

**FACULTY SENATE***Minutes of Special FS Meeting, May 8, 2014*<http://www.southernct.edu/facultysenate/senateminutes/>

This is a Special meeting, the 14th meeting of 2013-2014 was called to order at 12:10 pm by President William Faraclas.

**Members Present/Absent** (Members absent are designated in **bold**)

<b>Emmanuel Emenyonu</b> (Accounting)	Ramon Vega de Jesus (Couns/Sch Psych)	<b>Luisa Piemontese</b> (WLL/Foreign Language)	<b>Mel Prince</b> (Marketing)	(Part-Time Faculty)	Heather Pizzanello (Social Work)
<b>Joseph Manzella</b> (Anthropology)	<b>Jim Fullmer</b> (Earth Science)	Lisa Vitale (World Literature Language)	Maria Diamantis (Mathematics)	David Pettigrew (Philosophy)	Stephen Monroe Tomczak (Social Work)
<b>Greg Cochenet</b> (Art)	<b>Sam Andoh</b> (Econ/Finance)	<b>Leon Yacher</b> (Geography)	John Scheuermann (Mathematics)	<b>Jim Dolan</b> (Physics)	<b>Jessica Kenty-Drane</b> (Sociology)
(Athletics)	<b>Beena Achhpal</b> (Education)	<b>Nikos Chrissidis</b> (History)	Wes O'Brien (Media Studies)	<b>Kevin Buterbaugh</b> (Political Science)	Patricia Major (Special Ed/Reading)
Jonathan Weinbaum (Biology)	<b>Peter Madonia</b> (Ed Leadership)	<b>Byron Nakamura</b> (History)	<b>Mark Kuss</b> (Music)	Gayle Bessenoff (Psychology)	<b>Ron Tamura</b> (Special Ed/Reading)
Adiel Coca (Chemistry)	Joel Dodson (English)	Jerry Dunklee (Journalism)	Chris Denhup (Nursing)	<b>Kevin Colwell</b> (Psychology)	<b>Larry Nye</b> (Theatre)
<b>Derek Taylor</b> (Communication)	Mike Shea (English)	<b>Elsie Okobi</b> (Library Science)	Lisa Rebeschi (Nursing)	William Faraclas (President)	<b>Susan Cusato</b> (Past President)
<b>Deborah Weiss</b> (Com Disorders)	Paul Petrie (English)	Rebecca Hedreen (Library Science)	(Part-Time Faculty)	Deb Flynn (Public Health)	Elizabeth Keenan (UCF)
Amal Abdel Raouf (Computer Science)	Matt Rothbard (Exercise Science)	Jeff Dickens (Library Services)	(Part-Time Faculty)	<b>Jan Jones</b> (Recreation/Leisure)	<b>Chris Petto</b> (Grad Council)
<b>Michelle Lawler</b> (Counseling)	Robert Gregory (Exercise Science)	<b>Rick Bassett</b> (Management)	(Part-Time Faculty)	Catherine Koehler (Science Ed/Env Stud)	<b>Mary Papazian</b> (SCSU President)
Guests: Many faculty members	Guest: Dean Breese	Guest: Brad Crerar			

Approval of Minutes: No minutes were approved since this is a Special Meeting to address P&T decisions that were over-turned by the Administration.

Due to the nature of this meeting, President Faraclas invited written and verbal statements from all faculty. The minutes reflect the comments/suggestions raised by the attendees either verbally

(thus, marked below with a V) or in written form (thus marked below with a W). The statements were recorded in that fashion to recognize all faculty who wished to express their views.

