

Christopher Newport University Faculty Senate Minutes
Board Room of the David Student Union
August 29, 2014
3:00PM – 6:00PM

Senators Present: Adamitis, Manning, Martin, Grau, Brash(3:05); Nichols, Holland, Barnello, Hunter, Timani, Jelinek, Thompson, Winder, Hasbrouck
Absent: Busch (conference)

1. Call to Order President Adamitis called the meeting to order at 3:04

2. President's Report

President Adamitis welcomed everyone to the first meeting of the 2014-2015 academic year. Senators then introduced themselves and their department affiliations. The agenda for this meeting will include a vote to approve the April 25 minutes. There will be brief reports from individual members of the SEC regarding the summer Board of Visitors meetings. A member of the SEC attended each of the different subcommittee meetings of the summer BOV meeting. Reports from these senators will follow later in this Faculty Senate meeting. Continuing business will include Senator Grau presenting an endowment agreement which will serve to establish an endowed scholarship at CNU for a dependent of a CNU faculty member. A major item for today's meeting will be the careful consideration of a set of proposed Faculty Senate goals for this academic year. President Adamitis asks that senators consider if any additional strategies need to be added, or specific data pursued. Deadlines will need to be set for us, as a senate, to meet these goals.

Senator Adamitis wished to express to President Tribble and all involved how grateful the CNU faculty are for the recent salary increases. The Provost met with SEC members again over the summer to provide further details on how salary increases were derived. In addition, the Provost has been working on a new proposal to give parental leave at the university. The University Council is involved in this. Provost Doughty will relay that proposal to the Faculty Senate in the next couple of weeks. At this summer SEC meeting with the Provost, the SEC discussed instituting a new form of contract for restricted faculty. Included in this summer meeting was a discussion of new titles for Lectures such as Master Lecturers. In particular, Vice Provost Kidd will begin development of a promotion system for Lecturers. Vice Provost Kidd will be developing a proposal and possibly forming a task force. We are certain that some part of this consideration by the task force will include ongoing monitors that no degradation to the tenure system occur here at CNU

President Adamitis went to the first Provost Advisory Staff (PAS) meeting one week prior to today. The PAS includes Vice-Provosts, Deans and administrative assistants including members of the IRAR staff. To her understanding this was the first time that a Faculty Senate president had been invited to one of these meetings. The President's opinion is that these advisory meeting will be extremely useful to faculty for creating lines of communication with the administration.

President Adamitis was particularly pleased with the turnout of faculty at the August 20 All Faculty Meeting. She expressed her appreciation to all faculty in attendance. Many of the faculty that were present shared their concerns and ideas. We, the Faculty Senate, want to be a proactive body here at CNU, and the faculty have already been most helpful in this respect.

3. Affirmation of Minutes.

It was noted that the April 4th minutes had been approved at the April 25th, 2014 meeting.

4. Affirmation of Minutes.

The Senate agreed to affirm the minutes from the April 25, 2013 meeting electronically. Only past year faculty senators are eligible to vote on the April 25th minutes.

Motion that the minutes of the April 25, 2013 Faculty Senate meeting be approved electronically. Moved Senator Barnello. Seconded. Rachel Holland. Passed unanimously.

5. Summer BOV reports

A. Finance Committee

At the BOV meeting, Cindi Perry presented a clear and thorough explanation of the fiscal year budget, giving great detail on everything involved. The BOV voted and approved the new operating budget. The BOV's knowledge and expertise on financial matters is impressive. It is well-regarded and it is assuring to the Senator that the BOV provide such full disclosure of all of the details on the University budget. As always, senators took away from this meeting how skillful the finance committee is. Senators report that the BOV has been trying for many years now to increase faculty salaries. President Adamitis will invite someone to give a budgeting basics session for all of the Faculty Senate.

B. Student Life

The Admissions office is doing more than ever to recruit students. It was reported that over 22000 student visitors came to campus during the past year. The Admissions Department had representation at over 230 college fairs. 2300 interviews were conducted as a part of this year's admission process. Electronic surveys are used to determine which students to send recruitment solicitations. Numerous mailings went out to prospective students. The Senator representative at the meeting reported on the change in the core advisor process, discussed by this BOV subcommittee. New for this academic year is a procedure that has all advisees, of a core advisor, simultaneously enrolled in one specific class. The effectiveness of this change will be monitored in the months to come. Senators voiced concerns about how students are assigned to core advisors. One senator expressed concern that there might be occasions in which an advisee might not want to reveal things to an advisor who is also their class instructor. On an aside, during this discussion a Senator expressed concern specifically about how honors students are assigned to advisors. From the BOV meeting it was made clear that a slight preference in admission decisions is given to students who show special interest in coming to CNU. This determination is likely made through campus interviews of applicant students. Action item: Get information on how exactly our Admissions Department determines which students are interested in coming to CNU.

