

Minutes for Faculty Senate meeting

3 PM Friday, Dec 7, 2007

Board Room in David Student Union

Senators present: Nate French, Jean Filetti, Lynn Lambert, Kathleen Brunke, Gary Whiting, Ming Zhang, Nicole Guajardo, Pete Carlson, Tim Marshall, Eric Duskin, Niazur Rahim, Leland Jordan, Bob Hasbrouck (arrived at 3:17), Kip Redick

Senators absent: Rebecca Wheeler

- I. President Whiting called the meeting to order at 3:06.
- II. Introduction of guests: Dr. Mark Padilla, Provost, Andrew Lundsten, SGA president
- III. Approval of minutes of Faculty Senate meetings
 - A. Acknowledge electronic approval of minutes for [November 2, 2007](#) meeting
 - B. Acknowledge electronic approval of minutes for [November 9](#) meeting
 - C. Approve [December 4](#) General Faculty meeting minutes. Guajardo/Carlson move to approve. vote in favor unanimous.

President Whiting asked to consider the the first item of new business out of order (discussion of the Provost's suggested [faculty evaluation schedule](#)). A description of that discussion is given under that agenda item.

- IV. President's report: Dr. William Ritchey was selected as the Director of Counseling Services. The schedule for Spring 2008 Faculty Development grants is:

Date	Day	Turn in to
Feb 1	F	Chair
Feb 13	W	Dean
Mar 3	M	Senate
Mar 28	F	Senate vote

The full president's report available [here](#) including the Spring 2008 Faculty Senate meeting schedule.

- V. Committee reports

- A. Election results for sabbatical replacement faculty on FRC (Kip Redick, Leland Jordan): Because both Michelle Vachris and Graham Schweig are on sabbatical Spring 2008, elections were held to replace them. Senator Redick reported that business elected Bob Hasbrouck to replace Michelle Vachris. Senator Jordan reported that Liberal Arts elected Steven Breese to replace Graham Schweig.
- B. Liaison Reports
1. Social Work Department (Eric Duskin): Department members wanted to know where the Administration planned to locate their Department after the new academic buildings were completed. [In later conversation with the Provost the Senate learned that plans for the location of Social Work are not yet in place.] The members of the Department also shared their thoughts on the proposed laptop program and all thought that the necessary infrastructure and faculty computers had to be taken care of before students should be required to own a laptop.
 2. Sociology and Anthropology Department (Pete Carlson): Sociology and Anthropology: Senator Carlson met with the faculty of the Department of Sociology and Anthropology on Tuesday, November 13, 2007. The primary focus of the discussion revolved around Provost Padilla's proposed new schedule for faculty evaluation. The faculty of this department are predominantly untenured and were concerned that new faculty may not receive the same guidance as they do now with the present yearly formative evaluations.
 3. Mathematics Department (Kathleen Brunke): The mathematics department had no pressing issues for the senate to consider.
 4. Honors Council (Kathleen Brunke): The honors council is reviewing the honors program and comparing our program to what other schools are doing. Discussion occurred on developing an honor's house, a required paper or research project, required study abroad, and a better designed webpage. Students have suggested having a town meeting to discuss changes to the program and have suggested ways to improve the webpage.
- C. Sabbatical Subcommittee Report (Eric Duskin): Filetti/Guajardo move that the Senate go into closed session. vote: unanimous. The senate went into closed session at 5:01 PM in order to discuss this year's sabbatical applications. The senate came out of closed session at 5:18. Redick/Filetti move to recommend the sabbatical applications to the Provost. vote in

favor: unanimous.

There was discussion about why only 2 sabbatical applications were received, which could undermine the argument that funding faculty research is important. One suggestion for why more faculty did not apply was that, with the switch to the 4-3 load, faculty might have been worried that sabbaticals would not be funded.

