

Christopher Newport University  
Board Room of the David Student Union  
November 21, 2014  
3:00PM - 6:00PM

Senators Present: Adamitis, Manning, Martin, Grau, Brash (enters 3:10), Nichols, Barnello,  
Hunter, Timani, Jelinek, Busch (enters 3:26), Thompson, Winder, Hasbrouck  
Absent: Holland

The meeting was called to order at 3:04

Motion to approve the October minutes: moved by Vice-President Manning  
Seconded: Senator Barnello

Discussion: Senator Grau suggested that as background, the Faculty Senate should make it clear that the faculty-dependent scholarship crafted by Senator Grau is ultimately intended to be open to all faculty dependents. A scholarship would be available however only after adequate funding (\$50,000) is achieved.

Vote to approve the October minutes: unanimous

1. President's Report:

President Adamitis announced that CNU has created a public health team. This team has been formed to address any event near or on campus that might affect public safety. The team will include Lori Westfall, Director of Human Resources, Kevin Hughes, Dean of Students, the Faculty Senate President, the Student Body President, and other representatives from the CNU staff.

Faculty President Adamitis was our representative at the Faculty Senate of Virginia meeting on Saturday, November 8. Representatives from the College of William and Mary, JMU, Radford, Longwood, University of Mary Washington, Randolph Macon, VCU and several Community Colleges attended the meeting. The majority of the meeting was devoted to the sharing of common faculty issues. Perhaps the greatest area of concern was faculty salaries, which have stagnated for the past several years due to state budget cuts and salary freezes. Unsurprisingly, universities currently grappling with inversion, compression and lack of internally funded raises are facing serious problems with faculty morale, while the few institutions that avoided inversion and gave internal raises are faring much better.

A second common theme that was discussed at the meeting was faculty evaluation systems. Community college representatives, in particular, voiced displeasure with their evaluation systems. At community colleges, there has been an increase in service required by faculty members. However, there has been no decrease in teaching load. At these colleges, annual reviews are taking up more faculty time. Since there is no tenure system at community colleges, contracts are

contingent and based on annual reviews. Their annual reviews are similar to our dossiers and thus represent a significant time commitment. One additional item relating to annual evaluations came out of JMU. At JMU, annual review standards are decided at the department level and that is where this decision making stops. Faculty at JMU earn their merit raises based solely upon the consensus of the department.

Yet another common theme among universities is the handling of sexual misconduct cases. A number of universities represented at the meeting are reexamining their policies and procedures. JMU, in particular, has set up a faculty panel to review how sexual misconduct cases are handled at the university. There, they have determined that a faculty member must be on all panels associated with sexual misconduct. Jana will find out more about JMU's guidelines at the Spring meeting of the Virginia Faculty Senate and will report back.

The Faculty Senate of Virginia passed a resolution regarding tuition waivers for children of faculty. This is targeted toward full-time faculty employees at state institutions. The Faculty Senate of Virginia is recommending a 50% tuition waiver for all faculty dependents enrolled at Virginia state institutions. This recommendation is different from the resolution that was passed last year, which simply granted institutions the authority to grant tuition waivers. University Presidents subsequently backed away from that bill's version as it would become their responsibility to provide funding for these tuition waivers.

President Adamitis did inquire about multiple year contracts and parental leaves at other schools. The representatives present at the meeting did not identify concerns regarding multi-year contracts for lecturers and supported granting parental leave.

President Adamitis reported that the CUC met and part of their discussions involved slightly moving the time of AR's and/or DRC's so that there would not be overlap between the two review periods at the department level. The Provost's idea of ending AR's at the Dean's levels was met with positive reactions among Senators, who appreciated that he is granting the deans and department chairs more authority in the evaluation process. However, Senators mentioned that colleagues have voiced their displeasure in some of the AR numbers that they were assigned this year.

President Adamitis pointed out that the new Summer Student Assistant's Research program could be very beneficial to the faculty. Obviously any funding for faculty research that might come from the research program is good. President Adamitis also suggested that faculty take this opportunity to increase our library collections. To date, we have been building our undergraduate resources in the library, but the summer program creates a need for more advanced material associated with faculty research. The Senate encourages the administration to continue allocating sufficient funding to the library so that we may build the research collections. Increasing library holdings will also strengthen our next application for Phi Beta Kappa.

