

Meeting Minutes for the 2012-2013 Faculty Senate
Madison ROOM of the DSU
March 15, 2013
3:00PM-6:00PM

Present: Bardwell, Hunter, Martin, Selim, Wang, Puaca, Manning, Depretis, Weiss, Adamitis, Connell
Absent: Zestos (Sabbatical), Keeling, Redick, Barnello

- 1. Call to Order: 3:03**
- 2. Welcome to Guests: Student Leader from *The Captain's Log*, Dr. Sharon Rowley, Liberal Learning Council Chair**

Student Leader from the Captain's Log, Darrell Fetz Senior history major came before the body of the Senate. He reported that he would be graduating in may and related that the *Captain's Log* is student-run newspaper distributed weekly on campus for free. The editorial board is independent of faculty advisor Dr. Terrance Lee, who advises students only when asked and approached. There are fifteen editors and four student assistants. Weekly over 1700 papers make their way on to campus and the editors estimate about 1600 are usually picked up and read by students, faculty and staff.

In their regular routine, the paper's staff has a Sunday meeting in which they plan the edition for the coming week. All stories, photographs and artwork are gathered together. By Monday and Tuesday the editorial staff establishes the format of the edition. The proofs are sent to Richmond by 5 PM on Tuesday and the printing office in Richmond returns the run of papers by the end of the week for distribution to the campus.

This year they have been working on adding regular columns that recurring weekly and these have generally received a positive response. There is a military news column, a comedy column, a student assembly column, a greek life column, and a sex and relationships column. These generally receive significant feedback from the paper's readership.

The paper's editorial staff is constantly working to improve the professionalism of the paper. to that end, they work heavily on proofing the copy. The editorial staff recognizes that they are judged on their grammatical correctness above all else. The paper has also started to offer internships and the business school has provided the paper with students to help with marketing and advertizing. These students work on commission. The paper also is working on increasing distribution and trying to live up to their tagline "the voice of CNU". Mr. Fetz also requested that faculty be aware that they are always welcome to contribute to the paper in the form of columns on community issues, letters to the editor and even possible story ideas. The paper is also constantly scouring campus for writers. They benefit from the English department which has provided interns even though there is no official journalism program at CNU.

Senators asked about some of the recent controversies involving the paper. they also asked about the process of selecting the editor and the way that the paper deals with any legal issues that might arise from their journalism.

On the issue of the editor, Mr. Fetz said that they usually have few candidates and so the process is fairly simple to select the one. This year they have a competitive race and therefore will have to elect an editor as an editorial board. They are working on the criteria that will help make this decision more effective.

On the controversy issue, Mr. Fetz reported that stories that are sensitive are scrutinized with extra care. He also said that the comedy column had sparked some backlash from the student body and beyond for commentary that it made recently. The editor has instructed the author of that column to use more caution. They also have a student representative who works directly with the Student Press Law Center and can review any issues of a legal nature that emerge through that body.

One senator suggested a story idea that the Captain's Log investigate why the starting infield of the Baseball team is composed of exclusively Math majors.

Other commentary asked about the relationship between the paper and the university administration and faculty advisor. Mr. Fetz suggested that the paper has a strong desire to remain independent and student run. Dr. Lee, the advisor for the paper, only comments about stories after they have provoked controversy and he discusses with the editorial staff how to head off potential problems in a 'post mortem' analysis.

Other Senators asked about the inspiration for the paper and if it was modeled on any other paper. Mr Fetz said that they were very impressed by the UVA paper and that they sometimes use it as a model (even though it is a daily paper at UVA). They have also sent representatives to the College Newspaper Conference recently that was in Chicago.

The Faculty Senate thanks Mr. Fitz for his dedication and service and he thanked senators for inviting him to the meeting. He left the table and adjourned to the audience seating at 3:16.

The Senate then welcomed Dr. Sharon Rowley, the Chair of the Liberal Learning Council, to address the senate regarding the curricular changes and assessment issues we have been working upon this academic year. She passed around an interim report and a map that she felt would help define the how the goals of the current Areas of Inquiry might be more ably assessed with a new set of Learning Objectives for each of the areas. The senate will consider these a second time and vote on them at the April Meeting. Dr. Rowley explained that the issue of assessment is one that is a constant struggle for us, but that after she attended a national conference on assessment recently, she realized that it can be done and that other Universities have faced this very issue.

Oral competency in the Gen ed curriculum is part of it – but no one really teaches it but all majors assess oral competency.