1. W: In my opinion, the current service component is given too much weight (4). Considering the education and training of our faculty, overstressing service underutilizes our resources. I summarized my suggestions below:
  - a. Some service duties should be re-evaluated to see if they need to be done by faculty.
  - b. Each school should hire more administrators so that faculty members can devote their time on more research, teaching and student advising. I would like to see administrators working at the school level rather than at the university level. For example, advisors and student success staff could be designated for each School.
  - c. I suggest that the "Creative Activity (research)" be weighted at least "6" instead of "5". I believe that a successful researcher can more effectively contribute to classroom teaching.
  - d. Considering the importance of advising to students at SCSU, I suggest that faculty's student advising be a component of "Teaching" instead of "Service".
2. V: Service needs to be examined carefully; we have Senior faculty members unloading work to some Junior members, this is not acceptable.
3. V: There seems to be a couple of issues now. We need to speak/address the issue of P&T at this time: the other is a bigger debate. The reversal is accepted but the original decision is more important and needs to be examined. Shared governance, and I need to stress this, needs to be first and just because there was a reversal we should not be complacent about it.
4. V: The "creative activity" issue needs to be examined closely; we should be focused on the administration but we also need to stay focused and continue to discuss it with the new provost that their actions were not acceptable. We need to be voiced and heard, that the expectations for creative activity for promotion have risen tremendously in the past few years and this time, many P&T members might be using different standards for creative activity. This concerns us, that they are placing higher levels than the contract and the Faculty Senate document. I even suggest that maybe using an external evaluation. Bottom line, I am very concerned with the creative activity definition/understanding at all levels.
5. V: We are guessing here why the President overturned the Provost's decision, they should be present to explain and discuss why she felt the need to overturn. We have played the guessing game for too long, maybe we can organize something with invitations for both President and Provost. And my second point, we don't have a specific definition of what creative activity is and it is hard for us to pinpoint and state what is sufficient, the margins of those guidelines are so flexible, and therefore, interpretations are very fluid. My suggestion: let's make them more transparent and put some minimal quantified requirements for creative activity and it might assist clearing this issue. Therefore, without minimum requirements we will not be able to overcome this confusion.

6. W: Could someone clarify the "disclaimers" now being part of the renewal letters: "Positive recommendation in early years are no guarantee of future success"? And furthermore, can someone explain the Dean's letters that call for external grant activity?
7. V: I agree for the need of transparency and understanding the process, between faculty and administration. What is more significant is that discussion is also includes all members making decisions, so, the members who see the files, need to be involved, including the deans, chairs, provost, president and all P&T members.
8. W: I am the kind of faculty that Southern wants to keep. I am fortunate to have a talent for most parts of a faculty member's job - teaching and research. I have consistently received excellent teaching evaluations from students and from faculty who have observed my teaching. Though still early in my career, I have racked up publications, secured spots in prestigious professional activities that directly benefit my role at Southern, and delivered papers at numerous national professional conferences. I am assured by my mentors within my department and outside of it, that I have a strong path to tenure and clearing that hurdle should not be a problem (thought who knows if such assurances are even worth anything anymore). Further, I am in a role that allows me to bring distinction to Southern in my area of scholarship and teaching.

One of the reasons I brought these talents to Southern was because of the strong sense of community I felt when interviewing and have subsequently experienced as a faculty member here. The metaphor of "family" is used not infrequently when faculty and staff speak of the culture here. Though not at all times comfortable with this metaphor, I've come to feel its worth and its truth; it describes a culture that sets Southern apart from the other academic environments in which I've worked.

However, the "family" of Southern would seem to be at war. The upper administration is wreaking havoc on all faculty in a desire to shift the institutional culture in an unclear and contradictory direction and junior faculty are the casualties of the conflict. This havoc concerns recent administrative actions regarding renewal, promotion, and tenure, which have and will disproportionately affect junior faculty, fostering a climate of fear and confusion. Consequently, in such a state of affairs, I am the kind of faculty member that Southern will not keep. In a few more years on the path I'm currently on, I will be a very strong candidate on the national job market in my field - stronger by far than I was in the national search that brought me to Southern. At present, I expect to spend the next few years using the resources at my disposal as a full time faculty member to polish my profile for that upcoming national job search.

9. V: A couple years ago, the nursing department developed guidelines in our department but suddenly we were told they are no longer accurate or used. Can we find out why?
10. V: Did the provost in those four denials stated that creative activity was insufficient? We always evaluate all areas carefully, what does the provost write and what is it?

