Christopher Newport University

Board Room of the David Student Union

January 16, 2015

3:00PM – 6:00PM

Senators Present: Adamitis, Manning, Martin, Grau, Brash, Nichols, Barnello, Hunter, Holland, Timani, Jelinek, Busch, Thompson, Winder, Hasbrouck

1. President Adamitis called the meeting to order at 3:03

2. Everyone had an opportunity to review the minutes from the November meeting as a shared Google document. Further discussion on the minutes was requested.

Motion to approve the November minutes: moved by Senator Hunter

Seconded: Senator Nichols

Vote to Approve: Adamitis, Manning, Martin, Grau, Brash, Nichols, Barnello, Hunter, Timani, Jelinek, Busch, Thompson, Winder, Hasbrouck

Abstain: Holland

3. President's Report:

As faculty may recall from Getting Started Week, the University recognizes the need for increased attention to Title IX issues, and meeting this need will require greater administrative support. Therefore, Michelle Moody has been appointed Director of Title IX and Equal Opportunity, which will allow her to dedicate more time to Title IX, most significantly [sexual harassment](). Human Resources will now oversee the application process for faculty recruitment. The transition of responsibilities has already begun, and the Office of Human Resources is currently conducting a search for someone to coordinate the faculty recruitment process. As in the past, the coordinator will collect applications and distribute them to search committees after the application deadline.

In response to this portion of the report, one Senator noted that two of the faculty searches in a department were posted a few weeks late this past fall and wondered if this was because of the transition. Senators then reported that several colleagues have expressed concerns about the role of departments in the hiring process. Faculty perceive a lack of trust in departments to make hiring and staffing decisions and that their disciplinary expertise is not always given due weight when selecting candidates for campus visits and job offers. President Adamitis will get an update on the status of the search for a recruitment coordinator at the next Senate meeting and begin a conversation about the faculty's concerns regarding the hiring process with the administration.

Next President Adamitis updated the Senate on our prior request for additional data on AR scores. In particular, the Senate had asked if the Provost could further break down AR scores to illustrate the distribution of the scores by college and rank. The Provost, in consultation with Deans, has decided not to provide additional data

beyond what he provided to the faculty at his fall open meeting. The primary concern of the Provost was that breaking down the data into smaller units would pose concerns regarding anonymity.

4. Unfinished Business:

The Committee on Committees presented *Handbook* changes that reflect their earlier recommendations regarding the structure of University committees. These changes are intended to strengthen the faculty voice in university governance by clarifying the roles and responsibilities of academic standing committees and improving the lines of communication between the faculty and administration. A summary of the changes follows:

- All committees will report to the Faculty Senate regarding policies and procedures and other issues as appropriate. Increasing communication between the academic standing committees and the Senate in this way will ultimately strengthen the faculty voice and help ensure faculty-driven governance.

- With few exceptions, standing committees will report administratively to the appropriate Vice Provost. This change reflects current practice, as Provost Doughty distributed the administrative reporting lines for committees among the three new Vice Provost positions last summer. Such a distribution will help facilitate expeditious, focused communication between committees and the Provost's Office.

- The Faculty Senate will assume responsibility for making most standing academic committee appointments, which is appropriate to faculty-driven governance. Exceptions will occur when the appointments are for administrators or when committee membership must follow external guidelines (e.g., AFPRC, IACUC, IRB).

- All appointments for upcoming academic years will be made prior to the end of the preceding spring semester, so that all faculty seats on all committees will be filled by the end of April. Currently, the Provost maintains a list of all of the faculty and their university-level committee assignments. The Faculty Senate will update this list to include service as department chairs, program directors and core advisors, and then use the list to help ensure that service assignments are distributed equitably across the faculty. The Senate will also consult with department chairs and program directors to help ensure that the university-level committee appointments take into consideration individual faculty members' specializations and interests as well as service responsibilities at the department and college levels.

- Elections for committee officers for the upcoming academic year will now take place by the end of the preceding spring semester, following the model of the Faculty Senate. This will help facilitate a smooth transition from one year's cohort to the next, as the outgoing officers can ensure that incoming officers have been updated on the committee's past accomplishments and

ongoing work. In addition, holding earlier elections may obviate the need for every committee to meet during Getting Started Week.

- Faculty who temporarily vacate a committee seat due to sabbatical, FMLA or other types of leave will be replaced for the period of absence either through election or appointment, as appropriate to the committee. Such elections and appointments should be completed within 30 business days of the notice to vacate. Faculty who permanently vacate a committee seat before their term expires will be replaced for the duration of their term either through election or appointment, as appropriate to the committee. Such elections and appointments should also be completed within 30 days of the notice to vacate. At present, there are no policies in place regarding vacated seats, so this change provides some much-needed guidance.