Next President Adamitis noted that multiple faculty members had contacted her regarding a recent AAUP report on faculty salaries in Virginia and expressed both surprise and concern about CNU's low ranking. According to this report, as compared to AY 07-08 current salaries at CNU are down

9.74% after adjustment for inflation. CNU was ranked second from the last in the Carnegie classification IIB schools and second to the last among all of the nearly 30 Virginia schools included in the report. Senators noted that the AAUP data does not include the raises we received this year. Moreover, the overall percentage change includes salaries for Lecturers and Instructors, and we have increased the number of these positions since 2007-08. Both of these factors would have impacted CNU's rating in the AAUP Report. The Senate compared the AAUP Report to data on faculty salaries provided in the *Chronicle Almanac* 2013-2014, noting that this report does not adjust for inflation. In the *Chronicle Almanac* our salary numbers compare well with the national averages, especially at the Professor and Associate levels. Within the context of these two reports, as well as the information shared at the Faculty Senate of Virginia meeting, it would seem that CNU, like other institutions across the nation, has fallen behind in faculty salaries relative to inflation. However, when looking at flat salaries, CNU appears to be keeping pace with other institutions. Moreover, CNU has made sound decisions as regards faculty morale by avoiding salary inversion and giving internally-funded raises. The Senate recognizes and appreciates the consistent support for faculty salary increases provided by the administration and Board of Visitors and the actions taken on our behalf over the past few years. We support their plans to continue increasing faculty salaries so that we meet our institutional goal of reaching the 60<sup>th</sup> percentile as compared to our peer institutions, and we look forward to working with them to achieve that goal. Lastly President Adamitis encouraged us to share this information with all of our departments.

#### 4. Committee updates

Senator Hunter shared her committee's first draft of a child care survey which will be sent out to all CNU faculty and staff in the spring. Senator Hunter asked that senators look carefully at the survey and provide their feedback to her. The survey includes an initial paragraph describing what the faculty senate has done on this issue in the past. Also, the preamble describes the committee's rationale for their data gathering. The survey is designed to identify what avenues faculty have used in the past, specifically, what centers, programs or other options have been successful, and which options faculty and staff would recommend be included in their list of options. The information from the survey will be compiled into a database available to new and current employees at CNU.

Senator Timani reported on the progress of the Religious Diversity and Dialogue Committee. Currently, there are both student and faculty groups active in this area. Student groups include the group, Faith Seeking Understanding, the United Campus Ministries and a group sponsored by the Rumi Forum. Each of these groups meets regularly. There are also numerous faith groups from varying traditions meeting regularly around campus. Senator Timani also provided Senators with information regarding his monthly seminar on scripture reading that is open to students and staff as well as the local community. Senator Timani's seminar has attracted students throughout the Hampton Roads area. Following Senator Timani's discussion, Senators expressed additional suggestions about religious diversity on campus. For one, we should be careful to avoid one-sided Christian-specific wording at any CNU required events (Honors convocation, graduation, new faculty gatherings). Such one-sided religious emphasis can and does make some students and faculty uncomfortable. The increased internationalization of our student body and faculty should keep us mindful of this matter. Senator Timani will share feedback from this meeting with the committee.

## 5. Academic Standing Committee Updates

The UGRC has developed their own committee handbook. The handbook includes things such as a detail about which committee member will be responsible for which of the UGRC duties and a calendar indicating a time line for their major activities in any academic year. This handbook will serve as a good model that other university committees might wish to follow. Difficulties arise for committees without such handbooks because successive year members may not be clear on their duties. This is especially problematic when there is large turnover in a committee.

The LLC has requested that a faculty senator attend their December 5 meeting. Currently the LLC is working on assessment of Western Traditions and Civic and Democratic Engagement. In particular, an outstanding question for them is what constitutes a valid sample size for this assessment. The LLC asks that someone with a background in statistics come to listen in during their December 5 meeting to possibly help with this matter. Anyone interested should let President Adamitis know. Senators pointed out that, given that A of I's will be assessed on a 3 semester cycle, the LLC is surely going to have a heavy work load. For one, the Western Traditions and Civic and Democratic Engagement courses are largely qualitative with a large portion of essay type questions. Senators pointed out that much will go into this particular assessment. So, this question of sample size is an important one that needs to be addressed. We are going to assess Western Traditions next semester so the issues of how the assessment is going to be conducted and who is going to conduct must be resolved. This issue needs to be resolved very early in the spring semester. Every LLC department representative should be going back to their departments to gather any input that their colleagues may have on this matter.

A question arose from one senator regarding the requirements for attending University committee meetings. The sentiment amongst senators was that the faculty handbook has no stated policy on this. However, attendance is simply expected of each committee member.

The CUC met and unanimously passed the following resolution:

The two week period for the DRC should be moved back by one week so that it does not overlap with the Annual Review process.

The rationale for this included that we insure that chairs can give adequate time to the AR process. The CUC asked that the senate vote on this resolution. The resolution was next placed on the table by President Adamitis and then seconded by Senator Thompson. Discussion followed. Senator Winder asked if there is any institutional reason why the DRC should not move. None were thought of at this time. It was pointed out that the Deans also need substantial time to conduct their AR reviews and that such a time line move might also improve their work schedule. One important thing to note is that the AR's cannot move because they must be done by a certain date.