11. W: The current status of P&T needs information to go to new faculty at Orientation. No guessing - even if the information is specific to each department. Transparency is crucial. Will the new provost change the current P&T status? How does the new provost feel about research and measuring research against other requirements? Recommendations: Make research requirements clear. Make service requirements clear. Example: is the university service more important than departmental service? Make it clear how much each group's input matters. Example: department chair, Dean, Faculty Senate, Provost, President, colleagues in the department. Maybe even % of each in the ultimate decision.
12. V: For many long time members, the P&T has always been in charge for our evaluations. We hope that our file is received well from colleagues at our department level and then the file goes to P&T from all schools. But at the end it is the faculty who evaluate faculty and it seems that administration doesn't follow that anymore; we are responsible for this process, and to change the process is not shared government.
13. V: I agree with the comments just made. And it bothers me that we had such great numbers of reversals and as I recall, in the past it only happened once. My personal experience, I received the faculty scholar award with 2-3 publications per year, but it would be misleading to hold new faculty to those standards. I was hired in 1987 without a PhD and received tenure without publications and my research started later after 2001 about 11 years from my PhD, so in those years, we were allowed to develop as researchers and allowed me to grow and to give me a commitment to stay here. So the comment from the Junior faculty talking about leaving, I feel that this institution, had a commitment and now, we will lose faculty with such commitment that we hired as we wanted them.
14. V: Transparency is important - it needs to be at the department level and above. I was very surprised knowing that now for tenure I have a different committee to evaluate me, than the renewal time. The department's objectives were denied as being so different; there needs to be some standards within the department and to be communicated to the other levels as the files move forward; we lose our own voice from the beginning of the process. Don't know what is the right answer, we need to communicate and the files will stand on their own merit.
15. V: One thing I have noticed—delayed tenure due to family and the "clock" needs to be changed if a faculty wishes to start a family. There has to be FMLA with extensions for such faculty.
16. V: As a Senior faculty member, I have seen that the faculty are raising the bar and I hear from us that our Administration is responding to this, but we have raised the bar. I was amazed on what I had seen, having served on the P&T, and now listening to some faculty suggesting that we can't do the research? I can see other who are doing it.
17. V: I agree the bar has been raised, but I don't think it can be raised when there is family needs (parents, children). When is AAUP entering negotiations? And maybe we can recommend such changes. I also know and I can't imagine that a faculty doesn't respond to student's emails. On an immediate timing, the expectations of communication on 24/7 with

emails, etc., is too much to negotiate with 5 hours of office "face to face" time, thus contractual needs... discussions are needed.

18. V: Clarification/info: last week at the leadership council meeting, with Interim Provost Kenned and the deans, there were 3 issues raised: 1. Try to streamline the amount of service that needs to be done; 2. Try to get more Senior faculty to do more heavy service so that Junior members can do what is needed with the spirit of shared governance; and 3. To reintroduce the notion of departmental guidelines in clear process which was not clear in the past. We need to know who will vet them, thus, start at department, vetted by chairs, deans, and then on to higher level; we tried but didn't work due to wrong process.
19. V: The contract itself gives us ONLY the bear structure as it governs all four universities instead of just SCSU, it should be the Faculty Senate documents that need to clarify this at each university level.
20. W: the Provost "deliberation" should involve a norm-based approach, as does P&T.
21. W: In ancient times, barbaric warrior-kings would order a general to publicly execute a group of captives in order to "send a message". Sometimes the king would pardon some of the captives in order to appear compassionate. The peasants would welcome or at least accept this action because they were already accustomed to blood sacrifices to appease the Gods. Eventually, we learned to deny power to those kings because they derive it from the consent of the governed.
22. V: I totally agree that the "departmental objectives", they were dropped because Selse left. It will make more sense if there exist reasonable expectations and yes, the bar has risen; but if Junior faculty know of the expectations, they will be ok. We need to keep in mind that according to the contract (shared governance is twisted), the faculty simple recommends, and provost makes the decision. Annual evaluations should assist in what goes on in the first years until tenure year. We need to have conversations to know what the expectations need to be, thus, make it more transparent.
23. V: I felt like the system we had did work so far and I am now confused. I feel it worked with shared governance, and while the provost can make a decision, it should be within the context of shared governance. This year there was clarity and while faculty was recommended all the way through and was renewed for the past 5 years, yet it didn't happen at the provost's level.
24. W: Currently there are no clear criteria for effective teaching other than the student opinion surveys. When other criteria are not articulated, it is easy to fall back on SOS as the "litmus test" for teaching effectiveness.

The current form of the SOS has not been tested for the main types of validity and reliability. As such it is patently unfair to use an untested measurement instrument to make personnel-related decisions about a faculty member. Using this untested form is unprofessional and hence in violation of the ethical principles of the AAUP. These principles

statement that assessment of a faculty member must be conducted in a professional manner. Moreover, there are many studies that have questioned the validity of student opinion surveys.

