

CNU Faculty Senate Minutes
20 January 2012
DSU Boardroom

Here: Redick, Pollard, Carpenter, Bardwell, Hall (left at 4:40), Weiss, Wang, Selim, Martin, Adamitis, Von Berg, Barnello, Connell
Absent, Zestos, Puaca
Guest, Jett Johnson, Student Assembly President

Executive Summary:

1. Call to Order 3:04
2. Affirmation of Minutes from 11.18.2011. The November minutes were approved electronically on 12/13/2011. Senator Weiss moved to affirm the electronic approval and Senator Von Berg seconded. The Senate unanimously affirmed the November minutes.
3. Student Assembly President, Jett Johnson
Jett Johnson, who is president of the Student Assembly visited the Senate and provided an oral report on its activities. The assembly, created two years ago, is a distinct body from the SGA which was dissolved. The reformed body under the direction of Mr. Johnson advocates for student issues with the University administration. The Student Assembly has been concerned with creating an environment of student governance that is participatory and thus all assembly meetings are open and held in a substantial space in the Freeman Center. Their meetings have designated times for open solicitation of ideas from any member of the University community including faculty and staff should they choose to express something to the assembly. Mr. Johnson has also made it his policy to meet with all student groups on campus to make them aware of the activities of the group. All groups now know who their representatives are and how to contact the Student Assembly in the event they have a concern or something to raise with the advocacy body.

The Student Assembly is concerned currently with residence life policies. They are advocating for expanding coeducation residence options on campus. They are also constantly in communication with the Dean of Students and actively involved in the reforms of the CHECS process in order to make CNU a campus where a broader range of students have a voice in the CHECS process. The Safe Ride program is one of their initiatives currently being organized by the Student Assembly. This program would offer a shuttle service between popular off-campus locations and campus on Friday and Saturday nights. The goal of this program is to make possible for students in need of transportation to get safely to and from off campus locations. Mr. Johnson reported that to do this, the Student Assembly would have to rent, from a private company, large vans and to provide drivers. It is a great expense, but one that the Student Assembly feels strongly is justified. There is also potential to have local businesses subsidize the expense. Campus resources in the form of University owned vans, although extant, apparently cannot be used to shuttle students.

Senators had a number of questions. On the Safe Ride program Senators asked about the time frame of the operation and the range of the shuttles. The plan is to offer the rides from 8PM to 3AM on Friday and Saturday and the range will limit the program to only the peninsula – it cannot go to Norfolk for example. Senators wondered why University owned vans were not usable. Apparently there are availability issues with the University vans which are often used for other purposes on weekends. Senators asked if there would be a fee to which the response was

no. Senators asked if it would be a service that students would have to call – to which Mr. Johnson responded that the shuttle would run a regular route. Senators asked if it would be restricted to CNU students and asked how drivers would determine who could ride. The policy, modeled on JMU's similar program would require that at least one person in a group be a student with a CNU ID. Senators asked about the CHECS issues and the concerns that the Student Assembly had with the process. Mr. Jonson reported that they had heard about some of the more controversial cases from the last academic year and expressed frustration that student representation was limited and the assembly was not involved at all. They hope to insert an after-the-fact review policy to raise concerns and to defend the rights of students on campus. Mr. Johnson also disclosed that he has been asked by President Tribble to participate on the President's task force recently constituted to assess CHECS policies.

Mr. Johnson left at 3:16.

4. President's Report

President Pollard submitted this report to the Senate and then gave an oral summary of his written comments. He first reported on Sabbaticals and Faculty Development Grants from the fall. The Provost approved all FDGs and all were funded at levels requested by the Senate. He also reported that the Provost awarded, upon the recommendation of the Senate, seven Sabbaticals for next academic year. This is one more sabbatical than was awarded in the last academic year.

