a copy of Green's memo be circulated to all faculty.

Senator Berry expressed concerned about the long term consequences of any action the senate takes on this matter.

Senator Whiting moved to form a committee to look at the issue and Senator Doyle seconded the motion. All approved. The committee membership is: Senators Grau (Chair), Doyle and Gray.

- B. OCTOBER MINUTES – Several mistakes were found in the October minutes. Senator Underwood moved to accept the corrections. Senator Doyle seconded. All approved.
- C. INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY COMMITTEE – Senators agreed that the Senate should take up at a future date the question of the structure and function of a University Information Technology Committee.
- D. POST TENURE REVIEW - Motion for first reading of Resolution 2003-2004: 09 (see below) by Senator Kidd and seconded by Senator Underwood. All approved, and floor opened for discussion.

**Page 95, line 10, part e):**

**(SECTION e) WAS MODIFIED)**

**e) Possible results of the evaluation process include:**

- (1) judgments of satisfactory performance,**
- (2) judgments of unsatisfactory performance**

**(WHAT FOLLOWS IS A NEW SECTION, f))**

**f) Judgments of unsatisfactory performance for any two of three consecutive years may place tenured faculty into an unscheduled peer review track. Unsatisfactory performance ratings in the area of teaching alone could be an initiator or unsatisfactory ratings in both professional development and service or unsatisfactory ratings in all three areas. This process is a performance review process conducted according to the applicable parts of section 4); it is not a dismissal process. The unscheduled review process has the potential to lead to sanctions but it is designed to be a helpful process aimed at improvement and will**

**focus on individual faculty and not institutional needs. The process will not impinge upon academic freedom. The outcome of this process will be a judgment of satisfactory or unsatisfactory offered by a peer group and will include a summary statement explaining its judgment together with judgments by the Dean, the Faculty Review Committee, the Provost, and the President. If the final judgment is unsatisfactory, administrative sanctions may follow possibly including initiating the dismissal process.**

**(1) What follows outlines the procedures and general schedule leading to and including an unscheduled review. A specific schedule with dates will be provided yearly by the Provost's office.**

**a. When a tenured faculty member receives an unsatisfactory rating in the annual evaluation process in any two of three consecutive years, this will result in a recommendation on the applicable EVAL-AR from the Dean to the Provost to begin an unscheduled review. The Dean will include specific reasons for this recommendation. The Provost may choose against an unscheduled review. If the Provost decides that an unscheduled review is appropriate, the Dean and Faculty Review Committee are notified and an unscheduled review takes place the following spring semester according to the steps of section 4) and the timetable for the spring peer evaluation cycle specified on form EVAL-1. In addition to the other materials specified in step 13, the dossier must include a performance improvement plan.**

**b. The peer group for the unscheduled spring review will judge the faculty member's performance as either satisfactory or unsatisfactory and will provide a summary statement on form EVAL-7 explaining its judgment. Judgments by the**

**Dean, the Faculty Review Committee, the Provost and the President are subsequently rendered on form EVAL-8.**

**c. If the performance review is judged to be unsatisfactory, the unscheduled review process continues into the next academic year and the unscheduled review peer group remains intact. The intention is that this peer group will retain the same membership throughout this process although individual members may find it necessary to leave the peer group. If that occurs, replacements will be named by the same procedures that established the original peer group. The faculty member will next undergo an annual evaluation as usual the following fall semester. The faculty member will submit an EVAL-6 with the standard documentation and an update of the performance improvement plan. The EVAL-AR that the faculty member receives as a result of this review serves as interim feedback. The unscheduled review process continues into the fall semester review cycle of the next academic year. At that time, the Faculty member is required to undergo a peer evaluation in the fall cycle according to the steps in section 4) with their peer group and with an updated performance improvement plan included in the dossier.**

**d. The faculty member's performance will be judged as either satisfactory or unsatisfactory and the peer group will provide a summary statement on form EVAL-7 explaining its judgment. Judgments by the Dean, the Faculty Review Committee, the Provost and the President are subsequently rendered on form EVAL-8.**

