



CHRISTOPHER
NEWPORT
COLLEGE

February 7

#4 of 1986

THE CHRONICLE

1985-86 Academic Year

Monday

February 10

Tuesday

February 11

Men's Basketball - (away) - 7:30 pm - N.C. Wesleyan College

Women's Basketball - (away) - 5:30 pm - " " "

Wednesday

February 12

Thursday

February 13

Friday

February 14

FACULTY MEETING - A105 - 3:30 pm

School of SS&PS - 2:00 pm - W209

Cider Sale - Campus Center - 8:30-1:00 pm

Admin. Bldg. - 8:30-1:00 pm

Saturday

February 15

Men's Basketball (away) - 7:30pm
Virginia Wesleyan College

Women's Basketball (away) -
5:30 pm - Va. Wesleyan College

Sunday

February 16

Men's Basketball - (home) -
2:00 pm

Glenn Winters, Pianist -
Recital, 4:00 pm. - CC
Theatre

OFFICIAL ANNOUNCEMENTS

Agenda for the fifth Meeting of the Instructional Faculty, 1985-1986, 3:30 p.m., February 14, 1986 in A105.

- I. Approval of the minutes of the meetings of 12/6/85 and 1/17/86 (p. 4)
- II. Remarks by President Anderson.
- III. Committee Reports:
 - A. Academic Status Committee..... Dr. Weiss
 - B. Admissions Committee..... Dr. Mollick
 - C. Curriculum Committee..... Dr. Park
 - D. Degrees Committee..... Dr. Hornback
 - E. Faculty Advisory Committee..... Dr. Gordon
 - F. Nominations Committee..... Dr. Gailey
- IV. Report of the SACS Self-Study Director..... Ms. Royall
- V. Consideration of two recommendations from the Curriculum Committee (p. 7) :..... Dr. Park
- VI. Consideration of recommendations from the Subcommittee on Commemoratives and Publications of the Twenty-Fifth Anniversary Steering Committee (p. 8) that the Instructional Faculty endorse the adoption of
 - A. "At the held of the future," and
 - B. "We Will Cherish Christopher Newport" as the official College Motto and College Song, respectively. Dr. R. Hubbard
- VII. Consideration of a recommendation from the Faculty Advisory Committee that the FAC be empowered by the Instructional Faculty to advise the President on matters regarding personnel in the event of a declaration of financial exigency. Dr. Gordon
- VIII. Announcements.
- IX. Adjournment.

PLEASE NOTE THAT THIS MEETING WILL BEGIN AT 3:30 P.M. -- NOT AT 3:00 P.M. AS WAS PREVIOUSLY ANNOUNCED.

-- Vice President for Academic Affairs

* * * * *

Faculty Salaries

In the Chronicle of October 4, 1985, I included the following message under the same heading shown above:

Last August at our first faculty meeting I discussed with the Instructional Faculty my intention to reexamine the methodology used in determining that component of annual salary offers which is directly performance based. Presently, this component is directed toward "rewarding exceptional service" (RES); and each spring each dean nominates, according to processes and criteria appropriate to his own school, a number of RES recipients not exceeding ten percent of the School's salaried faculty. Each such nominee then receives a salary offer for the following academic year that is \$500 to \$1000 greater than would otherwise have been the case. Consequently, the number of persons affected is few, the number of dollars involved is (relatively) small, and the process of selection is not tied directly to the formal and collegial faculty evaluation process.

I believe there is general agreement that, overall, our salary system is working well: that it is not only both realistic and fair, but also widely

perceived as being such. The RES component, however, has been a continuing source of concern; and that concern seems to me to be directly related to each of the three factors mentioned at the close of the above paragraph. As I mentioned at the August faculty meeting, it is therefore deserving of study, and, depending upon the outcome of that study, perhaps deserving of change.

To this end I have met with the Faculty Review Committee (FRC) and asked that it conduct such a study this fall. That work is to culminate prior to January 1, 1986, in recommendations from FRC to this office as to how our present methodology might be altered so as to increase the number of affected individuals, increase the proportion of incremental dollars involved, and tie the process directly to our formal and collegial system of faculty evaluation.

The FRC will no doubt be calling on many of you for counsel and assistance as its work progresses, and I ask that you be as helpful as possible when such a call comes. After I have received the FRC's final report I will publish it in this Chronicle and invite comment prior to effecting any changes in the present system.

Finally, there will be no change of this kind in the present system this year. Salary offers for 86-87 will be determined next spring in the same fashion as they have in the past two years. Changes, if any, will be implemented in Spring '87 and their first impact will be on salary offers for 87-88.