On assessment Dr. Rowley reported that each area of inquiry course is supposed to fulfill specific goals. To assess these goals the LLC is working to develop anonymized assessment of student work done by teams of faculty trained on a common rubric. The university needs to develop a means to collect and assess student work consistently from courses that are in the current or future Areas of Inquiry and to assess them for their capacity to meet the learning objectives defined by the LLC. At the AAC&U [[American Association of Colleges and Universities](#)] conference, this kind of assessment was the gold standard. Dr. Rowley also reported that the objectives need to be simplified and that the number of courses in the curriculum needs to be evaluated and perhaps curtailed to make assessment more manageable. To that end, the LLC will ask each department to look at the goals and to see if their course still fit in the areas of Inquiry that they are assigned to currently. She argued that departments should make these decisions and determine if they want their courses in the Areas of Inquiry.

The LLC then should assess the curriculum as well and determine what changes need to be made and to begin to structure a plan to assess the curriculum effectively. There are clearly a number of issues that remain to be decided by the faculty and their representative bodies – the UCC, the LLC, and the Faculty Senate.

Dr. Rowley responded to some questions by Senators who asked about different colleges and their representation in the Liberal Learning Core Curriculum. For example, with the possible elimination of the AIII social sciences will be less well represented in the core curriculum. Dr. Rowley argued that the curriculum and its goals should be set by the faculty according to our vision; assessment should follow, not drive curricular development. Provided that goals are assessable, there is no limit on what can be put into the curriculum from any college in the University.

Dr. Rowley reported that the deadlines have been relaxed that were suggested by the Provost at the beginning of this academic year in the 7 September memo. The plan is to tackle the foundations initially moving the formal and informal reasoning area and possibly adding an economics course to those areas. When these adjustments are considered fully by all of the proper curriculum committees and the administration by the end of the semester, those changes will be implemented for the next year. In Academic Year 2013/14, the LLC and other constituencies will take up any curricular changes it sees necessary for the Areas of Inquiry. Dr. Rowley stated that the curriculum and any changes made to it are in the purview of the instructional faculty and so she is seeking ways to make the necessary curricular changes through the consent of the faculty. Senators strongly supported the faculty ownership of the curriculum and asked what was to be done if the faculty did not approve the changes proposed? Senators pointed out that in the previous curricular changes that resulted in the current core curriculum, faculty meetings and workshops were regularly held to discuss curricular matters. Such meetings have not characterized the current curricular change process.

Senators recognized that there had been significant curricular changes in the past several years including the elimination of ULLC 100 and the Liberal Learning Emphasis and also the changing of ULLC 223 to ENGL 223. These ostensibly eliminated “curricular bottlenecks” but also changed some of the appealing elements of the curriculum as it was designed. Senators also worried that the current curricular changes under consideration might make the core more rigid – sort of like the old General Education Core Curriculum that the LLCC replaced.

The discussion turned to the Areas of Inquiry and the assessment of those. According to Dr. Rowley, the University has only patchy data, but that there exists significant, long-term data that has been collected on our students in the areas of critical thinking and scientific and quantitative reasoning. Many of these data are valid “closed cycle loops” and have been collected by the Associate Provost, Dr. Bobbye Bartels. We also have post course data that are assessments done independently of actual courses but from which the University can measure the value added of given parts of the curriculum. Issues of reliability, sample size and student investment in the outcomes of these standardized tests all limit the utility of these data. As a result, they do not seem sufficient to get a real grasp on the effectiveness of the core curriculum on student outcomes.

As a result, the assessment of the core probably needs to derive from within individual departments that can take the assessment they already do and modify it to provide the kinds of assessment that derive authentically from real student work – thus getting around the problem of apathy encountered with the standardized testing we already do. In these authentic assessments, students are motivated to put their energy into the work by the grade in the class and if these student work samples could be assessed independently in the interest of evaluating

the core curriculum by faculty it would provide better data. This would require an investment of time and energy and thus require the support of the departments.

Dr. Rowley was asked by Senators to elaborate upon how the instructional faculty would define the goals of the curriculum if they had not actually been asked to participate in the process of making changes. Rather, the process seemed governed by the curriculum memo from the Provost issued on 7 September 2012. Dr. Rowley argued that this was probably, at least in part, a communication breakdown. The LLCC Task Force represented all colleges; many of the changes recommended in the Provost's memo derived from the recommendations of the Task Force. The LLC has been refining the Area of Inquiry goals and responding to other recommendations in the memos from the Provost and the Task Force. The Area of Inquiry goals are going through the complete curricular process, having been approved by the UCC and put on the agenda for the Senate.

