

Faculty Senate Minutes
WEDNESDAY, AUGUST 21, 2013, 8:30 a.m.
McMurrin 101
Full Faculty Senate Meeting and All-Faculty Forum

Senators Present: Redick, Martin, Keeling, Connell, Selim; Barnello, Depretis, Grau, Holland, Hunter, Manning, Puaca, Thompson.

President Redick convened the meeting at 8:32 a.m. Approximately 60 faculty were present for the meeting, in addition to the senators. President Redick introduced the list of August 2103 graduates and asked that they be passed around for faculty perusal and subsequent vote. He then introduced the senators individually and stressed that two more were needed from the College of Social Sciences, requesting that nominations be sent to Vice-President Martin to be put to a vote. He likewise observed that the Undergraduate Research Council had gaps and promised to send an email explaining eligibility requirements and requesting volunteers.

President Redick then went through a list of topics and issues that the Senate planned to take up for the 2013-14 academic year. These included the following concerns:

- The incomplete search for a director of assessment;
- The planned national search for a new provost;
- The need for sponsors for major curriculum changes, who could track, shepherd, and explain proposed changes throughout the levels of committee approval;
- Search committee funding, so that committee members are not required to subsidize searches by paying for their own meals when hosting candidates;
- The need for improvements in Service commitment and Service culture among the faculty;
- The need to improve faculty development services and opportunities;
- The assessment and evaluation of administrators;
- The ongoing need for child care service for the CNU community of faculty, staff, administrators, and students;
- The upcoming curricular changes;
- Religious dialogue and diversity on campus.

President Redick then requested that faculty break up into small groups and brainstorm ideas on other issues and topics they would like to see the Senate address during the coming academic year. Among the ideas generated in the ensuing discussion were the following:

- Concerns for improved mechanisms to improve teaching performance evaluation, particularly how to establish protocol for peer observation that is rigorous and verifiable.
- Concerns about the administration of the IDEA: the best time to administer it (several faculty argued for the end of the term), when students find out about filling out the forms, and mistakes that occur so that students evaluate the wrong class.
- Concerns over bias and academic freedom.
- Concerns for tuition remission for the children of faculty members: how to get legislators to support such legislation and get colleagues to provide political pressure on

representatives, the possibility of an internal program at CNU, the costs and long timeline (estimated three to four years) for such a project.

- Desire for a Center for Teaching Excellence to support new and continuing faculty, that could help them develop syllabi and rubrics.
- Concerns for evaluating administrators, a process that has been in discussion for several years; Dr. Bardwell volunteered for a committee on this.
- Concern about CHECs and the faculty role in the process. Dr. Mulligan stressed that the Handbook makes clear that faculty control grades, that Section 10 of the Handbook defines what actions are allowed or not allowed for students, and that the University Counsel is concerned about inconsistencies between the Faculty and Student Handbooks. One faculty member proposed solution that the University Handbook just refer to the Student Handbook to eliminate inconsistencies, but another observed that the Student Handbook is not under faculty control and thus should not be referenced.
- Concerns over rejection of Phi Beta Kappa application and a desire to know any reasons given by the organization so that faculty may help with addressing them for a more successful application next time.
- Concerns over the low number of probationary faculty relative to lecturers among the new hires and the former provost's proposal for a 70% tenured/tenure-track vs. 30% lecturer split. This discussion produced concerns that replacement positions might erode, that a large class of disenfranchised faculty members is a problem for the university (though some noted that the constitution of the Senate had been modified so that non-tenure-track faculty could serve), and that lecturers should not be held to the same level of service as probationary and tenured faculty members. Faculty wondered what the turnover rate of lecturers is and expressed concerns that it may result in constant searches for the same positions. They also wondered how our statistics match those of our aspirant peer institutions.
- Desire for a place that faculty could meet on a regular and informal basis, such as a faculty club. The Luter atrium was mentioned as a possibility, although its open format and availability for other functions were seen as potential drawbacks.
- Concerns over how the list of universities deemed acceptable to hire from is being used, and a suggestion that it be reviewed in its criteria and application.
- A suggestion that students who wish to stay for the summer at CNU to pursue research projects with faculty have access to free or reduced-price housing.
- Concern over the timeline for the national search for a provost for the 2014-15 academic year.
- Desire for a central web repository that would list all internal faculty grants and awards, with a calendar for due dates.
- Desire for an evaluation of grants that provide overhead to the university and how much of the grant monies they take, with the point that the amount of overhead differs largely by field (with outside grants in the humanities and social sciences often having little overhead). Some faculty questioned how outside grants that don't include overhead are valued by the university, with concerns that grants lacking overhead are not valued as much. The faculty expressed the hope that Sponsored Programs will work to help with grants without overhead costs as much as grants that include them.

- Questions about academic regalia and a plan from a few years back to provide a stipend to help faculty to purchase their own regalia, so that the university can lower its rental costs.
- Concerns about parking, particularly that the welcome raised pay for adjuncts had the unexpected drawback of bumping up their salaries to the point they had to pay for parking.
- Questions on the possibility of more 75-minute classes meeting on Monday/Wednesday.
- Concerns that the Monday/Wednesday dinner break made late-night classes a problem, unattractive to both the faculty staffing the classes and the students enrolling in them.
- One faculty member expressed a desire to have Labor Day off, voicing concerns about child care on the holiday. Another faculty member recalled that years back faculties from universities across state agreed to give up Monday holidays in order to consolidate Christmas break.
- Faculty who had attended the Summer Institute put on by the Virginia Teaching Consortium expressed their willingness to make the resources they had collected available to the faculty at large and to help create a Center for Teaching Excellence.

President Redick requested that the faculty certify the August 2013 graduates.

Motion 8/21/13.1. That the August 2013 graduates be certified by the Christopher Newport University faculty. Moved Linda Manning. Seconded William Connell. Passed unanimously. [Action required.]

Past Senate President Bardwell reminded the faculty of the Senate webpage, where they could find minutes from previous years, and of the Provost webpage, where they could find important dates and information.

Motion 8/21/13.2. That the meeting be adjourned. Moved Scott Pollard. Seconded Veronique Frucot. Passed unanimously.

The Senate adjourned at 9:30 a.m.