President Pollard expressed concerns about the amended finals schedule from the fall semester. Apparently the aftermath of Hurricane Irene continued into final week with numerous scheduling conflicts which necessitated a number of accommodations. Because of the number of accommodations the Saturday conflict resolution day did not work as it should have. At the heart of the issue, apparently, was the revised finals template developed by the Senate was abandoned for an older template. The University Registrar worked tirelessly to resolve the conflicts but has expressed a desire to go back to a more rigid and predictable finals schedule. Some background discussion ensued where President Pollard reminded Senators that the finals schedule was until fairly recently a predictable document – virtually the same every year. The Senate resolved to address the issue in response to faculty concerns. Some faculty who taught the same schedule semester after semester felt the rigidity of the system negatively, relegated to undesirable exam perpetually. The Senate adjusted the schedule to make time slots rotate. President Pollard worked with the Registrar to mitigate some of the difficulties. This experience has perhaps made faculty and administrators more aware of the problems that can ensue with revising the final exam schedule and hopefully will make the next emergency which forces a revision in the exam schedule run more smoothly.

Senate President Pollard and Senator Connell were asked at the end of the fall semester to meet with the Deans of the three colleges to discuss the minutes from November. This cordial meeting was to address some confusion centered on the annual reviews and tenure reviews and the problems which occurred with the independent review mandated by the University Handbook. Of particular concern was a statement made in the minutes regarding the Deans whom the Senate included in their discussion regarding the FRC. Each entity, the Dean and FRC, reviews second-year, fourth-year, tenure, and promotion dossiers independently and submits a comment to the candidate when decisions differ from the Department Review Committee. Because of the confidentiality of the EVAL-8 which is the document used to report, the Senate did not know which entity was responsible. The Deans used this moment to clarify that they had done what the University Handbook mandated and hoped that the minutes would make this clear. Modestly revised language was then inserted into the minutes which were then posted to the Faculty Senate website. The clarification is as follows: "The confidentiality of the reviews made it impossible to

know specifically if the FRC or the deans did not report, subsequent inquiry revealed that the deans of all three colleges provided the necessary comments to the candidates.” The Senate discussed briefly their concerns, but were satisfied that the new language did not change the substance of the Senate discussion.

President Pollard reported on Virginia State Bill 104 which, if passed by the general assembly and approved by the governor would provide University Faculty state-wide with a 50% tuition reduction for dependent children. The bill conveniently addresses a long-standing CNU faculty concern regarding tuition remission for faculty children. The Faculty Senate of Virginia, a body which is made up of representatives of all Senates of all Virginia universities advocated strongly for this bill as did the council of University presidents. President Tribble advocated strongly for this bill and was able to orchestrate a strong endorsement by the Council of University Presidents. President Tribble has also advocated for this in Richmond independently. The Faculty Senate of Virginia and the Council of University Presidents helped shepherd the bill out of legislative committee substantially improving its prospects. President Pollard expressed his thanks for all Faculty at CNU who wrote to their state delegates and also for the strong support of President James Lollar (of the FSVA)

5. Chairs’ Reports

At the time of the first Senate meeting, Chairs meetings had not yet taken place and thus none of the liaisons to the chairs had prepared reports. Some discussion ensued among Senators. The Arts and Humanities chairs, according to Senators who had spoken to their chairs, reported some concerns over the budget outlook for the coming academic year and were asked to prepare for departmental reductions. The other concern is that Virginia has altered the way that it pays for equipment by eliminating the equipment trust. President Pollard suggested that the Senate invite the chair of the Budget Advisory Committee to the February Senate meeting. An invitation will be sent in advance of that meeting.

6. Department and Liaison Reports

Several Liaison reports were presented by individual senators. Senator Wang voiced concerns from his department regarding the FRC in cases where department members were evaluated negatively by the FRC on matters of promotion without explanation. His department, PCSE, offered positive support for candidates for promotion through the Department Review Committees (DRC) and subsequently received negative reviews from the FRC without comment. Senator Wang’s liaison department expressed concern that the FRC lacked the expertise to critique discipline-specific professional development and scholarship and may have relied overly upon a minority report that expressed concern. Senators asked about the specific issue of disciplinary expertise and how the University might assess expertise more effectively. Some Senators supported the idea of having external letters become a standard feature of dossiers to provide those assessing scholarship with a fair and expert opinion on the quality and prestige of scholarly contributions. Some Senators expressed concern that faculty might find sympathetic colleagues who might overstate the significance of a scholar’s contribution. Others felt that the professional culture in which we all live would mitigate any such concerns. Senator Wang pressed further, voicing concern about the lack of expertise in the external to the department member of the DRC who may not have sufficient knowledge of the discipline to assess scholarship. Senators from Luter pointed out that in Business, there is a point system that has been established to rate publications to address the issue of substance.