The result of that realization has now opened avenues to make the process driven by faculty; hence, the slowdown in the timeline for the changes. – but now the administration is asking us to work on this together. Senators suggested again that the LLC organize meetings for the general faculty to consider curricular changes so that the instructional faculty is directly involved in the process. Generally Senators and Dr. Rowley felt that the process needed to be bigger and more inclusive.

Senators asked further about the creation of the current curriculum and the Areas of Inquiry. Dr. Rowley said there was a task force and it spent considerable time building the framework of the curriculum. She also pointed out that the current process is one of modification to the current curriculum, not a wholesale revamping as was done before 2006 when the current curriculum was implemented. She also noted that the principle aim must continue to be assessment – finding ways to “close the loop” and by doing provide aggregate data and feedback that demonstrates that there is constant improvement.

Dr. Rowley suggested a number of ways to get the assessment issue in the minds of faculty further and to advance and build a culture of assessment on campus. She argued that workshops during getting started week would be effective. Modeling upon some of the other campuses like us that are further along in the process, she mentioned *Dornsife College, University of Southern California* as a possible place to begin. She also said that it might be possible to bring in for a workshop Barbara Walvoord, who is the author of [*Assessment Clear and Simple*](#) and an expert in the field.

The goal of these educational opportunities for faculty is to make the assessment regime tighter so that we get better data to assess the core. All of this will be useful for the looming evaluations of the university by SACS. The problem as Dr. Rowley sees it is partly because there is so much in the core that it is difficult to find a measure capable of providing useful data.

Dr. Rowley also talked about her vision for the Liberal Learning Assessment Council. She hopes that its staff will be expert in assessment and will get regular training so that they can be effective assessment leaders.

Dr. Rowley also asked the Senate to consider voting on the goals she passed around at the beginning of her talk – these are to define the objectives for each of the current Areas of Inquiry and Foundations.

The Senate thanked Dr. Rowley for sharing her thoughts and expertise with us.
She left at 4:15

Senate is now going out of order at 4:15 to consider the third minor.

3. Approval of Minutes February

The Senate Returned to order at 4:53

The Minutes were still being scrutinized by senators and therefore have been tabled for electronic approval.

4. Senate President's Update/Report

President Bardwell reported that she had met with the provost regarding the possibility of faculty raises in the coming year.

5. Faculty Senate Issue/Ad Hoc Standing Committee Reports

a. Administration Evaluation Assessment

i. Proposal for best practices, AAUP and IDEA

Senator Adamitis presented a document to the Senate for consideration that she had put together regarding the best practices for the evaluation of Administrators by University faculty. This had been examined already by the Senate Executive Committee. It takes language from the American Association of University Professors recommendations and also from the IDEA practices as well. While neither of these two organizations provided what we will likely use, there was sufficient congruence between the two sets of practices that it appeared a good place to begin the process and to establish policies for reviews. Reviews of all kinds in a University that values assessment should be seen as positive contributions that ultimately make the university administration more effective and improve communication between University faculty and the administration. The senate, according to Senator Adamitis' proposal must decide how to move forward.

Senators discussed a number of issues. Outside constituencies such as SACS and SHEV see the review of administrators apparently as a necessary process. AAUP argues that faculty review of administrators complemented by administrative review of faculty invites opportunities to collaborate and breaks down the distances between these two university constituencies. Given that administrators have appeared before the senate to say that they value feedback from Faculty and the Faculty Senate idea that these reviews should provide feedback that is formative or developmental rather than punitive, a system should be possible to work out in the coming year.

The Senate will propose in April the formation of a task force to develop a system for administrative evaluation. The main questions that should guide that task force are.

1. Should administrative evaluation at CNU be *developmental or summative*?
2. *Which administrators* should be reviewed (e.g., chairs, deans, vice provost, associate provost, provost, president)?
3. What should the *frequency* for reviews be?
4. What should the *format* for the review be?
5. What should the formal *process* for the review be?
6. Who should *participate* in the reviews?
7. How should the *results* be communicated and to whom?
8. What are the *legal issues* at stake?
9. How should faculty and administrators *respond* to the results?

Senator Adamitis then suggested that we also think about the actual formation of the task force. It should, it seems, consist of all constituencies involved – Faculty, Staff, and Administrative Staff and perhaps someone from Human Resources. The task force should be charged with communicating a plan to the Senate for consideration next year.

The Senate considered the document presented by Senator Adamitis and resolved to vote upon a revised version in April and will conclude with a final vote in May on the final proposal.

b. Elections

Senator Connell thanked Abbe Depretis and Laurie Hunter for their work on the election committee. All results were communicated to faculty in advance of this meeting and only a modest number of vacancies, including a Senate seat in the college of Social Sciences, remain open.