I appreciate very much your assistance and cooperation as this process unfolds.

I have now received the report that FRC has produced in response to the request cited in paragraph three above. It is reproduced in the "Committee Information and Faculty Business" section of this Chronicle. I ask that each member of the Faculty read it with appropriate care. I ask further that those who wish to comment upon its substance send me such comments prior to March 1, 1986.

In your consideration of this matter, please be mindful of the fact that in all of this the objective of any methodology must be to improve the process of determining salary offers. As such, it is necessary for us to maintain consistency with the general governing policy on such matters (Handbook, p. VII-49), which is quoted below for your reference:

The amount of contractual salary to be offered each Instructional faculty appointee for each academic year is determined annually by the VPAA on the recommendation of the appropriate school dean. Such amount is to be consistent with relevant considerations of rank, seniority, educational achievements, market forces and quality of service. (Regarding quality of service, the dean is guided in his recommendations by the results of applicable recent evaluations.) All final determinations of contractual salary are subject to negotiation between the individual employee and the VPAA (representing the College).

Thank you for your assistance in this matter.

-- Vice President for Academic Affairs
* * * * *

Board of Visitors

At the January 29, 1986, Meeting of the Board of Visitors, the following resolution was passed: Resolution 1. Personnel Performance Evaluation.

The next regular session of the Board will be held on Wednesday, March 26, 1986.

-- Joanne Landis, Board Liaison

NEWS & GENERAL INFORMATION

Library Acquisitions

A list of recent library acquisitions has been compiled, and is available at the circulation desk for your use and perusal. The list does not include gift books or titles purchased on the approval plan.

We will be updating the list on a monthly basis during the spring semester. Please let me know if you find the list helpful.

-- Jennilou Grotevant, Technical Services
Librarian

Wendell Barbour, Library Director

* * * * *

Cider Sale

The American Marketing Association will be holding another Hot Apple Cider Sale on February 14th 1986. They will have a table set up in the Campus Center from 8:30-1:00 pm. During this time, the AMA will come to the Administration Building to sell cider to the faculty and staff. Price for the cider will be 50¢ a glass. Cookies will also be available, 3 for 25¢, or both for 65¢.

-- Lisa Hassenger - President AMA

* * * * *

Faculty Recital

Glenn Winters, pianist, will present a faculty recital in the Campus Center Theatre on Sunday, February 16, at 4:00 p.m. This is his final recital in preparation for the completion of his doctorate which he will receive from Northwestern University in June. The performance is free and open to the public.

-- Cayce Benton, Voice Instructor

* * * * *

National Faculty Exchange

This is an early reminder to begin considering the possibilities for participating in the National Faculty Exchange Program for 1987-88. (The deadline is November 15, 1986.) A review of Exchange Opportunities for the current year can alert the prospective participant of the kinds of opportunities that could be available in 1987-88. I also have copies of a brochure, describing the overall programs. You may wish to drop by to receive a copy, or call me at 7392 and I will send you one.

-- Dennis Ridley, Asst., VPAA

* * * * *

Video-Taped Showing

Interested Faculty are invited to attend a video-taped showing of Aeschylus's Agamemnon in the library on Thursday, February 12, at either 9:30-11 or at 7-8:30.

-- Douglas Gordon

* * * * *

Faculty Development Grants

Faculty Development Grant applications are due in the Deans' offices on February 26. Grant forms are available from the VPAA's office.

Release-time grants for the Fall 1986 Semester are due on March 14th. Applicants should fill out a Faculty Development Grant form and include additional information required by release-time grant applicants. Both forms are available from the VPAA's office.

-- Douglas Gordon, Chairman, FAC

FACULTY/STAFF/STUDENT NEWS

"In Memory Of," a short story by Jane L. Hoppen, who is majoring in English at CNC, appears in the Winter 1985 issue of Western Humanities Review, published by the University of Utah.

COMMITTEE INFORMATION & FACULTY BUSINESS

Minutes of the CNC Faculty Meeting of December 6, 1985

The meeting was called to order at 3 p.m. by Dr. Summerville, the presiding officer.