Senators expressed concerns about the finality of decisions and lack of appeal procedures for negative reviews at all points. Should there be a formal mechanism for candidates to rebut or offer additional support when a review is resolved negatively?

On the reporting issue which was a feature of the fall review cycle Senators discussed several possible solutions. The Senate Handbook committee reported that it had submitted new language to update the responsibilities of the FRC to include the need to report to the candidate an explanation of its rationale for arriving at a different conclusion than the DRC (this change is discussed below). Senators also suggested that the EVAL-8 which the FRC must report to the candidate its decision should note that if the decision is different from the DRC a rationale must state clearly and specifically what it found deficient that the DRC did not. Other Senators suggested that some training might be offered to the FRC to ensure that it reports as it should. Senators also expressed concern that the FRC might, in its efforts to find a deficiency, may highlight certain unrepresentative evidence rather than consider carefully the whole individual record. As the review process has a tendency to elevate to tenure review and promotion to full only the most impressive candidates, others are lost at the second and fourth year or choose to seek other opportunities in response to early mediocre reviews, some fully qualified candidates who well exceed the requirements of the University EVAL-4 and departmental EVAL-4 will be denied tenure or promotion. Senators expressed concerns over the counterproductive nature of denying tenure and promotion to those who have demonstrated they meet our high standards. Other Senators expressed concern that the FRC seems to have overcompensated for alleged past consistent advocacy of faculty or to have bent overly to the critique that it may be considered a “rubber stamp” for the DRCs if it approves all who are recommended by the DRCs. Senators also expressed that faculty cohorts who come to tenure should not be measured exclusively against themselves – but rather – should be measured statistically against the group they entered CNU with, particularly when measuring tenure rates.

Senator Bardwell reported on the activities of the University Assessment and Evaluation Committee and stated that they were going through a new kind of training to prepare them for using an electronic reporting system.

Senator Redick offered a brief report from the Undergraduate Admissions Committee. He recently attended one of their meetings. The new Dean of Admissions was there and offered a frank discussion of the reorganization of the admissions process under his direction. He was positive about the changes and offered to reform and update the reporting of SAT and GPA data to avoid any skewing of the data and to align data presented in advertising material to always coincide with data presented in other more official ways. The Dean of Admissions has the full support of the administration in his efforts and has plans to involve the UAC more closely than had been done in past years.

Senator Puaca, although absent, gave to Senator Connell the following information regarding his meeting with the Music Department. Music faculty were concerned about the electronic IDEA from the fall. Unlike other departments on campus, Music faculty teach in a venue that does not have sufficient wireless internet access (Ferguson Center) in the classrooms to facilitate administering IDEA in class using laptop computers. As this option is available to all faculty who do not teach in Ferguson, Music felt they were disadvantaged. Senators commented that at the IDEA conference that some Senators had attended last fall, research supported the contention that in-class administration yielded more representative results and resulted in higher response rates. Furthermore Music was concerned that because of the nature of their discipline, they tended to build long-term cohorts of students who took their classes over and over for years. They would like a system that could be better adapted to this environment. The concern was that

a single student or small group of students could manifest a negative teaching evaluation over the course of many semesters that may reflect more upon a personal relationship than the quality of teaching.