Senator Connell also reminded Senators that in the April meeting the Senate traditionally welcomes newly elected Senators and conducts the election for the new Senate Executive Committee.

i. Report on Results

c. Faculty Pay Recommendation for Salary Increase

President Bardwell asked Senator Martin about his survey of the faculty again. The subcommittee on Faculty Pay that Senator Martin Chairs developed a survey in the Fall to ascertain faculty sentiment about the nature of the distribution of any potential raise. President Bardwell, based upon discussions that the SEC has had with the provost, suggested that he was developing a plan. Some senators, because of the ongoing nature of the Provost's evolving plan and the need to wait for Board of Visitors approval of any raise, urged caution and restraint so that the Senate not insert itself prematurely into a complex negotiation between the Provost and the BOV. Other Senators argued that we need the data to participate in any discussion that comes of the next BOV meeting. They also argued that simply conducting a survey of faculty to learn their preferences only would not be disruptive to any kind of raise negotiation. The Senate settled into two camps, those who felt that fact finding was important, more important than restraint and those who wanted to wait and see what the Provost would offer. President Bardwell asked for a vote to give the subcommittee the authority to revise the survey and to send it via electronic 'survey monkey' means to faculty before the next Senat meeting

Seconded by Senator Martin

VOTE:

In favor : Bardwell, Hunter, Martin. Selim, Wang, Manning, Depretis, Weiss, Adamitis, Connell

Opposed: Puaca

Abstain none

d. IDEA

i. Update on IDEA Taskforce and FDEC

There was no report

ii. Peer Evaluation

There was no report

e. LLC to LLAC

Discussed above with Dr. Rowley

f. Memorial Venue and Permanent location on Campus

The work has been completed

g. Religious Dialogue and Diversity

Senator Redick, who heads this committee was not present, but the new Pope Chapel on campus is hosting speakers already and Senator Redick wished to communicate that to the Senate.

h. FMLA Policies

The Senate had nothing new to add to the discussion of the FMLA policies raised at the last meeting. It appears that the Child Care subcommittee is now engaged mostly with FMLA policy. President Bardwell noted that the Provost said that he would have his website updated to include the exact policy on Family Leave. It does not appear to have been added as of yet. President Bardwell also felt that faculty were ill informed of their rights under FMLA which includes more than the birth of children but also includes ill spouses and parents. These policies need to be more accessible to faculty.

President Bardwell noted that for the 12 April meeting, subcommittee chairs need to send a blurb of what their committee accomplished.

6. Curriculum Changes

i. Update on ENVS

The ENVS proposals are still in the curriculum committees.

ii. UCC Course Changes from the Provost

Senators were asked to review the curricular changes.

7. Old Business

a. Faculty Teaching Development Committee (formerly Faculty Development and Evaluation Committee)

This committee was approved by the senate and the Provost is going to appoint representatives for the first year.

b. EVAL-AR possibly move to the Spring

The SEC and the Provost, following the lead of AH Chairs, have been considering several ideas regarding the review cycle for the AR. Currently, ARs and 2nd, 4th, Tenure and Promotion reviews occur concurrently in the fall thus providing a significant work load imbalance for Chairs, the Deans, and the Provost. AH chairs have suggested moving the process to the spring to separate the AR from the more substantial reviews with dossiers. Chairs have also argued that since AR reviews contain developmental feedback, they are less helpful for faculty when the results of the previous year's review come midway through the fall term of the following year. Chairs also generally ask faculty to submit abbreviated activities reports that are used in the production of the Annual Report each spring. Having faculty submit an Eval-6 would eliminate such double work.

Senators recognized that the timing would make any change enacted now in the review cycle to be for AY 2014/15. Senators also raised questions about the IDEA calendar, and the ability of IDEA to consistently provide data to write the report in time for a mid-May deadline. Faculty also expressed concern about the lost summer that would occur in the first year of implementation. Faculty also felt that it was rather tight to get the work done in the time frame that faculty are still under contract.

c. Handbook Changes 11 and 12

President Bardwell explained that Senator Redick had met with the handbook constituencies earlier in the week to represent the senate. Others were representatives from the Provost's office and Dean Hughes and Academic deans as well.