**e. A final judgment of unsatisfactory or satisfactory will end the unscheduled peer review process. However, a final judgment of unsatisfactory may lead to administrative sanctions, possibly including initiating the dismissal process.**

**(2) All tenured faculty will undergo a scheduled performance review in the peer group format every sixth year during the spring semester evaluation cycle. Tenured faculty may elect to undergo such an evaluation in any year according to the schedule published by the Provost's office. Any Class A review that occurs for the purpose of promotion will count as a scheduled review.**

**a. The Provost will notify the Dean and Department Chair using form EVAL-2 identifying tenured faculty who will be reviewed. An EVAL-5 will be generated by the Department Chair and Dean and forwarded to the Provost.**

**b. The final judgment will be satisfactory or unsatisfactory. A satisfactory rating results in the scheduling of a new scheduled peer review in six years. A final judgment of unsatisfactory results in recommendations for improvement which the faculty member will address in the EVAL-6 to be submitted at the beginning of the next fall semester review cycle. Part 1), above, specifies how continuing unsatisfactory evaluations can place faculty into an unscheduled review.**

**c. In the event that a scheduled review coincides with an unscheduled review, the procedures relating to the unscheduled review will be followed.**

Senator Knipp questioned how often faculty would be sitting on these peer evaluation committees.

Senator Doughty asked about the logistics of phasing in post-tenure review for 90-plus faculty who have not been reviewed in several years.



Discussion ensued about the logistics of phasing in the review process and about the number of people who should sit on the review panel. Senators also discussed how to avoid post-tenure review being perceived as head hunting.

President Purtle suggested that the Senate look for potential problems in the Post-tenure review proposal and bring any concerns back to the January Senate meeting.

#### VI. OTHER NEW BUSINESS

- Senator Wheeler distributed two handouts referencing outside employment by CNU faculty. It was agreed that CNU must set standard (guidelines) for outside employment of its faculty. The question raised was whether the Senate was interested in pursuing this. Senator Winder said he felt very strongly that this is an extremely important issue.

Senators agreed to form a committee to research the question. The committee will consist of: Senators Wheeler (chair), Winder, and Underwood. In addition, the Provost and General Counsel Thro will be consulted.

- Senator Grau distributed a pre-draft of a senate restructuring plan. President Purtle indicated that there were several areas in the Handbook where changes were needed and formed a Faculty Governance Committee to look into all of them. The committee will consist of Senators Underwood (chair), Grau, and Knipp, and President Purtle.
- Senator Grau noted a concern that several members of his constituency had been having with course scheduling. In particular, Associate Provost Doolittle has held that all classes must be finished by 10 pm. He stated that this creates a scheduling conflict because of the time restraint it puts on four-hour labs. Other senators expressed concerns about what appeared to be ad hoc rule-making. President Purtle indicated that she would consult with the Provost on the questions raised and would report back to the Senate.

#### VI. OTHER NEW BUSINESS

- Termination of the Bachelor of Science in Accounting – President Purtle advised senators to be ready to deal with a

set of recommendations related to the termination of the Bachelor of Science in Accounting degree. The Undergraduate Curriculum Committee was dealing with competing proposals for how this should be handled, one from the Dean of the School of Business and another from the School of Business Curriculum Committee. However, the Provost had set a deadline for when he would take some action and thus the senate would be compelled to take up the question in January.

VII. Meeting adjourned at 6:50 p.m. by President Purtle

**Christopher Newport University**  
**Faculty Senate**  
**Resolution 2003-2004: 09**

**Whereas**, the Faculty Senate formed an ad hoc post tenure review committee during the Spring 2003 semester and that ad hoc committee has produced a report recommending a schedule for post tenure review,

**Therefore Be It Resolved** that the report of the ad hoc post tenure review committee be forwarded to the Handbook Committee for inclusion in the University Handbook.