7. Old Business

1. Fall IDEA surveys

The Senate then turned to questions about the IDEA surveys which were administered electronically for most faculty for the first time in the fall. Several issues emerged from this discussion. First, there is a small but significant issue regarding students who withdraw from a class or students who although still enrolled at the administration of IDEA surveys are no longer in attendance in the class – some of whom ultimately receive the UI grade. These students, because of the way that the assessment office gathers data (usually from a census done early in the term well before the last day to withdraw with a W) these students are sent the email to evaluate the class. If they have dropped the class and have a grade of W, Senators reasoned these students should not be given the opportunity to evaluate the class. Some students with a W could have not attended the class enough to have made an evaluation. This is also true of the students who earn a UI grade for lack of attendance. Senators observed that such students have no basis to assess a class positively or negatively and therefore should not be given the invitation to evaluate the course and instructor. President Pollard has been in communication with the Director of Assessment about this issue. Recognizing the amount of effort required to remove students from the population once the census is complete, the suggestion was put to the director that the census be moved later in the semester. Some discussion ensued. Senators questioned whether the individual student responses could be removed from the data. Senators also proposed that the faculty be given an opportunity to report students who were likely to receive a W or UI grade. Other Senators expressed concern that faculty might not know these students because the IDEA surveys are done during week 11 and 12 generally. Also, faculty might not yet realize a student has been removed from their roster. The Senate resolved to continue to press the Director of Assessment and the Provost for solutions to these problems. Although they may represent only a small fraction of the student population that fills out the IDEA surveys, there is real concern that such responses might skew the survey thus making less-reliable the evaluations and less beneficial as formative assessment for faculty.

Other concerns emerged from the discussion. Some Senators suggested that the period for the IDEA surveys be moved later in the semester. Other Senators were less concerned about the timing of the survey. It seems that Senators need more reliable data on the implication of a later survey – surely such information exists – and the will of the faculty to move the surveys from where they have been consistently for many semesters.

Senators also voiced concerns about studying the data that comes out of the surveys conducted electronically. Specifically, some Senators requested that the Assessment office take data from like classes and compare the results from paper surveys and electronic surveys to see any changes in response, in progress toward relevant objectives and other measures to see if the variance is more than normal or expected with electronic surveys. These data will provide significant context that will allow faculty to understand how to talk about these data in their EVAL-6 for ARs and regular reviews. Finally Senators also discussed shortening the period to less than 2 weeks as this may be too long a period for the survey to be open. Senators acknowledged that the possibility for interruption in teaching might exist with a lengthy window. Students might respond to direct feedback (an exam or paper returned during the assessment window) that would make the data unreliable.

Senators were generally pleased to see the high response rate from the fall surveys. Caution, however, was generally the feeling about the high response rate and Senators generally felt that a

few more cycles may yet yield lower response rates as the novelty of surveys done electronically wears off and our vigilance slips.

2. Teaching Portfolio Development – Peter Seldin

Senators took up the issue of Teaching Portfolio development which has been a persistent focus of the Senate for the year. Senator Adamitis, who attended the IDEA workshop last fall in Texas, presented to the Senate a series of ideas about the use of teaching portfolios to move beyond overreliance upon student evaluations to measure effective teaching. To that end, however, the Senator cautioned that to build an effective teaching portfolio requires first outlining ways that already exist to present evidence of effective teaching, particularly for us, the EVAL-6.

Teaching portfolios, according to Peter Seldin, a recognized authority who has written on this topic for decades, can show effective teaching and can be developmental in improving teaching. To do this, a portfolio narrative should outline goals and objectives clearly for each class, have an explanation of why those goals were chosen, and show what measures were developed in the course to meet those goals and objectives. If the faculty could standardize this reporting and also learn to write and think about their teaching in this way, we could expect excellent outcomes. First, such exercises encourage teachers to be thoughtful and intentional about their activities in the classroom. Furthermore, they provide avenues to assess what works and what does not and to improve upon the unsuccessful and to strengthen the successful elements of teaching. It also provides a counterbalance to the IDEA scores which should be used only as one of a number of measures to assess teaching.

Senator Adamitis also suggested that in Digital Measures there might be better and more consistent use of the teaching effectiveness and innovation features of reporting that already exist. Indeed, one of the distinct and paramount shortcomings of DM is the inconsistent use of its features by faculty and the unclear and inconsistent communication from administration on how the information was used to assess faculty in the AR process. Yet, DM provides areas for faculty to show teaching innovation and improvement. There are training opportunities that must be taken by the Faculty Development and Evaluation committee to teach faculty how to report effectively their accomplishment. Senators also discussed that the DM system, which cumbersome and difficult to use, might be less so with more effective training and use of the technical support dedicated to DM, namely Samson Dixon, who can further tailor DM so that it does more intuitively what we need it to do as a faculty.