The meeting Senator Redick attended, however, did not resolve all issues with changes 11 and 12 fully and so the Senate will wait to act until April on these changes when a final version is presented.

d. Follow up on Technology – Identity Finder

This is a continuing issue but it seems to be moving forward

e. Students Adding a Third Minor

Dr. Jonathan White (LAMS), not as an invited guest of the senate but as a concerned member of the faculty, asked to address the Senate. President Bardwell, without objection, invited him to the floor. Dr. White argued that as a core advisor he sees around 70 advisees per semester. Some of these students bump up against the limitations of the curriculum which seems to prevent them from being able to choose and pursue a third minor. He argued that some students come to CNU with significant coursework already completed. Minors, he suggested, can, when they appear officially on a transcript, communicate a certain level of expertise outside the major area to potential employers. He suggested that if students can, without extending their time at CNU beyond 4 years, add a third minor it seems inappropriate to prevent them from doing so. Furthermore, the triple minor allows students to focus their energies and limits the amount of unregulated exploration when students sometimes find themselves hunting for courses to take that are not organized under the core or their major.

Senators wondered if there had been students who had triple minored in the past? They also wondered if the limitation was in the handbook or if it was a technological limitation based upon the software the registrar uses to keep track student records. Senators also wondered with the proliferation of interdisciplinary minors (Environmental Studies, Asian Studies) the university should try to accommodate students who wish to seek additional focus in a minor field.

The secretary of the senate agreed to ask the registrar if the limitation on the number of minors was intentional, if it was philosophical in nature or a technological limitation.

The senate thanks Dr. White for his insights. He left at 4:20

8. New Business

a. Handbook Change 13

The senate considered this item out of order at 5:25

Handbook Change 13 governs the use of University computers specifically making clear that unauthorized personal use of University computers, especially when engaged with social media and other such communication tools, faculty and staff must follow the state law governing proper use which prohibits the infringement of copyright and trademarks but also the prohibition from accessing “sexually explicit content” as defined in the Code of Virginia §2.2-2827.”

Senators wondered why we needed handbook language to say we must follow the law of the state. Senators also asked why this change came in so late and what prompted it? According to

the change itself – the attorney General of Virginia asked that all state agencies update and clarify their policies on the use of state computer equipment.

Senator Weiss called for the vote and it was seconded by Senator Martin.

VOTE: unanimous in favor.

The motion passes

b. Teaching, Service and Scholarship Awards

Deadlines for the Faculty Awards in Teaching, Service, and Scholarship are upcoming. Jana and Stephanie will ask the past winners to serve on the committee. The Senate will vote on these in April

c. Parking on Campus for Next Year

Faculty raised the concern that the movement of the Administration from the Admin building to McMurren in the fall may create problems for parking on the McMurren side of campus. These faculty wondered if there were possibly a way to determine if the Administration had thought of how to alleviate the potential strain on parking resources. The Senate resolved to ask William Brauer about this at the April meeting. Some senators suggested a return to parking on the circle that was used in past years to deal with congestion.

d. Emeritus Resolutions

- i. Bobby Bartels**
- ii. Belle Pendleton**
- iii. Mario Mazarella**

The Senate determined that without approval from the appropriate dean, it could not approve officially the resolutions of these three faculty.

These are tabled for the April meeting.

9. Department Reports

Senators brought from their departments several issues

One senator suggested that CNU make the application process for faculty employment more electronic to facilitate distribution of materials and to make the process simpler for applicants. The Senate agreed in principle on the idea of more electronic applications, and suggested a meeting with Michelle Moody might generate a good discussion on the nature of the application process and the reason we do not have a more electronic system.

In psychology, some senators noted, the idea of resurrecting the nursing program has been floated. In Psychology the faculty have wondered where this initiative is coming from and how it might be profitably resurrected in the near term as it was originally eliminated due to budgetary exigencies. Senators noted that the STEM task force had identified nursing as a potential major that could focus on science and math and that it might be built in a way that allows CNU to partner with the nursing program at Riverside Hospital.

A senator received a comment that in the counseling center, a student who needed some assistance was denied access because h/she worked in the center and therefore could not be accommodated. It struck Senators that all students should be allowed to use the services of the center without having to give up their job on campus. Senators felt that a question might be directed to Kevin Hughes or Nicole Guajardo.

10. Liaison Reports

There were no liaison reports

11. Other

Senators who served on search committees this year asked the question why the University does not budget their searches so that all committee members can attend lunches and dinners with candidates with their expenses covered through the search. It seems that it is fairly standard practice in other institutions to cover the meals of search committee members when they are entertaining a candidate on campus.

The Senate made a proposal that asked that all members of a search committee to be reimbursed to the state limits for all meals that they participate in on the search in an official capacity.

Motion made by Senator Puaca and seconded by Senator Hunter

VOTE

Unanimous in favor.

The motion passes.

With that Senator Puaca asked for a motion to adjourn seconded by Senator Depretis.

Unanimous – the Senate adjourned at 6:08