Senator Manning next called the resolution to question and the vote to approve the CUC resolution was unanimous.

Additionally at the recent CUC meeting the members expressed their support of the Provost's idea to end the AR's at the Dean's level.

The CUC members discovered that there is not uniformity in how the three deans share their rubrics for AR evaluations with the department chairs. Only one of the deans provided a hard copy of the rubric to the chairs; however it was shared after the Dean performed the evaluations. The CUC respectfully requests that all the Deans share their written rubrics with the chairs. There was a positive reaction from Senators to this idea. In particular, departments are currently devoting much work to revising their department rubric for AR's. Understanding the Deans' current standards will be beneficial for this work, as it will help ensure consistency between the two levels of evaluation.

Faculty have reported on having two consecutive years of nearly identical activities and yet different AR numbers resulted. One senator wanted to expand the resolution to request that the Dean's rubrics be provided in advance of chair evaluations. Some senators disagreed over this and thought that, because Deans are evaluating numerous departments, their evaluations should be completely independent from the chair's evaluations.

Everyone agreed that having some explanation from the Deans on how they arrived at their numbers would be worthwhile. Senators think it particularly important that the Provost show the distribution, by college, of the AR's scores. Furthermore the Senate requests that the Provost break down the AR score into two groups -- restricted and tenure/tenure track. This led to a debate over the pros and cons regarding the Dean's practice of norming all AR scores to a 3.0. There was a general agreement among Senators that AR scores should instead be tied to clearly defined benchmarks for faculty. If done in this manner, the mean AR score for a college would not necessarily result in 3.0. Since AR scores form the basis for restricted contract evaluations and post tenure decisions it is important that this matter be given significant attention. Currently 3.0 is read as average performance. If the Dean's are norming to a 3 then perhaps they are too heavily focusing on keeping the balance of people above and below the mean score. For some faculty evaluation scores, this would lead to a somewhat imprecise evaluation assignment. An improved evaluation scale was proposed by Senators. In this model the wording on the departmental AR scale would possibly change from fair, good, truly outstanding to words such as: does not meet expectations, capstone achievement, etc. Descriptors would be included detailing what is required for each level. Also the 4 point scale that is currently in place would be replaced by a 5 point scale. The Senate has decided to form a committee to better examine this issue. Senators Adamitis, Hunter, Thompson, Hasbrouck and Busch will head up this examination. It was suggested that the manner in which the recent raises were arrived at be a part of the committee's discussions. In particular, were the recent raises too heavily geared toward across the board increases?

The CUC is also exploring the rules for state employees and yearly evaluations. Members of the CUC have encountered schools that are doing faculty evaluations on a 2 or a 3 year cycle. If necessary, CNU could at least perform formative evaluations each year and this might meet state requirements. In some ways this makes sense since such a time span is more aligned with the typical length of a faculty research project. Also it would allow for the gathering of more sufficient numbers of teaching evaluations.

## Unfinished Business

### 5. Endowment Agreement for a Faculty Dependent Endowed Scholarship

Senators surveyed their departments in order to see their interest in having a faculty dependent scholarship and to determine if they would contribute to the scholarship. Also Senators were to obtain opinions on whether such a scholarship should be need-based or merit-based. Faculty from at least one department reported that most of their faculty favored need based and merit based awarding systems. Furthermore half of faculty surveyed said that they could take advantage of such a scholarship.

However, many departments also reported that their faculty would be more likely to contribute to a departmental fund rather than the Faculty Dependent Endowment during the annual campaign, which raised questions about whether we would be able to meet the \$50,000 goal over the allotted seven-year period. Some additional concerns that Senators heard from their faculty included the following:

1. Having a faculty dependent scholarship would create division among the faculty.
2. Some departments were much more in favor of a tuition waiver program.
3. Faculty are concerned about the problem that exists in the event the scholarship is not fully funded. In particular, faculty would contribute to the scholarship and then, upon insufficient funding, their money would be diverted arbitrarily.
4. Faculty are concerned about how merit could be judged among children of colleagues.
5. Having such a scholarship would only partially help faculty having difficulty paying college tuition. Perhaps tuition waivers for all would be a more sound fix.

After hearing the concerns of faculty, the Senate agreed to table this item. We as a Senate will be happy to come back to this issue if there can be some assurance of a large donor.

Senator Brash thanks Senator Grau for all of his hard work on this front. Senator Busch also expressed great appreciation for Senator Grau's well thought out attention to this serious matter.

