

Minutes for CNU Faculty Senate Meeting  
Friday, January 17, 2014  
Board Room of the David Student Union

Senators present: Redick, Martin, Keeling, Connell, Selim; Barnello, Grau, Hasbrouck, Holland, Hunter, Manning, Puaca, Thompson, Winder.

Guests: Sally Grace Holtgrieve, Marie Albiges, Dr. Jeffrey Gibbons, Vice Provost Laura Deiulio

**1. Call to Order** at 3:02.

**2. President's Report**

President Redick introduced two guests, Sally Grace Holtgrieve, Editor-in-Chief of the *Captain's Log*; Marie Albiges, News Editor of the *Captain's Log*, who wished to observe the meeting for a story for the newspaper. He welcomed back the Senators back after the holiday and observed that the Senate had much work to do during spring semester. He informed the Senate that Provost Doughty had informed faculty members who had applied for sabbatical of his decision, and that eight sabbaticals were being given this year and that he hoped that there would be ten next year. One senator inquired if the list of sabbaticals given correlated with the Senate's recommendations; President Redick said he could check that.

Old Business

**3. Approval of November and December minutes**

**Motion 1/17/14.1 That the minutes of the November 15, 2013 Faculty Senate meeting be passed. Moved Harry Grau. Seconded Bill Connell. Passed unanimously.**

**Motion 1/17/14.2 That the minutes of the December 6, 2013 Faculty Senate meeting be approved electronically. Moved Brian Puaca. Seconded Raouf Selim. Passed unanimously.**

**4. Adjunct Faculty Excellence in Teaching Award**

The Senate reconsidered the proposal from the Committee for Adjunct Faculty Excellence in Teaching Award (Michelle Barnello (chair), Bill Connell, and Bob Hasbrouck).

**Adjunct Faculty Excellence in Teaching Award**

-This award carries a stipend of \$500.00.

-There will be a maximum of one award per college annually.

*Nomination Guidelines:*

A cover letter from the department chair (maximum 500 words) highlighting the merits of the adjunct faculty's teaching at CNU.

*Application Materials:*

A cover letter from the applicant containing a narrative explaining the excellence of the applicant's teaching at CNU (maximum 500 words);

copies of all teaching evaluations (IDEAs) over the past four semesters, a preponderance of which must demonstrate scores above the gray band, and have “Excellent Teacher” ratings of 4.5 or higher (Raw or Adjusted Score).

*Eligibility Requirements:*

Applicants must have taught at least six classes and been at CNU for a minimum of four semesters;

winners of this award may be reconsidered for eligibility every three years.

**Motion 1/17/14.3 That the proposal to establish an Adjunct Faculty Excellence in Teaching Award be accepted. Moved Linda Manning. Seconded Bill Connell. Passed unanimously.**

## **5. Status of the Provost Search**

President Redick outlined the progress of the search so far, noting that the search committee had met, that the pool contained 40 applicants so far, and that over 60 were expected. He stressed that everyone on the search committee was committed to discovering the best candidate for CNU. Bob Winder agreed, emphasizing that the committee was conducting an open and honest search with due diligence, with no favorites, and no inside track. Senator Winder mentioned that the committee would compose a short list of candidates once they had read all the applications, and that if the committee was not satisfied that there were enough candidates of the kind desired that they would indicate that. He added that the closing date for applicants is January 20, 2014, and that the committee was planning to start looking at files in next week. President Redick noted that the committee would meet the last week in January and the first week in February, that they had set aside three days to discuss the list of prospective candidates. Senator Winder emphasized that President Tribble wants an open and honest search. Other senators agreed on the importance of having a provost who is the result of a national search because of the position’s importance to the university community. Provost Padilla was commended for having put into writing what university values for tenure and promotion and used as an example of the value in bringing right person into position. Several senators stressed the need for a provost of high academic caliber, as someone who can continue to build school reputation, and the value in bringing someone in from outside with a wide experience of academic institutions. Senators inquired if the model from the last search would be followed, bringing in three candidates whom the faculty would have opportunities to hear speak, and Senators Winder and Redick, as members of the search committee, assured the senate that such opportunities would be available and urged senators and other faculty members to come to those meetings prepared to ask questions of the candidates. They also reminded the Senate of the search committee’s role in recommending candidates to President Tribble, but that the final hiring decision rests with the President of the university.