C. Academic Affairs

The General Assembly approved a procedure for awarding credits to veterans, in particular giving joint services transfer credit. The General assembly mandated that all Virginia schools have a policy in place for awarding credit to veterans. Currently CNU awards credit to veterans on a case by case basis. Retention rates were presented at this meeting as well as new opportunities for faculty and students in study abroad programs. The number of upcoming faculty searches was also reported. SCHEV retention data were presented.

D. University Advancement

Details on the giving amounts for the 2014 fiscal year were presented. There is currently

a 14% giving rate by university alumni. Next year the board hopes to improve upon this number. Of the 42 million dollar Comprehensive campaign goal, almost 37 million dollars has been raised. For one, moneys from this will help with the creation of an endowed professorship and has already lead to 72 endowed scholarships for students. The enormous advantages of having the Lifelong Learning society here at CNU was discussed. There is an ongoing goal of 600 involved in Lifelong Learning which is being met. Finally, the opening of the new Alumni house on campus was announced with a potential October groundbreaking.

6. Faculty Dependent Endowment Agreement

At the April 14 meeting with the President and Provost we approved a motion to create an endowed scholarship for faculty dependents who attend CNU. The CNU Faculty Senate will be the sponsor of this program. This scholarship is geared solely toward children of full-time faculty. For eligibility, the student must be enrolled here at CNU. For a faculty dependent to receive this, they would have to be admitted and maintain full-time status. It is the intention of developers of this agreement that these scholarships will be four year awards and that these will not be merit-based awards. Instead, the award decision would be based upon a faculty member's length of service at CNU. Naturally, requirements for the scholarship include the student maintaining good grades. The sponsors of this scholarship hope that gifts to this fund will be made for one, through the faculty staff campaign and designated to this fund. Time is of the essence in getting this fund off the ground. Once the amount in this account reaches \$50000 we will be able to begin awarding one such scholarship. Every \$50000 will support a \$2000 per year scholarship. Doubling the amount in the fund would lead to a doubling of awards, and so on. After this discussion, senators questioned whether or not it should be a merit-based scholarship. Given that this will serve as a vehicle for faculty recruitment, Senators questioned whether seniority is the best way to decide on the awardee. It was left to senators to propose amendments to the draft that was presented. President Adamitis specifically asked that senators look at statement (3) in the draft and the language of statement (1). The scholarship is currently open to naming rights.

Senator Grau moved that we accept the endowment agreement. Seconded by Senator Brash. Motion tabled.

The Faculty Senate will vote on this at their next meeting. Strategies need to be formalized for raising the necessary dollars in the seven year time frame. Senator Grau will present to the Faculty Senate secretary what other schools do for faculty dependent scholarships. Also, clearly worded awarding requirements need to be put into place. Senators need to go through the language to explore exactly what responsibilities the Faculty Senate would incur under this proposed agreement.

7. Faculty Senate Schedule for AY-14/15

Faculty Senate meetings are scheduled for the third Friday of each month. The week following each meeting the SEC will meet with the Provost. SEC planning sessions have all been scheduled (the week before full Faculty Senate meetings) as well as full Senate meeting with President Tribble and Provost Dougherty. President Adamitis would like to return to the old tradition of occasional open faculty meetings.

8. Committee Volunteers and liaison reports

All departments have been assigned a liaison from the Faculty Senate.

Senator Thompson (Chair, Faculty Development Grants) and Sabbaticals committee) with Senator Nichols and Senator Hasbrouck

Senator Hunter (Chair, child care committee) with Professors Rodden and Valdez

Professor Redick (Chair, religious diversity and dialogue committee) with Senator Timani and Professors Moran and Connable

Senator Jelinek (Chair, Awards committee) with Senators Brash, Timani and Barnello

– former award winners will also be asked to participate

Senator Barnello will send to President Adamitis criteria for making these awards.