At this point the Senate voted to go into closed session to vote on Faculty Development Grants and Faculty sabbatical applications. (5:15)

Moved by Senator Adamitis

Seconded by Senator Brash

The vote to approve the list of FDG and sabbaticals was unanimous.

Senator Hasbrouck leaves at 5:36

### 7. Lecturer Proposal

The Senate next considered the administration's proposal for new restricted faculty ranks, specifically Lecturer/Senior Lecturer/Master Lecturer. As stated in this proposal, to be qualified for appointment to this rank, a candidate must hold a terminal degree in the respective field, have a strong focus on teaching, and have a relevant basis of scholarly work or professional expertise and achievement to demonstrate expertise in the field. The proposal gives the requirements for application to each of these levels. The language on Lecturer remains exactly the same. Newly formed requirements occur for Senior Lecturer and Master Lecturer status. Under Senior lecturer status a faculty would have a fixed year contract of five years. For Master Lecturer status, a faculty member must have rendered no less than fourteen years of service to the university.

The Senate has already agreed that having such a promotion system in place is important. However, Senators noted that the proposal did not include a concrete plan for evaluating each of these positions and see an opportunity for the faculty to contribute to the proposal by taking the initiative of developing evaluation standards for lecturers and instructors. Some issues to be considered are as follows. Currently we use the AR's for evaluation. Should restricted faculty be lumped in with tenure/tenure track faculty during the evaluation process? As it stands the proposal has no rubric for promotion standards. A further concern of Senators arose from the language of the new handbook provided to us. This language states that these positions must be spread throughout departments and that there will be a limited number of these positions at any one time and yet it is not made clear in the proposal how that is to be done.

Instructors will not benefit from this proposal. Some wondered about the effect this proposal would have on them.

Another question of concern from Senators was whether or not chairs would be hesitant to support the long term commitment of five years on some of the positions. Additionally, Senator Winder asked if there might be situations in which a person would be hesitant to apply for these titles in fear that they might miss out on a tenure track position.

President Adamitis charged the Senate with coming up with an improvement to the evaluation system for restricted faculty that is transparent and fair. A recommendation needs to come out of the Senate on how restricted faculty are evaluated. Should there be a separate rating scale for restricted faculty?

Town hall sessions for restricted faculty regarding this proposal are scheduled to take place early in the spring semester. President Adamitis will present this proposal at the December all faculty meeting. In addition, Senators are asked to get feedback on this proposal from their departments.

## 8. Committee on Academic Standing Committees

The rationale for reexamining all Academic Standing Committees are many. For one, many faculty Senators feel that they are not being kept well-informed by committees. Secondly, there is the need for better faculty ownership on academic committees. Third, committees want to know their

responsibilities and to whom they should report. Vice President Manning presented a flow chart which presents a new model for oversight of committees. Under this model, each of the three Vice-Provosts will be in charge of certain committees. Also, this model better makes clear that academic committees are supposed to report information through the faculty senate. One of the major changes created from this suggested restructuring is the making of appointments by the Faculty Senate. There are some exceptions to this such as the IUCUC and the IRB. There will be very few committees reporting directly to the Provost.

Faculty Senate recommendations include guaranteeing that faculty are the ones to chair all academic standing committees. Furthermore, this committee reminds us that all committee elections must be done well before the end of the spring semester. In the past, last minute elections have led to some mistakes in membership. It is the recommendation of the committee that chairs of academic committees should be appointed in the spring semester. In so doing, the getting started meetings can be devoted to the training of committee members.

There is a request from this committee to set aside funding for training for some committees. Also, funding is needed in some cases for administrative support, for example in the UGRC.

The committee will continue to research whether or not service is being allocated equitably. Are there efficiencies that still might be exploited? Phase II of this committee will also explore exactly how many seats are needed in each committee. There is also a question of whether core advising is inadvertently hindering university service.

## 9. Incentives for IDEA

It has come to the attention of Faculty Senate that there is substantial extra credit being offered to students for them to fill out the IDEA. Senators were very disappointed to hear of this. Senators conjectured that this practice might have an effect on student responses. Uniformly the senators thought it inappropriate for a faculty to do so and many felt it unbecoming of the University. It is thought that this is symptomatic of a bigger problem and that is the overemphasis of student evaluations in the EVAL-4's.

If incentives are to be allowed, there must be uniform guidelines in place for all faculty at CNU for doing so. The reason that has been given for faculty to give incentives is so that student response rates may be made adequate. Senators rebuffed that by saying that an easy fix would be to replace this system that we are using with one that forces the students to fill out the form.

The IDEA committee will be asked to look into this matter. Our hope is that the university can produce guidelines on best practices for the IDEA.

Senator Barnello Motion to Adjourn  
6:00 meeting adjourned