## **6. FMLA/Childcare subcommittee report**

Senator Thompson summarized the subcommittee’s report, starting with FMLA (Family and Medical Leave Act). She observed that there were two main concerns that faculty have raised in response to the Provost’s suggestions. First, faculty members were concerned with the potential legal ramifications of being required to sign an affidavit that they are the child’s primary caregiver. She mentioned that the issue had been brought up in the SEC’s meeting with Provost Doughty, who had said he would check with the university counsel on the issue, but that he

believed other universities also had the same requirement. The second issue the subcommittee has been considering is a cut-off due date for fall term pregnancies that would make clearer when faculty members should take fall term leave and when they should take spring term leave. The subcommittee had checked FMLA and spring term start date patterns, and sought faculty feedback, and they had determined that for pregnancy due dates before November 1 faculty members should take fall leave, and after November 21 they should take spring leave. But for due dates that fall between those dates, there needs to be a window for discussion between the faculty member and the provost. She noted that Provost Doughty is open to that. She then requested Senate feedback on those two issues, and whether senators felt they needed more clarification.

Senators generally discussed their concerns and questions. Some suggested that since the Provost has a concern over conforming to the six week leave window required by FMLA and the shifting dates of the beginning of spring term, that perhaps it would make more sense to set the cut-off date as six weeks before the start date of spring semester rather than firmly fixed on November 21, and the subcommittee members agreed to that. The Senate then took up the affidavit issue. Senators had not found other universities that had such a practice, though several had looked. Others questioned why CNU should be concerned if spouses employed elsewhere also had leave from their jobs. Senators agreed that such a concern was reasonable if both parents were CNU faculty, so that the university only covered the leave of one parent. Senators noted that other issues might be compromised by such an affidavit requirement, such as when adoption agencies retain primary custody of a newly adopted child, so that a new parent perhaps couldn't legally sign such an affidavit. Senators suggested that perhaps the faculty might want an independent legal opinion on the question. The Senate did note that faculty do want a policy, to move away from case-by-case requests that in the past did not seem equally applied, and that they were grateful to Provost Doughty for being willing to work towards a full semester's leave at full pay. The subcommittee said they would look further into seeing if there were other universities with such a policy, and the Senate agreed to pick up the issue at the February meeting.

Senator Thompson then reported on the taskforce to establish a childcare center on campus (report included below). The task force now had 16 faculty and 4 staff volunteers, so a total of 20 members. She noted that the faculty members were composed of 75% restricted faculty and 25% first or second year faculty members. She asked if the Senate could officially form the task force or if it should be formed by the Provost. She explained the research the subcommittee had done on what the task force needed to try to accomplish. She started by explaining the fund raising that will be needed: such centers are not cheap to start and fund raising will be a two year process. She had spoken with the director of her own children's preschool, who had strongly advised first hiring a director who could guide the opening of the center by helping form the list of the center's requirements, as well as staff it once it was ready to open. But fund raising must come first in order so that we have the money to build the facility before hiring someone to run it. Senator Hunter, also from the subcommittee, pointed out that it is critical to realize that the childcare facility will need to be an on campus facility, but not a research/teaching facility. The best way to raise funds is to show how it will provide support for our faculty, staff, and students to do their best work, rather than serve a pedagogical purpose. Senators inquired how much money would be needed, and Senator Hunter estimated two to three million dollars to build a building that meets code, noting that her estimate did not include any price for land that it will be on. The Senate discussed whether it might be endowed with private