- D. ΦBK Report (Nicole Guajardo): Nicole Guajardo, Chair of the Phi Beta Kappa Initiative Committee, has been working this fall to identify departments and faculty included in the calculation of the faculty base. This base will be used to determine whether 10% of the faculty is affiliated with Phi Beta Kappa. A second goal has been to gather the information for an application for a chapter to determine CNU's relative strengths and weaknesses. This information will be gathered by January 31. [Here](#) is a timeline of steps toward establishing a Phi Beta Kappa chapter on campus.
- E. Campus Safety and Security Committee (Carlson and Brunke): Senators Brunke and Carlson have attended two meetings of the University Safety and Security Committee. They reported that the work group is currently focused on the installation and testing of a university siren/public announcement warning system that can be activated if a crisis - life threatening - situation exists on the CNU campus. The siren and PA system were both successfully tested on Thursday, December 6. The test consisted of a 'test' message ('This is a test'), followed by a siren signal, and finished with another 'test' message. University Police report that respondents have confirmed hearing the entire audible test across the CNU campus, as well as in locations within a mile radius of the University. Audible tests will occur once a semester.

The committee will now work on expansion of the system so the administration is assured that emergency notifications can be heard in all academic buildings and student dormitories. It may be possible to piggyback onto the fire alarm systems and emergency police notification systems throughout the campus.

Finally, the committee will be developing procedures for faculty and students to follow if a class is in session and the emergency alarm is activated.

- F. Faculty Development Grants (Gary Whiting): Final Report received from George Zestos. Thank you to all faculty who have sent final faculty development grant reports to the senate.

VI. Old business

- A. [Revised Pass Fail Option](#) recommendation from Undergraduate Degrees Committee motion to approve. Discussion: The Pass/Fail in the current catalog is not as clear as it should be. This wording is suggested to clarify when Pass/Fail can be taken. It also allows juniors or seniors (instead of just seniors in the current catalog) to take a course pass/fail, and increases the total number of pass/fail credits from 6 to 12 (though because the liberal learning core, major courses, and courses taken in freshman and sophomores years are excluded, it is rare that a student takes many courses pass/fail).

Filetti/Duskin move to approve as written. Vote in Favor: French, Filetti, Lambert, Brunke, Zhang, Guajardo, Marshall, Duskin, Rahim, Jordan, Redick. Opposed: Carlson. Abstain: Hasbrouck. Motion Passes.

VII. New business

- A. Discussion of Provost's suggested [faculty evaluation schedule](#). This item was considered out of order, before the president's report.

Discussion was split into five topics: the switch to tenure-track faculty being evaluated in years 2-4-6 and not every year, the order of consideration (new suggested order: DRC, FRC, Dean, Provost), peer group selection process, the makeup of the FRC, and the merging of tenure and promotion into one. The Provost answered questions about each of these.

1. Switch to 2-4-6:

- Question: When a new faculty member performs extremely poorly, that faculty member would be here for three years. How should that be handled? Answer: An extremely ineffective faculty member should be handled as an exception, with the administration using a different process rather than the normal evaluation process.
- Question: Will this change what candidates submit? Answer: The dossier, and what it should contain, is being examined by the Senate Faculty Evaluation Subcommittee chaired by Bob Hasbrouck. Changes to the dossier are not part of this proposal.

- Question: Many faculty are concerned about not having enough feedback and formative evaluation before tenure: Answer: The annual Eval-AR, (to be implemented) faculty mentor program, and chair feedback should provide ample feedback when implemented appropriately. Possibly, former FRC/DRC members could be available to junior faculty to demystify the process.