- No individual faculty member may serve on multiple curricular bodies simultaneously. This will prevent a single faculty member from having multiple votes in the process.

- The Dean Parks Colloquium Committee will be eliminated. A new Phi Beta Kappa committee will be proposed, and this committee will assume responsibility for organizing the Dean Parks Colloquium. This move helps us prepare for our next PBK application, since PBK requires its faculty to organize a lecture series as a condition of membership. It also addresses our current organizational challenges. Typically the Dean Parks Committee was appointed in August, and this late start made it very difficult to organize fall events for the colloquium. By reassigning the Colloquium to a standing committee with fixed membership, we can begin the planning a full year in advance, thus allowing for a stronger fall program.

- The Faculty Grievance Committee and the Faculty Hearing Committee will be combined, as there does not appear to be an administrative need for two separate groups. Individual committee members will not be permitted to serve on Faculty Grievance Panels and/or Dismissal Hearing Panels that concern that same faculty member and/or case. By reducing the number of tenured faculty needed for these committees, we increase the pool of tenured faculty for the FRC.

- Since the FRC is not a curricular body, we will remove the current restriction on faculty serving simultaneously on the FRC and curricular committees. This will increase the pool of eligible faculty members for all of these committees.

- The FRC must have at least two full professors in its membership. Assistant Professors seeking tenure and promotion to Associate Professor have the benefit of peer review at the FRC level, as all FRC members have tenure and have been promoted to Associate Professor. Associate Professors seeking promotion to Full Professor should have the same benefit. By requiring that two FRC members have Full Professor status, we can ensure that each FRC subcommittee conducting the initial dossier review for a Full Professor application will have at least one member with Full rank.

- IACUC and the IRB will increase its number of consecutive two-year terms from two to three, so that a committee member may serve for up to six years. Because these particular committees require specialized training, a longer period of service makes sense.

- Serving on the Honors Faculty will have no term limits, which reflects existing practice at CNU.

- As per the recommendations of the Faculty Mentoring Committee, the number of its own seats will be reduced to one per college.

- All members of the International Study Abroad Committee must have previous experience leading study abroad trips, as the primary curricular responsibility of this committee is reviewing course proposals for study abroad courses led by CNU faculty with a special focus on trip logistics.

- At the request of the UCC, department chairs may not serve also as committee members, as this effectively gives the same faculty member two votes in the curricular process.

- At the request of the UGRC, the Director of Sponsored Research and one student will be added as nonvoting members.

The Senate made the following edits to the proposed *Handbook* changes:

- Change the phrase "reports to the Faculty Senate regarding policies and procedures <u>or</u> other issues as appropriate" to "reports to the Faculty Senate regarding policies and procedures <u>and</u> other issues as appropriate" for all committee charges.

- Indicate that we will keep the Dean Parks Colloquium Committee if the Phi Beta Kappa Committee is not approved.

- Add the requirement that two full professors <u>from different colleges</u> serve on the FRC committee.

Senator Brash moved that we accept all of the Committee on Committee recommendations.

Seconded: Senator Barnello

Vote to approve unanimous

5. Committee Updates

The Faculty Mentoring Committee expressed concerns about the IDEA and have requested data involving the effect of student participation upon validity of the instrument. The IDEA committee hopes to have guidelines by March for best practices and have administrative support by then.

ATAC reminds us that we are welcome to send them recommendations regarding technology.

Lastly, the IRB has already reviewed 40 proposals this academic year.

6. Town Halls on New Lecturer Proposal

Town hall meetings on the proposal for new rank streams will take place next week, and some will target specific focus groups. Senator Grau will conduct one session for tenured faculty. On the following day, President Adamitis will lead an open session for all faculty. Senator Hunter will lead a session for lecturers, while Professor Mary Best will lead one for Instructors. As a Faculty Senate, we will consider the feedback from the town hall meetings at the February faculty senate meeting and prepare for a vote. Senators should check with their departments for feedback on the proposal and send feedback to email to President Adamitis. President Adamitis reported that a group is working on data collection to see what other schools, in our aspirant group, are currently doing regarding lecturer ranks and their contracts.