money or made a part of the university budget; Senator Hunter noted that of the campus child care models that the subcommittee had examined few were built by state monies and nearly all were private in some way. Senators asked the reason behind the recommendation to not include integrating a child development lab into the facility, and Senators Hunter and Thompson answered that that type of facility has nearly triple the number of regulations that a non-lab facility would have. They noted that many potential clients might not want their children to be subjects of experiments and that the Psychology Department already has a child development lab, so attaching that purpose to the child care center would not significantly help the university, particularly since CNU lacks a School of Education, unlike most other universities that incorporate a lab component to their child care programs. The subcommittee had decided after investigating the issue that a lab component wouldn't be cost effective and that a focus on supporting faculty, staff, and students to develop community would be better for fund raising purposes. Senators inquired whether it would be only for CNU employees and students or open for the Peninsula community at large. Senator Hunter suggested that it be primarily for CNU faculty, staff, and students. The Senate discussed the possibility of later adding a senior administrator, such as Bill Brauer, to the task force, but for the moment agreed to vote on recommending the task force to the Provost as suggested by the committee's report.

**Motion 1/17/14.4 That a task force to establish a child care facility be formed, consisting of the volunteers from faculty (Melissa Hedlund, Kristin Skees, Laura Lloyd, Ivan Rodden IV, Russell Burke, Anna de Jong, Heather Harwell, John Finn, Andria Timmer, Molly Waters, Dawn Hutchinson, Andy Bibby, Jessica Thompson, Laurie Hunger) and staff (Ada Badgley, Juliana Wait, Tammy Waldroup, Claire Jacobs). Moved Kip Redick. Seconded Bill Connell. Passed unanimously.**

## **7. Equity of annual evaluations**

The Senate took up the issue of the equity of annual evaluations between tenure stream and restricted faculty. President Redick brought up the three considerations outlined at the December meeting: the pressure on deans to norm to 3 on evaluations, the comparison of publication requirements between tenure stream and restricted faculty, and the lack of clarity in AR evaluations. President Redick recognized Dr. Jeffrey Gibbons, who told the Senate he had come to the meeting to address this issue. He argued that restricted faculty members are hired for their scholarly expertise, not for their scholarly activity or productivity. They are hired to teach, do some service, but not to do research, and therefore should not be evaluated on whether they have accomplished research. He believes it should be either remove from the AR evaluation or that restricted faculty members should be evaluated on their scholarly expertise, but not on production. There should be a benefit if they choose to do research, but they should not get a black mark for not doing it since they were hired to teach, not do research. Scholarly production should be only a bonus category. A number of senators expressed agreement; discussion shifted to the pressure to norm at 3.0, with several senators arguing that it is a terrible math error because for every reward given, someone else has to be punished with a lower score even if not deserved. Senators observed that the problem is that 3.0 is treated as the mean but it isn't truly, that the numbers are being artificially adjusted to make 3.0, and that the deans are being forced into trying to average to the mean on each person. One senator suggested that a more accurate method would be for the deans to assign a raw score reflecting their evaluation, which could then

be used to create a mean from the rest of the faculty, for purer comparison. Senators then discussed the need to institutionally decide on standards, since policies seem to change with changes in administrators on whether restricted faculty should be held to the same publication standard as tenure stream faculty. Senators noted the administration position that different teaching loads had different weights for scholarly production, but many noted (particularly department chairs) that the weighting didn't really work to accomplish its goal, and that the different teaching loads should be in different strata rather than weighted differently in the same stratum. Another senator noted that part of the problem derives from the lack of clarity in criteria for evaluation: we have people being hired to do different things but all seem to be evaluated by a single system based on the requirements for achieving tenure on the EVAL 4. There's no separate criteria for ARs, even though we're told the two are different. One senator summed up the discussion as showing that the university needs to more clearly articulate the differences in kinds of faculty, which should be reflected in kinds of criteria for annual evaluation—but there is no criteria because the EVAL 4 is supposedly not used for ARs, even though it is the only place written criteria exist. Senators mentioned the departmental EVAL 4s, but with the comment that the upper levels of administration don't look at departmental EVAL 4s so they don't help solve the problem. Senators agreed that an AR evaluation criteria document is needed, that different levels that reflect the differing requirements for the three different levels of faculty. Senators also agreed that the pressure to norm to 3.0 needs separate attention from the criteria issue. The Senate asked Senators Manning, Puaca, and Dr. Gibbons to work as a subcommittee to articulate the Senate's concerns on the 3.0 mean and AR evaluation criteria that mirror the University EVAL 4 but that takes the three kinds of faculty and differing teaching loads into account. Senators also mentioned the question of requiring 0.5 increments, rather than more flexible smaller increments.