Whenever a DEC or P&T member judges creative activity of a faculty member as "enough", he/she must have a notion (a number?) of what constitutes "enough". Yet, we all refuse to articulate what is "enough?". It is unjust and unfair to those who are being judged to keep that notion of what is "enough" unarticulated. We would be in a better position to articulate specific standards because we can negotiate what the standards should be among ourselves and with the administration. Moreover, we can be in a better position to determine the precise resources we need to reach the standard.

To begin a discussion, I suggest 1 peer-reviewed publication or exposition once every rolling 5 years for tenure, and promotion from assistant to associate. The standard should rise to 2 peer-reviewed publications for promotion from associate to full. These standards assume that we keep the same teaching load, the same CSU research funding level, and no research release time.

The Senate should create a valid and reliable student opinion survey. This entails a literature review of student satisfaction surveys and teaching effectiveness, focus groups of students and faculty to determine their notion of teaching effectiveness, identification of instruments that can provide construct or concurrent validity, generation of items to be included in the survey, testing these items through surveys, statistical analysis, and so forth. If establishing validity and reliability in a professional way, seems too much effort, the Senate could decide to not use this form and leave it to the departments/faculty members to create their own forms. Another alternative is to keep using the form but not use it in the P&T process.

Start a discussion on the criteria for effective teaching. To begin the discussion: effective teaching occurs when:

- a. learning outcome (weight 5 out of 10): xx% of students can demonstrate (through test scores - C or higher) that 90% of learning objectives has been achieved. It best that individual faculty members determine the criteria of effectiveness because they set the learning objective of each course (determined by self-report and distribution of course grades).
- b. Process outcomes (weight 3 out of 10): Learning objectives and learning assessments and course assignments are clearly articulated (determined by level of detail of course syllabi). Teaching materials are up-to-date (evidence that the teaching materials have been updated each year; and that most assigned readings are not older than 3 years). Teaching methods are interactive (determined by observation). Teaching methods use technology (determined by description of course assignments). Teaching methods are innovative (determined by description of course assignments and how methods have improved learning).

Other Outcomes (weight 1 out of 10): mentoring (evidence of successful mentoring such as student presentation in conferences). Advising (evidenced by number of students advised).

Contribution to course development (evidenced by the number of courses developed or modified).

Student satisfaction (weight 1 out of 10): student perception that: a) they have learned a lot compared to the beginning of the semester. B) the course was of high standard. C) they have a lot more confidence in performing x skill now than they had in the beginning of the semester. D) they are better critical thinkers now than in the beginning of the semester (if critical thinking is a learning objective). E) Compared to the beginning of the semester, they have become better self-learners.

25. V: Normal standards are ok but then we get into a numbers' game, and then what are we judging? The standards of products or numbers, that becomes dangerous; evaluating creative activity is not a numbers game, we need to communicate the nature of the products we produce.
26. V: I am a Junior faculty member and I spend a lot of time out in the school districts and this should be an indicator of creative activity, not necessarily giving presentations, but have long standing relations with schools to help them improve their student's growth, with priorities. But how can this be included in the file (as I go out every week) and I feel this is very important work that we are asked to do.
27. V: The most important thing in our contract is teaching, teaching a 4-4 load. It is teaching in this contract and also due to lack of resources and external grants (which is not easy as some programs are not accredited internationally), that is why teaching is the most important and not other requirements.
28. V: I love this university and my department, proud to work in this department and collaborate with other departments. I also love research and would love to write and disseminate that work. I also haven't heard from my Junior colleagues that they hate research, but what I hear is that research and disseminating it, is time consuming and it can take up to 2 years to get published in some of our areas. I love teaching and I hear nothing other than that. If this is a teaching university and we are here for the students, to teach them, to advise them, to hear their concerns; teaching a 4-4 load and advising at the levels we do, leaves no time for research for examination of data and dissemination for publication. So, if standards are changing, then we need to reconsider the theme of our university: from teaching, changed to research.
29. W: it appears to me that the shift in standards for creative activity has taken place without regard for faculty input and joint governance. My decision to pursue a tenure-track position at SCSU was partially based on conversations with my future colleagues, chairperson, and dean regarding the nature of the position. It violates my sense of fair play and justice that the standards for promotion and tenure that were in place when I accepted a tenure-track position appear to have changed unilaterally. Expectations for creative activity appear to be VAGUE and INCONSISTENT, and I find this confusing and unsettling. I've never heard a clear, explicit statement on expectations for creative activity articulated by the Dean, the Provost, or President. I've received changing-and widely