Some discussion ensued. Senators wondered about the nature of IDEA. Which questions determine score adjustments? What is the difference between long and short form IDEAs and should there be a more clear description of when such forms are used and what those forms can say to faculty. Other senators wondered if IDEA scores were relied upon overly to assess the quality of teaching when they really say more about satisfaction and thus are they really the best measure to be used for personnel decisions and merit raises. Senators seemed convinced that there should be more to the assessment of teaching even though it is simple to apply a number to show teaching effectiveness, it is not the best way to ensure that we teach well our content (students would not be the best judge of this) and are as effective as we can be as teachers.

At 4:15, the Senate went out of order to discuss Dossier organization. Senators discussed the administrative response to the organization of the dossier. Senators raised concerns that the service binder seemed to be missing in the counterproposal sent in the fall to the Senate proposal from last spring. Some background – Senator Lewis and an ad-hoc committee convened last year to assess the organization of the dossiers that faculty submit for 2nd, 4th, tenure, and promotion

reviews. This resulted in the proposal that the dossier be subdivided into a core binder with a number of supplemental binders containing relevant material. The goal was to shrink the size of dossiers and to clarify what was most important.

Senators discussed that the service binder was an important binder as well and should not be neglected. Other Senators noted that while some deans liked to have electronic, others in the administration liked the paper binders. Some Senators expressed the concern that there was substantial duplication of effort in uploading information into DM only to then print the very report that DM was acquired to replace.

The Senate discussion continued into new territory. Some Senators raised the issue that the binders should only contain 5 years worth of material. This conflicts with the review term for the Full Professor dossier which normally requires a minimum of seven years service. In other words, it will miss two years worth of service, publications, and teaching for no good reason. The Senate seemed to agree that the content of binders should be governed by the review not arbitrarily, and that a Full Professor review should or at least could contain information from the entire period under consideration. Senators also expressed an interest in making a decision to go electronic or to stick with the paper.

3. Spring book orders and distribution

The Senate returned to order at 4:20 to take up a discussion of the spring experience with Follet and book ordering. Senators spoke from their personal experience and from their discussion with liaison departments. Some voiced the concern that they had been notified that Follet could not get books requested, even though these books were in print. Others seconded with the concern that Follet identified this problem at the very end of the fall semester many weeks after having received the book orders (which are generally submitted in advance of the advising period which begins week 10). President Pollard reported that 4-5 faculty had this issue, although there were two senators who experienced problems. The administrative contact with Follet, Lorraine Hall, is aware of the issue and has assured President Pollard that the problems were few in number and isolated. Other issues involved the long-standing problem that the materials on the online system were sometimes different than those proposed by the faculty member. This causes some delay.

Lorraine will continue to advocate for faculty as she pursues Follet to correct the problems that remain.

4. Dossier Organization: Administrative Response Considered out of order above

5. New Language for 2 and 4 year successful reviews

The Senate raised a number of objections at the last meeting regarding the new language for the successful review letter. While Senators generally understood the Provost's desire to be able to make each review independent of the others, Senators continued to express their objection to the clause as counterproductive in the retention of faculty who might take this clause as cause for concern and for faculty mentors who will have little recourse to advise junior faculty who seem to be exceeding sufficiently the benchmarks for success outlined in the UE-4 and Departmental EVAL-4. Given the professional stakes of a negative tenure or other review – such experiences tend to limit severely future employability in academia – makes it incumbent upon the administration to provide assessment that professionals can trust as indicative of what they might expect in the next review.

Senators also raised this issue at the 1 December faculty meeting which was used to approve the fall graduates. Notes from that discussion show the concerns are echoed by the broader faculty outside the Senate. The faculty at that meeting made the following points.

- Faculty expressed the concern that it is difficult to mentor junior faculty with such uncertainty and apparent capriciousness the paragraph implies.