At 4:35, the Senate took a short break. Senators Puaca and Manning left during the break. The Senate returned to session at 4:47.

President Redick informed the Senate in his that Provost Doughty had agreed to the Senate's recommendation to fund search committee members' meals when hosting candidates on campus, and that the University would now reimburse up to four search committee members for their meal expenses for one meal, subject to state regulations.

## **8. Supersections**

Senator Connell introduced the issue, saying that he has noticed that supersections fill first, even when smaller class sections of the same course are available. He believes that this occurs because students perceive them as easier, because they know they won't have to write as many papers for large classes. He noted that the class sizes that are important for the overall university statistics are those comprised of 19 and 50 students. He noted that CNU advertises that not more than 4% of the classes are over 50, but that more than 4% of students have classes that size, of course. He suggested that the Senate should review which courses are being taught as supersections and consider pedagogical issues. Senator Hasbrouck noted that the increase in classes over 100 comes from increase of classes at 19 or less. Vice Provost DeJulio informed the Senate that the administration had decided that starting in Fall 2014 there would be no more classes over 100 in the fall. President Redick said that he had been informed that the registration number would be 95 students, which would provide some wiggle room if a student needed the course to graduate.

Senators discussed the background to having created supersections, which was to create the space to move from a 3/4 teaching load to 3/3. Some senators suggested that supersections don't affect pedagogy very much in some courses. Other suggested that the Senate needed to think carefully through potential unintended consequences of eliminating supersections, such as classes over 50 without the release that comes with teaching a supersection. Senator Connell noted that the History Department had decided not to teach supersections because they don't fit department pedagogical aims: supersections would strip essential writing and critical thinking out. But he observed that other disciplines may have pedagogies that made supersections tenable within their departments. When questioned about how his department coped, he explained that they had realized that the numbers advantage for super sections was not significant and so temporarily raised their caps and used the expansion of the faculty to reduce the numbers in the course caps for their introductory surveys.. Vice Provost Deiulio noted that department chairs can explore options with their dean, as History had done. Senator Keeling read a long email from a colleague who discussed his pedagogy in teaching writing within a supersection and how it differed from his pedagogy in teaching writing in smaller classes. He emphasized that while he could not require as much writing or teach it as intensively as in small classes, he did feel it was important within the class and had devised means by which he could accomplish it for the one class he teaches in supersection form. Other senators noted that in most supersections grading is based on multiple choice tests, and that students don't get as much nurturing as they do in smaller classes. They noted that there is a big difference in student behavior in large classes as well: it is difficult to get class discussion going, that students appear to be physically present in class but not mentally, with students sleeping or texting in class. It is a difficult problem to manage, forcing the professor to choose between being a police officer or teacher. Choosing the latter, however, fosters an environment in which students can text or sleep. Senators also noted that large classes force professors to entertain students to keep them engaged, but that frequently means foregoing more substantial engagement with issues. Senators agreed that a review of which classes are offered as supersections would be a good idea, not with an eye toward eliminating them, particularly if they are necessary for departments to cover students, but so that they are chosen carefully, for good reasons, and with pedagogical purposes and techniques in mind.

#### **9. Provost's proposal to move dossier reviews to spring term**

President Redick went over Provost Doughty's suggestion to move tenure and retention dossier reviews to spring term:

1. Reviewing dossiers in the spring would provide an extra semester of data at every review (2, 4, 6, full, etc.). At the two-year review this is 50% more data (3 semesters instead of 2), and at the tenure review it allows an extra semester at the time when productivity should be high. I always want more data! And candidates should too!
2. We are currently doing too much evaluation in the fall, and we risk overloading evaluators. When the dossier reviews were moved to the fall, we were NOT doing systematic 3-year contracts for restricted faculty, conversion requests and triennium proposals in the fall. We are now doing all of these, in addition to the ARs and dossier reviews.