7. Faculty Development Grant Committee Report

The Faculty Development Grant Committee expressed concern about the fact that there is no viable rubric in place for the evaluation of faculty development grants, which presents obvious challenges for the committee in executing its charge; moreover, the lack of a rubric necessarily entails a lack of transparency. The Committee also questioned whether lecturers and instructors are realistically able to compete with faculty who carry lower teaching loads and must meet higher expectations for research productivity. The Provost's Office attempts to reward all worthy applications and when conducting evaluations takes into consideration the standing of the faculty member, the quality of the proposed project, the feasibility of the project, the possibility of a resulting product, and whether the grant would affect retention, tenure and promotion. This last consideration, while logical, obviously impacts the success of applications from lecturers and instructors. One possible way to address this concern would be to delegate a certain percentage of the FDG money to lecturers and instructors, but the number of applications from lecturers and instructors varies, so it would be difficult to determine how much funding to allocate. Another possibility would be to dedicate some of the overhead from large external grants, which goes to departmental budgets, to support for lecturers and instructors. We should also remember that departmental funds are available for all faculty and not just probationary/tenured.

Finally, the Faculty Development Grant Committee recommended that we revise the budget portion of the current application form. Sometimes a faculty member will not be able to move forward with a project if it is not fully funded up front, or if a partial grant does not cover specific needs. The current application form does not request enough detail to help evaluators determine the extent to which partial funding impacts viability. Moreover, it is not always clear whether the applicant will be granted funding from other sources.

The Senate charged the Faculty Development Grant Committee with creating a rubric for evaluating the faculty development grants and revising the application to address the funding issue noted above. Department chairs and Senators should also advise lecturers and instructors about the different kinds of research support available to them beyond Faculty Development Grants.

Next President Adamitis moved that the faculty senate go into closed session.

Seconded: Senator Holland

The Senate went into closed session at 4:50.

The Senate came out of closed session at 5:27.

9. IDEA

The Faculty Senate received two reports on IDEA. The first concerns IDEA response rates at CNU for the Spring 2014 semester and was provided by the Provost's Office. This report shows the IDEA response rates based upon faculty rank, form type (long versus short form) and college. Rates by rank ranged from 60% (adjunct) to 75% (Assistant Professor); by form from 64% (short) to 66% (long); and by college with CAH and NBS at 64% and CSS at 71%. According to the IDEA Center, as of 2012 the average response rate for paper delivery was 81%, and for online forms 67%. So, CNU's response rates are generally on par with the IDEA national averages for online forms. Probationary faculty had a higher response rate, which may also account for the slightly higher response rate for long forms, since probationary faculty are required to use these.

The Faculty Senate also received a study conducted by a CNU colleague in which the list of institutions that use IDEA was cross-referenced against the schools included on the educational credentials list that we use for hiring, i.e., the *U.S. News and World Report* rankings. Only one of the best national universities and seven of the best Liberal Arts schools use IDEA. One justification for using IDEA at CNU is that this system allows us to compare ourselves against peers.   So this study elicited the following question: If CNU views the institutions ranked by *USNWR* as our peers, and these institutions do not use IDEA, then how can we justify using IDEA as a way of comparing ourselves against our peers in the area of teaching?

A further area of concern is the propriety of offering incentives to students for completing the IDEA forms. At present, some evaluators encourage their faculty to offer incentives, while others do not, and still others do not offer any opinion on the matter. As a consequence, we find a wide variety of practices among faculty members regarding incentives, some of which quite likely have a positive impact response rates. But is it fair that the faculty who do not offer incentives either as a matter of principle or because they have been advised not to do so should risk lower response rates, which could impact summative performance evaluations?

The Senate then turned to a discussion of the use of IDEA for formative and summative assessment. Some Senators pointed out that IDEA is well researched and is one of the best instruments available for formative assessment. Other Senators noted that, according to IDEA, student evaluations should form the basis for at most 30-50% of summative performance evaluations for merit, retention, tenure, and promotion. Yet faculty perceive that the IDEA feedback counts much more heavily than that in CNU's evaluation process and do not understand how the other materials provided in the EVAL-6 and/or dossiers factor into summative judgments.

The Senate and standing committees have already begun to address these concerns and will continue to do so. The IDEA Committee is currently working on guidelines regarding best practices for using IDEA for summative performance evaluations that will address many of the concerns outlined above. Moreover, when conducting its annual review of the University EVAL-4, the Senate can consider reassessing the value assigned to IDEA scores. As Departments work on revising the departmental EVAL-4's, they might consider how materials other than the IDEA should factor into teaching evaluations. Finally, the Center for Effective Teaching might think about holding sessions on how to talk about teaching within the dossier and on EVAL6's.