- Faculty expressed concern that retention of the best junior faculty would be diminished by the new language who might interpret the statement as jeopardizing their career aspirations.

- The change is worse than what we currently do because it takes a celebratory moment and undermines its significance and it undermines the purpose of the 2 and 4-year reviews and the standards of the UE-4 that lay out the path to tenure.

8. New Business

1. Reports from the subcommittees

i. On-Campus Child Care (Hall)

Senator Hall provided an update on the activities of the Child Care subcommittee that he chairs. The active committee has been surveying fifty institutions across the country to determine their childcare options for faculty. He has been working with the HR department at CNU to give his survey some official veneer and hopefully with that increase the response rates.

Generally Senator Hall has determined that the programs that are most successful at other universities charge market rates which vary widely but can be quite expensive for full-day care/school at around \$1000 per month.

The next step in the child care initiative is to do an interest survey of faculty to determine the needs of the faculty but also the extent to which something like this would have active enrollment from faculty. One issue is that the University community may not be large enough to support the kind of enterprise that is envisioned. Also, as the faculty ages, the needs for child care will presumably diminish.

Senators asked if there could be a subsidy for University faculty. Apparently there are rules in place in Virginia that prohibit such subsidies.

Senators asked about the previous experiences that CNU had had with childcare on campus. Apparently many years ago there was a psychology laboratory that worked with faculty children. It was neither a school nor a daycare.

Senators asked about the possibility that it might be on campus. Senator Hall explained that there is no space in the current building plans for a daycare/school on campus.

Senator Hall suggested that the subcommittee put out a request for proposals to see if a site could be found and an entity contracted to do what would be desired. The subcommittee is also working to negotiate a subsidy for CNU Faculty at extant community centers and preschools. Hopefully HR will be able to assist in these efforts.

The Senate took a break from its business at 4:40 and returned to the agenda at 4:50.

ii. Faculty Life (Carpenter) returned to session at 4:50
Senator Carpenter handed a survey to all Senators that she and the ad hoc committee on faculty life have developed in conjunction with the office of assessment. This survey will be distributed during early February and will include questions that are designed to determine faculty interest in the initiatives that the committee has come up with. Senators were generally receptive, but some expressed concerns that there may be too many surveys floating around during the month of February. The Senate committees and other faculty committees have combined together to include three surveys in one – thus minimizing the potential for survey fatigue among faculty. The religious tolerance committee headed by senator Bardwell has included their survey as has Academic Technology Advisory Committee (ATAC). Senators seemed confident that such a strategy would yield excellent feedback from faculty and will give the three constituencies some guidance in how to proceed.

iii. Standing Committee on Faculty Development (Pollard)
The Senate then turned to the proposal to create a new university standing committee. President Pollard circulated the proposal – it can be found [here](#). The issues before the Senate included the ideal composition of the committee. The ad hoc group that President Pollard chaired forwarded two proposals. The first option included 1 tenured member and 1 probationary member from each college who would be elected. The Vice Provost, a representative from IT services, the Director of the office of Assessment, Evaluation and Accreditation and the Deans of all three colleges who would serve *ex-officio*. Option two called for a committee of the same administrative representation but would include three faculty from each college, 1 tenured, 1 probationary, and 1 restricted. The committee was charged with the task of providing a centralized resource for general faculty development in the three areas of teaching research and service including but not limited to providing development opportunities in the form of seminars, symposia and other kinds of workshops and training for faculty. The development committee also should serve as a place of mediation for faculty and administration. Finally, the committee will monitor and recommend modifications to the assessment of faculty in the three areas. The committee will also monitor and promote appropriate uses of the IDEA surveys and reports used to assess faculty performance and also work to promote the assessment of teaching using the best practices for such assessment.

The Senate discussed the committee and the options proposed for its composition at length. Senators voiced concerns over transparency and consistency in the evaluation process and the role that such a committee might have in reshaping and making more developmental and formative the assessment of university faculty. Senators also commented on the size of the committee and voiced concerns in two distinct areas. One, they felt that two representatives from each college was adequate and that it was important to have both tenured and either probationary or restricted representation. Senators reasoned that the service responsibility of the university faculty is already at its limit and that adding many elected positions might make difficult the staffing of committees. Senators, however, felt strongly that the committee needed tenured faculty for the strength of their voices but also probationary and restricted faculty for their obvious interest in monitoring assessment in the second, fourth and tenure reviews.

