

Faculty Senate Minutes
20 January 2017, 3:00-6:00 p.m.
DSU Board Room

Present: Adamitis, Connable, Donaldson, Gerousis (arrives at 3:15PM), Grau, Holland, Kennedy, Mulryan, Puaca, Shollen, Timani (arrives at 3:55 p.m.), Waldron (arrives at 3:19PM), Winder

Absent: Brash, Thompson

I) Call to order: 3:00PM.

II) QEP Update by Dr. Michaela Meyer, QEP Director

The Acronym LENS, as in research lens, is used for the **Implementation plan:**

Learn: (focusing on ENG 123/223, library instruction, Upper-Level Discipline Specific Instruction). The library is increasing its efforts to liaison with faculty to provide structured library instruction for students.

Explore: Students generally explore within the classroom when in direct contact with a faculty member. Part of the implementation effort is to connect students with resources on campus but also outside the classroom. In addition to the Summer Scholars program, there will also be Fall and Spring Scholars programs. Students will have to go beyond research projects from class, developing independent ones, completed under the mentorship of a faculty member.

Navigate: developing research projects through capstone classes.

Share: Paideia, Student Travel Funding

Gerousis (arrives at 3:15PM)

Support for Research Lens:

Office of Research and Creative Activities (ORCA):

The Faculty Director will help articulate the mission and multiple functions for the office.

Faculty Compensation Plan: a year will be required to develop the plan, and it will be implemented by year 3. Ten percent of faculty will ideally be reassigned to UG Research Activities.

Discussion:

A senator inquired as to the meaning of “ten percent,” whether it means ten percent of faculty or ten percent of a given faculty member’s schedule. Dr. Meyer responded that ten percent of faculty would get a course release to participate in the program. She further elaborated by stating that course releases would be based on a token system (i.e., credit established based on research projects done with students mentored by the chosen faculty members in the past). One senator expressed concern that such tokens could be based on “uncompensated work from the past,” in the form of independent studies, etc. Some senators expressed criticism of such a premise.

The budget for the five-year plan:

The anticipated budget for the five-year plan (about four million dollars):

1 million towards ORCA

1.5 towards student programs/enhancement.

1.5 million for faculty compensation.

Waldron arrives at 3:19PM

3:20PM

Continuation of Discussion:

One senator remarked that there is very little money in the budget for research in the classroom or for research literacy for students who are not part of the program. The senator also inquired whether there would be funds available for material support for research. Dr. Meyer responded that “material support” was a line item that was eliminated. The rationale for its exclusion was that it is already a part of faculty compensation packages. In other words, departments must provide that funding, or the departments need to come up with a strategic plan to get those materials.

A senator added that one might claim that we are not necessarily facilitating an increase in research that is being done but rather the compensation for students who do said research. This will not necessarily increase quantity. Dr. Meyer responded that is one of the stated goals of the five year plan to increase the number of students who participate in the program. The senator responded, that at least in the sciences, this will probably not increase participation; scientists already have the maximum number of students they are able to mentor. The senator added that the compensation package for students is a good idea.

3:30PM

Continuation of discussion of the QEP:

A couple of senators inquired about the administrative procedure and protocols that would be followed for faculty members who would like to participate in the program.

Would department chairs have to approve this first? If that is not the case, this would create many complications in the chain of expenditures, since materials for research projects and course releases would represent additional costs that would directly fall on the department. There would have to be more clarification on this issue. Senators also inquired about the records that have been kept on research spending associated with undergraduate research. Dr. Meyer responded that she did not know whether departmental approval would be a prerequisite for participation in the program and that research spending can be a bit nebulous, and that keeping track of how much has been spent with one hundred percent accuracy is very challenging.

Another senator wanted confirmation that the \$10,000 line item would be for a course release for the director. Dr. Meyer confirmed that it is for a reduction of three courses, from an official 4/3 to a 2/2 course load.

One senator was concerned that with an annual salary of \$75,000.00, the staff director might make more than the faculty member. Another senator interjected, stating that the staff director would have a twelve-month contract, unlike the faculty member, so even if that were the case it should not be a cause for concern.