3. The current cycle means that we deliver bad news to unsuccessful candidates right before the Christmas break, at a time which should be full of joy and celebration. And then we only give them three weeks or so to recover before we ask them to get right back into teaching the spring semester. By contrast a spring evaluation with bad news delivered in April will allow them the summer for "psychic recovery."
4. After a negative review, candidates will only be on campus two full semesters, rather than three full semesters, as under the current plan. This is a significant issue, as there is an undeniable awkwardness once a negative review has been completed and the "terminal clock" begins ticking. In virtually no other enterprise does a "discontinued" employee stay in their old job for 18 months.
5. Many universities take the better part of the academic year to complete the review process, beginning in the fall and ending sometime in the spring. Finishing the reviews in the spring is very common (we used to do it here!).
6. We know that we can finish in one semester, because we do it now, in addition to all the other things we are doing in the fall! There is no problem with timing - Laura has a schedule worked out which roughly looks like this:

JAN - DRC

FEB - Deans and FRC

MAR - Provost and President

APR - Notification in early April, BOV action at the April meeting.

The only serious objection I can see to this plan is that it would mean that faculty couldn't search for a job in that first spring semester, as they can now. My answer to this objection is that very few faculty actually take advantage of that and leave at the end of the year. We have looked at the Fall 2011 and Fall 2012 reviews, and of the seven faculty who received negative reviews, six stayed at CNU for the full three additional semesters.

Another (minor) objection might be that we are doing searches in the spring, which is true. But, on average we are doing one search per department at this point in the academic year (sometimes more searches are added later as searches are unsuccessful or we learn people are leaving). Thus doing a search or two and dossier review should not put undue strain on departmental resources.

Senators discussed the Provost's suggestion. Several took issue with his interpretation of faculty staying the extra year, for various reasons. One noted that while few jobs have an 18-month to search, few have such compressed job search opportunity times either, and that his data works against him: it suggests that most need two years to find a new job. Others pointed out that while those expecting a bad decision might be on the market during the tenure year, not knowing if they would get it or not would make it difficult to accept a job offer in the spring before they had the results of their search. Others cited the difficulty of getting the tenure dossier prepared during winter break: though much could be done in the summer before, a fair amount would still

have to be redone to account for the extra term of data, plus the work of doing it twice: once in fall for ARs and again in the spring for the dossier, plus the IDEAs for fall term might not be available until just before the dossier was due, creating problems in responding to and incorporating them. Other senators cited the psychological difficulty of having to wait another semester to know the results of the decision. Still others suggested that an extra semester might increase expectations still further. Others suggested that it might be more practical to move ARs to spring if the administrators were having difficulty doing both ARs and dossiers in the fall, though it was noted that two of the colleges hadn't liked that idea last year. Senators who had checked with junior faculty reported mixed reactions, with some for it and some against. Others suggested that more substantial checks with junior faculty were needed, and that this was too big an issue to tackle in a year of transition and it would be better to wait until next year with the permanent provost. Ultimately, the Senate felt that it is more important to protect faculty members who do not get renewed and give them two cycles to hunt for a new job, rather than consider the convenience of those at CNU who have jobs.

President Redick inquired if there were other outstanding issues, and the Senate warmly congratulated Dr. Quentin Kidd for having won the SCHEV Outstanding Faculty Award.

**10. Motion to Adjourn. Moved Harry Grau. Seconded Bill Connell. Passed Unanimously.** The Senate adjourned at 5:45.

**Child Care Taskforce as of January 2014.** In our September discussion with Provost Doughty, he proposed there would be a larger net benefit to a greater proportion of the faculty to use available university resources for increases in salary, which may then make paying for child care easier for those faculty members who need it. Faculty, however, are interested in an on-campus child care center, so the subcommittee has continued the work of the 2011-2012 taskforce.

As we have continued to mention, faculty support is crucial to our pursuit of this on-campus child care center. Several requests for potential members for the proposed taskforce have been made. So far, we have 12 interested faculty members, all of whom are restricted or first-year tenure track, and 4 staff members. If we want to see an on-campus center, then we need to have active involvement. This undertaking will be huge, with much investigation and fiscal planning.