Senator Bardwell offered the friendly amendment against which there were no objections, that the committee should be a “liaison” with administration rather than a “mediator”. Furthermore, the Senate also agreed that, and added the friendly amendment that a Senate liaison should also be part of the committee. Finally, the language of the document should reflect the following composition “1 tenured and 1 probationary or restricted from each college (elected)”

President Pollard ended the discussion and asked if anyone might move to call for a vote. Senator Martin requested the vote seconded by Senator Von Berg.

In Favor: Redick, Pollard, Carpenter, Bardwell, Weiss, Wang, Selim, Martin, Adamitis, Von Berg, Barnello, Connell

Opposed: none

Abstained: none

The motion passes. Senators Connell and Adamitis were asked to submit the proposal to the handbook committee so that it might be considered for a handbook change for next year. Senator Pollard also expressed his desire to fast track the committee so that we might elect it this year. The SEC will forward the idea to the President and Provost for their consideration at the next meeting.

iv. Religious Tolerance (Bardwell)

Senator Bardwell reported that the ad hoc committee on religious tolerance was hard at work. She also noted that the dates for all of their meetings for the term are available on the Senate website. Senator Bardwell prepared and circulated these minutes. She also noted the participation of her committee in the survey of faculty that will go around in February.

2. Motions

i. Faculty Development Standing Committee

The Motion was considered above out of order and voted upon

ii. Changing the college representation to a minimum of 5 departments

The Senate then turned to consider a motion that would offer an amendment to the constitution of the Senate requiring that a minimum of five departments be represented on the Senate from each college. Background: The current language of the constitution permits representation from four colleges. This was done when NBS had only four colleges and was seen as necessary to give NBS full representation. The unintended consequence was that in AH and SS, multiple candidates from large departments could win elections and limit representation of smaller departments. As a perennial issue the limited representation of smaller departments has been before the Senate dating back to the last two Senate reviews and the most recent all faculty meeting with the Senate at the beginning of this academic year. To address the issue and to make it possible for more departments to have direct representation, the Senate was presented with the following motion by Senator Adamitis to make it so that the five representatives from each college must all come from a different department.

The Senate discussed this amendment briefly, but was generally persuaded by the argument that more departments on the Senate would be a positive innovation. While some recognized that there would be limited opportunity for those who wish to serve in larger departments, this was generally seen as a negative consequence that was less significant than the improvement to departmental representation promised by the change. The Senate also discussed that colleges that currently have difficulty fielding requisite numbers of senators now might have increasing difficulty. The Senate also discussed that this would disproportionately hurt large departments in AH. The Senate concluded that it would be good to have this measure on the ballot for upcoming election, but that the change to constitution would not take effect until 2013-2014.

Senator Bardwell called for a vote on the resolution and Senator Von Berg Seconded.

In Favor: Redick, Pollard, Carpenter, Bardwell, Weiss, Wang, Selim, Martin, Adamitis, Von Berg, Barnello, Connell

Opposed: none

Abstained: none

The motion passes.

iii. Handbook: FRC Report Back

The Senate handbook committee proposed a change to the description and responsibilities of the FRC. Background: this change address directly the problems that occurred during the fall 2011 review cycle. The Senate, last academic year, changed the handbook to make it necessary, but did not see the need to also make the change in the responsibility statement in the University Handbook, Section XVIII, p. 161 in the 2011-2012 version).

The Senate discussed in brief the changes as presented and agreed on their utility. Senators also felt that it would be useful for the EVAL-8, the form that the FRC uses to report its conclusions after it evaluates a dossier for second-year, fourth-year, tenure and promotion reviews, to include a statement outlining the reporting responsibilities of each constituency.

Senator Weiss called for a vote and Senator Von Berg seconded.