Another senator asked if we know the desired benchmark for student participation, and Dr. Meyer responded that that would only be established once the benchmark of 10% is met for faculty.

Another senator remarked that in the past one college has participated in undergraduate research programs to a disproportionate extent when compared to the other colleges and wanted to know if there was a plan in place for ensuring that all colleges would participate in a relatively proportionate manner.

Another senator inquired if any research activity would represent credit for these projects, and another asked if the summer, fall, and spring scholars' programs are all in the same system. On both fronts, Dr. Meyer answered yes.

Dr. Meyer concluded by stating that the UGRC has had an increasingly large burden in terms of administrative workload for undergraduate research, including grant applications, but this new center would relieve them of much of the burden. She also added that faculty members have two weeks to provide feedback before the final report is submitted.

3:48PM: Meyer leaves

Before moving to approve the November and December minutes, the senate president mentioned that a paragraph had been left out of the ISAC report. It has been added as an addendum to the original report. There is also one other amendment: Proxy voting is not allowed according to the Senate's Rules; thus, the proxy vote for the curriculum proposal does not count.

A) November minutes

Motion: Adamitis moved to approve the amended minutes, and Kennedy seconded.

Vote in Favor: Unanimous

Abstain:

B) December minutes

Motion: Donaldson moved to approve the minutes, and Connable seconded.

Vote in Favor: Adamitis, Connable, Donaldson, Gerousis, Grau, Holland, Kennedy, Mulryan, Puaca, Shollen, Waldron, Winder

Abstain: Puaca

C) Reports

a. President's Report

- i. The Faculty Senate would like to recognize President Paul Tribble for dedicating forty years to public service in Virginia and twenty years to providing outstanding leadership at Christopher Newport University
- ii. Last year the Senate recommended bringing back the Departmental EVAL 4's and heard some concerns from faculty about the "no recommendation" option as well as criteria for promotion to full professor. The Senate will ask the Faculty Review Committee (FRC) for feedback on the usefulness of the Departmental EVAL 4's and their thoughts on the concerns related by faculty.
- iii. On January 28th the University will hold a Teach In, which will comprise panels on key issues in the Trump presidency. The Teach In seeks to provide factual information and will be non-partisan. All faculty and students are welcome to attend.

b. Academic Standing Committee Reports

c. The president commented on three reports:

1. **ISAC** is doing an excellent job. There is a new form for faculty-led summer trips. This has already been distributed to faculty by Mandi Pierce. They are continuing to work on their mission and goals. Right now ISAC reviews the summer courses in March. The new curriculum committee will be reviewing all these courses too, but they will have to do it very quickly after ISAC does in March. This is a cause for concern.

2. **The Undergraduate Admissions committee** is now meeting again and is working on clarifying their *Handbook* charge. One item under discussion is having

faculty attend and contribute to meetings at which the Admission team reviews applications that are in the “grey zone” for acceptance.

3. The Committee on IDEA Survey Support (CISS), a.k.a. the IDEA committee, was created when the faculty were concerned about the effectiveness of IDEAs and significance of the data provided in the IDEA reports. They are now having interesting conversations about the future of the committee as we move forward with focusing teaching evaluation away from IDEA. In fact, keeping a committee solely focused on IDEA might now have the opposite of its intended effect, that is, to overemphasize the importance of IDEA rather than help assuage faculty concerns about it. The committee members have done an excellent job researching IDEA and, more recently, researching and reporting on alternative measures for evaluating teaching. Perhaps we could expand CISS to a broader faculty evaluation committee. Such a committee might keep abreast of research on best practices in faculty evaluation, organize workshops on Digital Measures, dossier building, and/or redesigning Digital Measures so it better serves the faculty.

Discussion of reports on standing academic committees:

A senator asked if the new committee, if formed, would be a standing one, and the senate president responded yes. The current committee is appointed, so in their discussion about changing the CISS charge the committee will have to address whether members will be elected or appointed. They will also have to consider their relationship to the FRC.

One member of the senate commented emphatically on the need to standardize the dossier process, since they can look so vastly different. Part of the problem is the faculty just do not know what expectations are, since everyone has various opinions as to what should be included in the dossier.