10. Final examination policies

We will discuss this issue at our February meeting, since Senators requested background information on the history of the final examination policies. The issues on the table are as follows:

(1) In general faculty have raised questions about the definition of a comprehensive final assessment and the appropriateness of scheduling a comprehensive final assessment during the exam period for certain classes. For example, there appear to be questions regarding the appropriateness of a portfolio comprising work completed throughout the semester as a comprehensive final assessment; and some courses, such as Marching Band, do not lend themselves to a comprehensive final assessment given during exam week by their very nature. While faculty understand the academic value of having a comprehensive final assessment, we do need to allow discipline-specific variations from the one-size-fits-all model described in the current *Handbook*.

(2) Faculty have also indicated that the period of time given to faculty for grading final exams is quite short and does not always facilitate giving the kinds of comprehensive final assessments that we find most academically effective. For example, a professor teaching three upper-level classes with caps of 35 (as is typical in some programs) who assigns a 15-page final paper during finals week (a typical assignment) will have 1575 pages of writing to grade within the space of ten days *at most*.

(3) Finally, one Senator noted that the language regarding the rescheduling of exams differs between the *Undergraduate Catalog* and the *University Handbook*. The current *Catalog* (p. 45) says that students with three or more exams *in a 24-*

hour period may request a schedule change. However, the 14-15 *Handbook* (p. 51) says that a student with two or more exams on a single *day* may request a schedule change. A 24-hour period and a calendar day are not the same.

11. PBK report

In November, Dr. Linda Halpern, an administrator from James Madison University, visited CNU for a consultation regarding our next PBK application in 2018. Senator Jelinek offered the following notes based on Dr. Halpern's meeting with the PBK committee, of which she is a member:

- **General requirements for students to qualify for PBK**:
    - PBK faculty at CNU can vote on which majors qualify – they must be majors within the "liberal arts and sciences."
    - 75% of the student's course credits should be in the liberal arts & sciences
    - Mathematics is required; CNU's math requirement is sufficient for this.
    - PBK requires student to have completed *four* semesters of a foreign language; CNU currently requires only three.
        - If we don't want to change CNU's requirements, one way to get around this is to present statistics indicating that the top graduates do in fact take at least 4 semesters of a language, in spite of the fact that the requirement at CNU is only 3.
    - The student should have taken upper-division courses outside of his/her major.

- **Some "values-based" requirements for PBK:**
    - PBK is concerned about academic freedom
    - PBK is also concerned about faculty governance
        - For example, faculty should be the ones to decide curricula, not the Board of Visitors or some other non-faculty body.
        - There should be clear processes that are followed with clear criteria
        - Faculty-driven
    - PBK looks for evidence that there is a "free flow of information and ideas" among students and faculty.
    - Students should be encouraged to do their "own independent thinking and work" and they "should have the resources to do this work"
        - Example: establish a grant to provide money for students to present their research at conferences off campus

- **Problem areas for CNU to work on:**
    - DIVERSITY among faculty.
        - If we can't increase racial/cultural diversity among faculty, one thing we could do instead is this: Invite a visiting scholar to

come to CNU for a week and host events that emphasize a minority perspective on some relevant issue.
- o Diversity among students
    - ▪ Encourage students to interact with diverse populations
- o Financial aid, both merit-based AND need-based, for students

- **One of CNU's strengths**: our area studies minors. This is something we should highlight in the application.

- **Things that the PBK committee can do NOW:**
    - o Celebrate student academic achievement
    - o Honor students who would be PBK eligible (if we had a chapter). The point is that we can honor them in some way (ie hold a reception) *now,* even prior to obtaining a PBK chapter.
    - o Communicate the value of a liberal arts education to those outside of the CNU community
    - o PBK faculty should be active in ways that are visible to students

- **Things that the administration can do:**
    - o The Provost should give the PBK committee a budget
    - o Faculty members should get service credit for participation on PBK committee
    - o We should track what students do after graduation
    - o Keep track of students who pursue graduate school – PBK wants to see a sizeable number of students pursue post-graduate education.
    - o Honors Program: PBK highly values the Honors Program. We need to increase the retention and graduation rate of Honors students in the program.
    - o Encourage undergraduate research
        - ▪ Perhaps individual departments could keep records of undergraduate research projects in each dept.
    - o Faculty salaries:
        - ▪ The reason PBK looks at faculty salaries is that they see this as a measure of the school's ability to recruit new faculty
        - ▪ We should present our salaries as compared to schools in our SHEV peer group
    - o Send some PBK faculty to the PBK Triannual Council meeting this summer.
    - o Get students & parents to understand and appreciate the value of PBK

- **Athletics**
    - o PBK looks for evidence of a balance between athletics and academics. They are concerned when athletics compromises academic performance
    - o In the next application, we should emphasize that we provide tutoring for athletes. We should also cite the graduation rate for athletes, and

cite how many athletes are on the Dean's List or in the Honors Program.

The meeting was adjourned at 6:30