The following websites provide some insight into the process and areas of consideration ([http://www.nal.usda.gov/ric/ricpubs/rural\\_child\\_care.htm](http://www.nal.usda.gov/ric/ricpubs/rural_child_care.htm); <http://www.richmondgov.com/planninganddevelopmentreview/documents/ChildAdultCareUsesPamphlet.pdf>; [https://www.dss.virginia.gov/facility/child\\_care/licensed/child\\_day\\_centers/](https://www.dss.virginia.gov/facility/child_care/licensed/child_day_centers/); <http://www.gsa.gov/graphics/pbs/startupguide.pdf>).

Also, Jessica has contacted a local child development center for information as well. The director has provided us with some crucial planning and organizational information,



including the strong recommendation of hiring a director to coordinate this effort, rather than a faculty taskforce.

- Interested faculty: Melissa Hedlund, Kristin Skees, Laura Lloyd, [Ivan Rodden IV](#), Russell Burke, Anna de Jong, Heather Harwell, John Finn, Andria Timmer, Molly Waters, Dawn Hutchinson, Andy Bibby
- Interested staff: Ada Badgley, Juliana Wait, Tammy Waldroup, Claire Jacobs

## **FMLA as of January 2014.**

**Summary (see bold sections in original proposal; highlighted portions reflect Provost's comments from SEC meeting on January 13, 2014):**

**The two main issues with regard to the FMLA guidelines are as follows: (1) faculty are concerned about the legal ramifications of faculty having to sign an affidavit stating he/she is the primary care giver, and (2) there will need to be a window of time in the semester (e.g., due date from Nov 1-25 for the fall and something similar in the spring) when the semester to be taken off will have to be discussed based on individual and departmental needs.**

The subcommittee met with Provost Doughty on Sept. 17, 2013. Dave expressed an interest in making the FMLA policy more consistent by developing guidelines as to how faculty will be awarded leave for the birth or adoption of a child. These guidelines should enhance faculty understanding and expectation of how leave will be awarded, will allow the provost to more rapidly and judiciously make decisions regarding leave, and will allow departments to more easily plan for these events.

The current CNU policy is to provide 12 weeks of paid leave for faculty who give birth to or adopt a child during the academic year, leaving the faculty member to work for four weeks during the semester in which the event occurs.

Dr. Doughty proposes:

- Faculty members be given a full semester of leave. He would like to provide full pay during that entire semester, but that decision will ultimately rest with the President and the Board of Visitors. Dave will press for full pay, but feels confident that at a minimum, he can offer faculty 75% pay for the entire semester.
- Faculty must take leave in the semester the child will be born (or be adopted), with the exception of cases where the birth occurs very late in the semester. This policy will prevent departments from having to cover for faculty members for an extended portion of the semester. The exact cut-off date for when leave would be moved to the next semester should be addressed by the Faculty Senate.
  - **The subcommittee suggests two dates, one reflective on an early fall birth (fall semester leave) and one reflective on a late fall birth (following spring semester leave). There would be a two or three week window for which faculty would need to discuss the leave time with the Provost. The requested time off must coincide with federal regulations regarding leave.**
- A faculty member requesting leave must sign an affidavit stating he/she will be the primary care giver for the newborn. If two faculty members are employed by CNU, only one will be eligible for leave. Alternatively, both faculty members may request half-time leave with a 50% course reduction.
  - **The subcommittee recommends consultation with independent legal counsel to understand any legal issues concerning a signed statement regarding caregiving. We recommend a statement when both parents are**

**CNU faculty only one may request leave. Provost Doughty will present this issue to University Counsel.**

- Faculty have the option of extending the tenure clock if they take FMLA leave, and this should be discussed with the provost.
- Unforeseen events such as a difficult pregnancy requiring bedrest or the premature birth of the baby will be addressed on a case-by-case basis by the provost. This situation may fall under the medical leave clause of FMLA (such that a faculty member may take medical leave for a portion of a semester and then maternity leave for the following semester, if appropriate).

Once a new policy is established, Provost Doughty would like the University Handbook updated to reflect the policy. The sub-committee will press for a statement linking to the relevant Handbook section to also be posted on the Provost's website in order to address some of the issues identified by faculty regarding easy access to relevant information.