disparate-guidance on expectations for creative activity from DEC members and my department chairperson. How can Junior faculty members be expected to make well informed, judicious decisions regarding creative activity when we are receiving highly inconsistent guidance? These issues have diminished the satisfaction and joy that I felt during my first two years as a faculty member in this community, and have eroded my confidence in the fairness and openness of our administration.

30. V: The discussion on 4-4 load and 3-3 credit loads. Our sister universities have changed by increasing the 3 credits to 4 credits, thus, do a 3-4 credit courses. The shift has been successful but it will be tremendous work to change and no one seems to have the resources to make this huge change.
31. V: I came from a school with 5-6 credit load. Over-turning the decision at the Provost, that is where the contract worked and probably it was not her gesture, but rather the contract working. The untenured faculty who are afraid to speak, that is not good. We at the sciences, we need lab equipment and we get equipment after year 3 and then we are expecting to publish asap, maybe one in 5 years. I got a muddy lab and then nothing else. What tier journals is the highest level? And the process has been changed in the past 3 years that I have been here. So maybe we should get "creative activity reassigned time" and not research reassigned time.
32. V: A reminder the scholarly publishing work is changing dramatically as we speak. Tier 1 and tier 2 journals are changing and this needs to be known, as major changes are on the way. Departmental guidelines are important.
33. V: During the summers I run a camp for youngsters and we should be discussing of what we do during the first 5 years. We should include these events during the renewal times not just at the P&T process. Maybe, the Renewal files could/should be read by the P&T members, thus, they are cognizant of what needs to be done/changed in the process towards the penultimate year. Thus, everyone has a voice through the process all along.
34. V: Maybe we should be looking of what is going on a global source. The university was closed to faculty and admin's from within. We didn't see outside at other institutions like us out there, similar to us in all areas; we need to see at those institutions that are similar and benchmark ourselves to them, we need to be up to standards and alike with them. This can create opportunities and it might points us to new directions, we have to look outside, not within. The world is changing, thus, so we should recognize that. The credit loads that are being discussed, hide details that are worst. Here I worry that we will have more service work if we download the teaching credit load.
35. V: I have taught 26 years at SCSU and we have been asking for clarity for years from administration and for 26 years things have not changed. I would agree to look outside and keep moving ahead. We need to sit down with deans, provost, presidents and we need to speak about having clarity, because the administration either follows what exists or make their own changes.



- 36.V: What we are running into now is the rubber-stamping all the way up. I was one who had a decision reversed and had to go through the process again. I asked an outside colleague to evaluate my file and he did. I learned more from that evaluation.
37. V: If we go up early and get denied? Do you look for another position? I am still confused about the process. What can I do in the next 4 months if I get a "do not recommend" at the end of 5<sup>th</sup> year?
- 38.V : We need some guidance ASAP - what do you need us to do? The new administration come to this university which has a history in service and shared governance and now recently they bring up research? There has been historical precedence, but it seems to be out of the window. Finally I am not sure what the administration is thinking, they go out to get new faculty, and give them 4-4 load and demand more research, we definitely need more guidance for our Junior faculty.
- 39.V: At my penultimate year for tenure, I got good advice from my colleagues, but again I put items that were not as helpful. I spent a lot of time as coordinator and spend lots of time for accreditation, but it wasn't recognized, so, we need to put things in the right place and we need to have our files represent all we do in every area. Encourage the Junior faculty to seek advice from others.
- 40.V: Yes, tell Junior faculty to go for tenure early. For the reason that in the past three years faculty got tenured in less than penultimate year.

President Faraclas thanked everyone for attending and for expressing their concerns. The last few weeks have been difficult weeks and this meeting displayed the need for clarity as the bars have risen and we need to do so with the right resources.

Motion to adjourn at 2:10 pm.

Respectfully submitted,

Maria Diamantis  
Faculty Senate Secretary