2. Order of groups evaluating candidate:

- Question: This year, because of the FRC's increasing workload, the FRC focused on all promotion and tenure reviews and all areas where the peer group and Dean disagreed. If the Dean reviews candidates after the FRC, then the FRC will need to scrutinize every dossier which will increase their workload considerably. How will that be handled? Answer: The FRC should look at all reviews. There does not need to be a massive process of what a professor is because the Eval-4 has established that; the FRC instead should focus on whether a faculty member is doing enough in the three areas: teaching, research and service. To accommodate the extra work load, the size of the FRC may need to increase, or there may need to be incentives for serving on the FRC (e.g., service on the FRC might be an automatic "outstanding" in Service on the Eval-AR).
- Question: Maybe the Provost and Dean should be combined? That would be consistent with the Provost's original version. One advantage of combining the Dean and Provost would be that the FRC could have more time. If there is a Dean separate from the Provost, the candidate must be given time to respond to each level up to the Provost which would take even more time. Another advantage of combining the Dean/Provost statement is that the FRC statement would then go directly to the Provost. Answer: The FRC will need 6 weeks, and the candidate must have time to respond to every level up to the Provost. The goal is to be efficient and effective. Letters to candidates go out at end of January now. We need to decide when faculty need their letters, then work back from there to determine how much time each part of the process should have.
- Comment: The Dean and Provost make formative statements which are extremely helpful for candidate coming up for tenure.

Having statements from both is important.

- Comment: The Dean should have a separate review before the FRC. Moving the Dean to issue a single statement with the Provost would diminish the impact of the Dean.

3. FRC selection process: Currently, the FRC is 1/2 appointed, 1/2 elected. The new plan will have 8 elected members from the different academic areas, and 1 at large faculty member appointed by the Provost (to add another perspective, and to create a balanced and fair environment). Note: In the attached document, all members of the FRC would be elected. This change was adopted by the Provost based on faculty suggestions.

- Question: How would the chair of the FRC be determined (by appointment or election)? Answer: The document does not specify how.

4. Peer Group Selection process:

- Question: Could untenured faculty observe? Answer: no. Untenured faculty will no longer be part of the faculty evaluation process regardless of whether this plan is adopted. The Provost that untenured faculty evaluating untenured faculty is a conflict of interest, He also feels that these committees are conducting serious business, and that is it not appropriate to have untenured faculty "trying out" the process at the expense of a candidacy.
- Question: How will departments with not enough tenured faculty be handled? Answer: Tenured people from associated departments would be brought in. The candidate would submit a list. The chair of the department will still be on DRC.
- Question: When will this start? Answer: It would start Fall 2008 with no grandfather clause.
- Question: Will it still be possible to have minority reports? Answer: The output of the DRC should be a statement, but not individual signatures. The process should allow, but not require a minority report. There are times when a reviewer disagrees with whether a candidate has met the appropriate standards; the reviewer should not have to write a report just because the reviewer disagrees with the majority decision.
- Question: Can a candidate choose their dept committee members? Answer: That will be up to departments. Tenured department members should be able to disqualify themselves

without any reason.

- Question: Should probationary faculty serve on hiring committees? Answer: yes.

5. Merging of tenure and promotion process: There was a feeling that there was support this change.

The faculty evaluation schedule change will be discussed on Jan 25 again. The faculty senate will vote then. The Provost left at 4:30. The agenda proceeded to the president's report when discussion was complete. All other agenda items were considered in order.

- B. [Handbook Changes](#). Discussion: Brunke/Guajardo move to go to the committee of the whole. Minor changes are made. At 6:00, the senate comes out of the committee as a whole. Brunke/Guajardo motion to approve the suggested handbook changes. vote in favor: unanimous. motion passes.
- C. Curriculum: French and Filetti recommend approval on Busn302 [submission](#) as a new course in the AoI Formal and Informal Reasoning Redick/Duskin move to approve. vote in favor: unanimous.
- D. Development of procedures for handling disruptive conduct in a classroom. As the president's report mentions, President Whiting is working with Kevin Hughes on this.

VIII. Other

- A. [Emeritus Resolution](#) for F. Samuel Bauer. Marshall/Guajardo move to approve this resolution. vote in favor: unanimous

President Whiting adjourned the meeting at 6:23.

submitted by Lynn Lambert, secretary of the Faculty Senate