In Favor: Redick, Pollard, Carpenter, Bardwell, Weiss, Wang, Selim, Martin, Adamitis, Von Berg, Barnello, Connell

Opposed: none

Abstained: none

The motion passes. Senators Connell and Adamitis will make sure that this is given to the university handbook committee so that it can be voted upon for the handbook for the next academic year.

iv. University and Student Handbook Motion

The Senate then moved to consider the problem of the Student Handbook updates which then sometimes by default change the University Handbook thus opening a limited thought potent backdoor that appears to supersede regular faculty and Senate governance.

Background: Last academic year, the Student Handbook updates required a number of changes to the University Handbook. Then, Senators objected to the procedures and sought ways to limit the possibility that this might happen again. The Senate President and Vice President were supposed to meet with the Dean of Students who oversees the Student Handbook over the summer when his office finalizes any changes to the Student Handbook. As this meeting was difficult at best to arrange during the summer, the problems were not effectively resolved. To address this issue, the Senate considered a new approach outlined here, which would make the statement that any update to the Student Handbook that affected the University Faculty and required a change to the University Handbook, must first go through the regular update protocols for changing the University Handbook before it can change the Student Handbook.

The Senate had a rather robust discussion. Some Senators expressed concerns that this might not be the most collegial way to pursue making a change that the Dean of Students, and University administration understand are necessary. Some senators supported the idea in principle, but also wondered if there were not a better approach to solve the problem.

The Senate resolved to put this back on the agenda in the future, but to not push for its passage until it could discuss the issues more directly with the administration and with the Dean of Students and his staff.

3. Elections

The Election Committee, Senators Connell, Weiss and Barnello, are at work on preparing the elections for February. This is significantly earlier than elections have been conducted in past years. The rationale, articulated in previous minutes, bears repeating. By establishing standing committees earlier in the spring, it will make it possible for newly constituted committees to meet at the end of the academic year to move the agenda for the subsequent year. This will facilitate the reduction of the need for standing committees to meet during Getting Started Week in the fall. The election committee plans to send out the call for nominations by college early in February and to conduct the election in advance of the next Senate meeting in February.

4. IDEA Feedback for Administrators Survey Tool

The Senate then turned to a new proposed being discussed by the SEC to look into the development and implementation of an assessment tool for the university administration. Background: Over the past 5 years, the Faculty Senate has repeatedly, facing much resistance, attempted to provide formative assessment for administrators. The logic, because we as an institution rely upon and value assessment for its ability to provide formative and therefore developmentally oriented feedback at all levels (departments, programs, the liberal learning core, the University itself, and most obviously individual faculty in the classroom) that there would be a positive benefit to the entire institution by extending that formative assessment to administration where it is currently lacking. President Pollard, who has been working with the IDEA taskforce constituted last year, discovered that IDEA has a product that is designed for assessing Chairs, Deans, the Provost and other elements of university administration. These tools are modeled upon the IDEA surveys currently used in the classroom to provide formative assessment.

Senators were generally receptive to the idea of pursuing an IDEA product to assess the administration. Senators also expressed the feeling that they perceived a need for such assessment, arguing that the university should provide assessment of performance at all levels.

The SEC was asked by the Senate to discuss these views at their upcoming meeting with the President and Provost.

5. Teaching Award

The teaching award that will be given this year by the University and is promised to be funded by the Provost is currently working out its schedule. The committee is currently soliciting applications for this award from department chairs. The candidates will present an application – the deadlines will follow the faculty development grant schedule for the spring.

Senators were encouraged to take up the discussion with their liaison departments.

6. Other

President Pollard informed the Senate that President Tribble has put together a task force on the honor code and judicial process for the University. This task force has two current senators (Puaca and Weiss) and former President Carlson. The president of the student assembly is on the task force as are numerous representatives of the administration and the office of the Dean of Students. The task force will be chaired by Carlson and Dean Hughes.

The provost sent around a list of curricular changes that were given to Senators in the information packet for the meeting. This is for information purposes and there was no discussion.

President Pollard moved to adjourn and Senator Martin Seconded.
The meeting adjourned at 5:40.