Questions ensued regarding Adjunct awards. Senator Timani asked where part time faculty fit in under teaching awards. Senator Jelinek will research these and other questions regarding faculty awards.

Vice President Manning (Chair, Elections committee) with Senators Timani and Hunter

Senator Brash (Chair, Handbook committee) with Senators Holland and Busch

Vice President Manning (Chair, Committee on Academic Standing Committees) with President Adamitis and Professors Carpenter, Kennedy and Sweet

For this academic year we will move away from liaisons to University academic committees. Instead, President Adamitis would like to serve as Faculty Senate liaison to all committees. President Adamitis will send an email every couple of weeks asking for updates from University academic committees.

9. Faculty Development Grant Schedule

The schedule for faculty development grants is available now on the Provost's website <http://cnu.edu/provost>. All forms are available there as well.

10. Faculty Senate Goals (A-D) for AY 14-15

A. Increase faculty participation and leadership in University governance and ensure open, effective communication between the faculty and administration for the purpose of enhancing the academic strength of the University.

As a part of this, the Faculty Senate proposes that the University committee structure be reviewed by the Committee on Committees to determine such things as the appropriate number of faculty on each committee and whether all existing University committees are needed.

B. Ensure clarity, consistency and the implementation of best practices regarding faculty performance reviews and evaluation standards for the purpose of increasing faculty satisfaction, faculty retention and job performance.

The above became a concern last semester when the subject of how much could be taken from a dissertation and credited as faculty publication during evaluations.

It was suggested that Departmental Eval-4 should now be given greater attention by all. A primary reason for this is to serve as an educational instrument on departmental differences. Senators liked the

idea of these for some of the following reasons: they would tell an outside member how the department works and what it values. Typical time scales for publication within different disciplines could be elaborated. Are there customary practices in certain disciplines for taking results from dissertation for publication? Departmental Eval-4s provide context for what is usual teaching and service requirements within each individual discipline. Individual department needs are different in areas such as service and how FTEs are distributed to faculty. Senators agreed to charge each department chair with translating the University's EVAL-4 into each of their own department's language and requirements. It is the hope of the faculty senators that each and every faculty member regardless of rank participate in this discussion of departmental EVAL-4 translation. President Adamitis will place the CUC in charge of overseeing production of these documents. Since the primary purpose is educational, senators suggested that these Departmental EVAL-4's be more narrative than the University EVAL-4. The Faculty Senate would like a report from the CUC in November. A deadline for a final report should be February so that it might be ready for inclusion in the University handbook. Senators suggested that we might want the departmental EVAL-4 to cite journals that are appropriate for each individual department. The Senate will also bring our desire for a greater use of departmental EVAL-4's to the attention of the President and Provost at our next Senate meeting with them.

Action Plan: Monday, the CUC will get the charge to translate the university EVAL-4 into individual departmental terms.

CUC preliminary report to Senate in November.

CUC final report to Faculty Senate in February.

Potential Handbook language: all evaluators are required to take the department EVAL-4 into consideration. Secondly, the department EVAL-4 must be included as a part of every dossier checklist.

An outstanding question includes when we want these minor changes to come into effect? The Senate did not arrive at an answer on this.

Senator Brash in his role of Handbook Liaison pointed out that Section XII.8.a.6.b of the University Handbook includes the following:

Consistent with the general standards described in XII.8.e.2) and XII.8.f.3) and in the University EVAL-4, each department delineates the specific criteria and procedures it will use in evaluating its members. The criteria are submitted to the appropriate dean for review of the initial statement of amendments thereto. In the absence of departmental action, the dean writes the departmental criteria. Such departmental criteria supplements but does not supersede the evaluation criteria contained in the *University Handbook* of in the University EVAL-4.

Senators expressed their hopes that the administration support this endeavour of the CUC. It was mentioned that a side benefit will be to provide clarity for evaluators who are outside the evaluatee's department. President Adamitis suggests that we first go to the Provost and the Deans to see if they are in support of this.

Senator Hasbrouck left at 4:40

There had been a technical issue associated with IDEA evaluations. It was pointed out that Lorraine Hall has fixed a past difficulty with the IDEA system in that it allowed students who had withdrawn from a course to still complete the IDEA form for that class. She has altered the IDEA calendar so that the link goes out after students who withdraw have been removed. Concern remains that only students enrolled in a class are the ones that are submitting a faculty

evaluation for a course.