Another senator remarked that Digital Measures has been practically the same since its inception some seven years ago and that it should change based on the history of the institution.

4:03PM (Standing committees discussion over)

D) Unfinished Business

a. Diversity and Inclusion: **Discussion of faculty feedback on proposal**

The department of LAMS had some concerns regarding the Diversity and Inclusion statement, and some of their faculty asked the following questions:

Why was this statement written? What is the initiative behind this?

Do we want to have this? What are the legal implications of making such a statement public? What are the implications for hiring? Do we have to reserve seats for students from diverse backgrounds? How do we count these things?

They had a lot of foundational questions about the statement. If we are going to put out a statement on diversity and inclusion from the faculty, are we doing the typical process of senators relaying their department members' opinions?

A senator who co-authored the statement responded that many faculty felt that the university was not doing enough in this regard. There are also very few universities without a diversity missions statement, so it was time for CNU to prepare one. Then a senator inquired who called for the diversity council? The president of the senate responded that it was President Tribble. A senator suggested we could talk to Michelle Moody about this, but the intent is not to create an affirmative action policy. It is more of a philosophical statement. We have more faculty and staff diversity than student diversity. The intent was not to create a quota system.

Timani arrives at 3:55PM

Then a senator asked what the expectations are concerning this statement? Should it go in the *Handbook*? How far do we expect this to go up the food chain?

Another senator responded that it will be sent to the Council on Diversity and Inclusion, that people perceive a need for improvement in this respect. While there are some references to diversity in our various mission and values statements, the term is never defined. We never say anywhere why this is important, except in our anti-discrimination policy, but that does not explain why we value certain things. We cannot speak on behalf of the university. We can send this statement to the Council to adopt, but it is merely advice.

Another senator explained that there is a fundamental misunderstanding of this statement as a policy, when this is really a commitment. A lot of the criticism of this is how it leads to policy. The meaning and implications of it are being misconstrued.

Another senator added that the faculty have to think about all the implications, once the ball has been thrown.

Another senator explained that people fear we are trying to create affirmative action policies. There is some wording here that could create these fears:

“underrepresented groups,” ideologies. Maybe it is worth changing to the wording to change that slant.

Two senators agreed that the statement is too long, and that the wording problem could be fixed by eliminating a sentence.

Another senator added that rather than jumping to a statement, might it not be a good idea to just state that CNU policy is silent on diversity?

A senator added that the faculty do not know too much about what the Council on Diversity and Inclusion actually is or what they do. We don’t know where the policy is going to be developed. It might be worth stating that this is not a policy statement.

Several senators added that language that even indirectly or suggestively alludes to policy should be taken out and that the statement could be more concise. One of the co-authors of the statement suggested sending out a memo to all the faculty.

There was also a brief discussion about word choice, and the possibility that the word “diversity” might be misinterpreted as being too racially charged, even though this is the typical word to use in such a statement nationally. One senator said including “inclusiveness” in the statement might be a good idea.

4:32PM

Senators also mentioned the fact that public universities by their very nature are diverse, but other senators responded by stating our student body is primarily middle-class and Caucasian. One senator elaborated by stating that there was a great deal of concern that the QEP did not act on improving diversity (one of the main concerns of CNU students who took the survey).

One senator included anecdotes from job candidates who felt that CNU is not a diverse campus, and that this was a cause for concern. In other words, the lack of diversity also has recruitment implications.

Senators agreed that having a public memo would be very useful and that a final draft should be written before sitting down with administration.

4:37PM Break

4:45PM: Gerousis leaves

4:49PM Senate meeting resumes

- b. Revised Budget Advisory Committee (BAC) Memo
Adamitis: summarizes the contents of the proposal.

Motion: Adamitis moved to approve the proposal, and Kennedy seconded.

Vote in Favor: Unanimous

4:51PM: Waldron leaves

- c. Faculty Development Committee: Discussion of recommendation on changing FDG procedures

Discussion

After completing a good deal of research, the committee found there was no preferable system for awarding faculty development grants at peer institutions. One problem with the current system have been identified as the following: it is not clear how to handle interdisciplinary applications in terms of funding.

The committee suggested the following changes:

- 80% of the funding to the deans for direct allocation.
- The other 20% will be ranked by the deans, and then they will go the FDG faculty committee and then the list will be sent to the provost.
- Deans make decisions on interdisciplinary proposals (intercollege research) collectively and decide on how to fund them.

Multiple senators expressed concern about taking the senate out of the FDG process. Making such a move might threaten the sabbatical process, which is currently in the senate's hands, since the system for granting FDGs and sabbaticals is similar. Members of the FDG committee countered that sabbatical applications are much more manageable due to the low number, and they are generally easier to understand for faculty without disciplinary expertise, unlike FDG grant applications. The senate president suggested that CNU could have faculty committees at the college level and then that list goes to the dean. One department made a case for keeping the money in the provost's office, even if we move to a college model, for fear that FDG's could at some point become an unfunded mandate at the college level

5:03PM

A senator exclaimed that the FDG process is peer-reviewed, and the senate has more or less control of that funding, and that the deans have discretionary funds. Why should we cede control of those monies when it is already a peer-review process?

A senator responded that the issue is that faculty members are doing peer review in disciplines in which they do not have expertise, and several senators agreed that the committee should specify that college-wide committees make FDG recommendations.

Senators from the FDG committee made several clarifications, including the following: 1) Recommendations would be separated by college, and that, in the end, 2) it is up to the provost how such funding is spent and is thus not really in the hands of the senate in the first place.

5:10PM

After much discussion, senators agreed on the following model for the FDG process:

1. The Senate will continue to assess FDG grant proposals.
2. Membership will be expanded by college (thus, there will be one committee divided into groups separated by college that evaluate proposals accordingly; this does away with the issue of lacking the necessary disciplinary expertise to evaluate proposal).
3. Grants will be allocated on a per-capita basis by college.
4. There will no longer be a 80%/20% breakdown for the funds (20% to each college and another 20% for interdisciplinary proposals); deans will decide what to do with left over funds and how to fund inter-college interdisciplinary proposals.
5. Process: Deans will develop lists of preferred candidates first, then FDG committee on the senate will develop their own, and then the Provost will evaluate both lists and make a decision.

5:44PM end of discussion on FDG

d. Handbook Language on Curriculum: Discussion of feedback on proposal

The Senate has considered the following suggestions from the UCC chair, and we are thankful for such feedback. The Senate opted to defer discussion of these options until the February meeting, so that Senators would have time to hear feedback from their constituents first.

Suggestions: Remove the Deans from the Curriculum Review Committee and consider one of the following options

1. Deans remain as independent reviewers concurrent with the review of the respective College Curriculum Committees. This is essentially the role they currently play. Each Dean reviews proposals in his or her college. For an interdisciplinary proposal, each Dean whose college has courses in the proposal would review. Next, the proposals advance to the EPC. Only proposals approved by the EPC go to the Provost.
2. Deans form a new committee to review the proposals. This would create a bicameral legislature with one elected body (faculty) and one appointed body (Deans). This bicameral review would take one of two forms. The Deans' committee either would review proposals concurrent with the review by the College Curriculum Committees, or concurrent with the EPC review and following the decisions by the College Curriculum Committees.

E) New Business

a. Emeritus Recommendations

i. Dr. Roberta Rosenberg

Motion: Puaca moved to approve the proposal, and Adamitis seconded.

Vote in Favor: Unanimous

ii. Dr. Terry Lee

Motion: Donaldson moved to approve the proposal, and Connable seconded.

Vote in Favor: Unanimous

iii. Dr. Marsha Sprague

Motion: Puaca moved to approve the proposal, and Holland seconded.

Vote in Favor: Unanimous

F) Other : A senator mentioned that the deans have suggested that IDEA forms should be filled out with a minimum of three objectives in all colleges.

Since there has been no official rational for this new policy, senators wondered whether some people suspect that faculty members are somehow gaming the system. Another faculty member suspected that the administrative motive behind this change had to do with score differentiation. Several senators disputed the merits of this new policy, since IDEA explicitly recommends no more than three to five objectives but does not exclude less then three. The senate president advised that we ask the deans for clarification on this decision.

G) Adjournment: Adamitis, motion to adjourn. Seconded: Mulryan
Unanimous.