IDEA states that small class size result should not be used as reliable information for summative evaluations. For instance, after one semester with only data from small classes, how does a chair utilize IDEA scores? Also senators are uncertain of the impact of supersections on IDEA evaluation scores. Also Senators ask, what the expectations are for IDEA scores of first year faculty who are just beginning to become settled at the university. Importantly, senators ask how we best make use of the IDEA data to make informed decisions. Are we using the IDEA's to make us better teachers? Strong sentiment among senators is that IDEA scores should be just one factor in evaluating teaching effectiveness.

Several senators advocated for obtaining longitudinal data from the IDEA center (over long time scale) for individual instructors. Senators wondered if the IDEA could pool the numbers over many semesters. **The Senate** requests that our new committee on IDEA evaluation make a report on these matters. Can the committee make a report on best practices to be used with the IDEA scores?

- C. Increase Faculty participation in the curricular process for the purpose of enhancing the University's academic strength.
- D. Enhance the quality of faculty life at CNU for the purpose of increasing faculty satisfaction, retention and recruitment.

In this regard, Provost Doughty will provide us with a proposed new policy on family leave. Senators were unclear if this new policy was going to codify a leave for an entire semester or not. Past policy only provided 12 weeks of leave. To date, there is no official policy as to whether or not requests would necessarily be granted. Senators mentioned that for someone newly hired they might be reluctant to ask the Provost for a family leave. Also Senators voiced their displeasure that the whole procedure for obtaining family leave is currently unclear.

The Child care committee will look to see if there might be innovative ways of partnering CNU with an existing Newport News Child care facility. Senators asked if there might be a way of listing potential baby sitters on an internal CNU website. Senators mentioned that for faculty who only require after school care, perhaps some of our MAT students could assist.

Senators wonder if we are creating an environment that fosters faculty research? A committee will be formed to look at the adequacy of research support for faculty members and to determine if there are innovative way to enhance faculty research support (Chair Senator Brash). Senator Brash will solicit members from the instructional faculty for this committee. Senators requested that the membership on this ad-hoc committee be diverse across various disciplines. Some questions for the committee: Amount of start up funds for lecturers? Should this tie in somehow with the departmental Eval-4?

Finally President Adamitis raises the question if the weights for evaluations are appropriate across various faculty ranks. Should there be a higher service expectations for post tenure faculty? Objections to this included the ongoing availability of individual instructors for requesting adjustment to weights in a given year.

Motion that the Faculty Senate goals A-D above be accepted
Moved Senator Adamitis. Seconded. Senator Brash. Passed unanimously.

11. Annual Review Forms

The CUC recommends that we make one change to the Overall Performance scale. Their recommendation is to change from our current half point increment scale to a .1 increment scale. Their rationale: the chairs would like to have additional specificity and control in their evaluations. (A 3.2 score gets rounded down to a 3 as does a 2.8, which are actually very different performances.) On the other hand, one senator pointed out the following scenario: If a faculty member has a 3.5 on say Teaching and a 3.5 on Scholarship, Research, Creative Activity, but Service is not very good; in this situation a chair might like the leeway to still award an overall 3.5 (since 2 out of 3 were a 3.5) for such a department member.

**Motion that the scale for overall performance be changed to a 1/10 increment scale.
Moved Senator Martin. Seconded. Senator Brash.
Passed unanimously.**

12. Other business

Senators expressed their desire for a formal written procedure of evaluation of Lecturers. Vice Provost Kidd is beginning an examination of this matter. Senators remain unclear on the potential movement toward a future 70%-30% tenure/restricted split in the faculty at CNU. This will be an excellent opportunity to have open sessions on this subject. Senator Hunter has volunteered to conduct one of these. Given her Lecturer status she is especially suited to leading such a discussion.

The LLC is asked how we can adjust the procedure in the University Handbook in the event of academic policy change. Specifically, solidify language on the proper chain of approvals for such.

Lastly, sponsors names need to now be included in all curriculum change proposals.

Recent concerns about fall freshmen registration have been voiced by faculty. In the past it has happened that chairs will build a schedule and then send them up to the Registrars office. The problem is that occasionally those seats will disappear. Senators believe that chairs should have a strong voice in allocation of seats in classes. Senator Adamitis will request that Lisa Duncan Raines and Pete Carlson come to the college chairs meeting to discuss this matter and explain the process of allocating seats in classes.

Motion to adjourn

5:45

approved