- I. The minutes of the November 15 and November 22, 1985, CNC Faculty meetings were approved, as recorded in the Chronicle (#36 of 1985, pp. 5-7).
- II. Committee Reports:
 - A. Academic Status Committee---No Report
 - B. Admissions Committee-----No Report
 - C. Curriculum Committee-----No Report
 - D. Degrees Committee

Dr. Hornback referred faculty to the Chronicle (#36 of November 29, 1985, p. 7) for the actions taken by the Degrees Committee.
 - E. Faculty Advisory Committee--No Report
 - F. Nominations Committee-----No Report
- III. Ms. Royall informed the faculty that a meeting was held to discuss CNC's Institutional Self-Study. Attending were the College's President, Rector, Vice Rector, and Director and Assistant Director of CNC's Self-Study Project. A report on the meeting will appear in a subsequent Chronicle.
- IV. The faculty approved the recommendations of the Degrees Committee on five student petitions (as reported in the Chronicle #36 of November 29, 1985). Dr. Hornback moved that a statement (as recorded on P. 7 of the Chronicle #36 of November 29, 1985) should be added to P. 41 of the 1985-86 catalogue. Dr. Paul moved to amend the first sentence of the statement to read: "These general requirements include all distribution requirements." Dr. Paul's amendment was passed. Dr. Hornback's motion was passed as amended.
- V. The faculty approved the candidates for graduation (as recorded in the Chronicle #36 of November 29, 1985) in January, 1986, subject to the successful completion by each of all applicable degree requirements.
- VI. Dr. Summerville wished everyone a happy holiday season.
- VII. Meeting was adjourned at 3:20 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Meritt W. Stark, Jr.
Secretary to the Faculty

* * * * *

Minutes of the CNC Faculty Meeting of January 17, 1986

The meeting was called to order at 12:03 p.m. by Dr. Summerville, the presiding officer.

President Anderson, Vice Presidents Eagle and Summerville briefed the faculty on the College's response to the Governor's budget proposal before the Virginia Legislature. President Anderson will keep the faculty informed of new developments by conveying information to the Faculty Advisory Committee and by utilizing the Chronicle. He also mentioned that he will be seeking the advice and involvement of the faculty in promoting the best interests of the College and community.

The meeting adjourned at 1:20 p.m.

Meritt W. Stark, Jr., Sec. to Faculty

* * * * *

FRC Report on Merit Pay

The FRC, in considering how to revise the structure and procedures for awarding merit pay, has spent considerable time discussing the strengths and weaknesses of the current evaluation system used to make all personnel decisions. We believe that the evaluation system can be strengthened and would like to recommend the following changes.

Perhaps the single most important weakness in the current evaluation process involves the

constitution of peer groups. It is our observation that in too many cases the current system allows and even encourages a politicization of the process whereby peer groups are selected. If a faculty member is liked or is in good standing with his or her department chairman and dean, the current process works to the advantage of the faculty member. If however, the faculty member is not popular or is disliked by his or her chairman and/or dean, the current process for selecting members of the peer group may work to the disadvantage of the faculty member. We feel that one possible reason why the narrative portions of the evaluation are so overwhelmingly positive may be result of the current process of selecting members of the peer group.

In order to strengthen the process and hopefully insure that the summary statements made by the peer group accurately reflect the evaluatee's strengths and weaknesses, we recommend that the current system for selecting members of the peer group be replaced by a single departmental personnel committee. We recommend that this committee be made up of all tenured faculty holding the rank of associate professor or higher. In the small number of departments where this body would number fewer than 3 individuals, the administration would assist the senior faculty of such departments in selecting appropriate faculty from outside the department who would sit on the department personnel committee. The department personnel committee would be responsible for selecting additional faculty from outside the department to assist them in making critical decisions regarding tenure, and promotion to associate or full professor rank. We recommend that the current policy governing the minimum number of faculty from outside the department for such critical decisions be maintained and followed.

The FRC discussed the situation of the assistant professor being considered for a critical decision who may be most deserving of positive consideration but who perceives that his case may be adversely affected by a professional or personal disagreement within his department. We believe that such an individual should have the right to obtain positive input from junior faculty from both within and without the department. Therefore we recommend that prior to a designated time (December 1st for spring evaluations) the department publish a list of the critical decisions (including merit) its personnel committee will be considering and invite signed written input, positive or negative from any member of the department not serving on the personnel committee. In light of the recommended reconstitution of peer groups the FRC reaffirms the right of every evaluatee to solicit written input from any faculty member not serving on the department personnel committee. But at the same time the department personnel committee may accept unsolicited but signed written input from all faculty not serving on the department personnel committee prior to the date the personnel committee would meet to formulate its recommendations.

The FRC believes that both the College and the evaluatee will be better served by this proposed change in the evaluation process. We expect the change to promote (1) greater uniformity of criteria and standards in making intra-departmental personnel decisions; (2) increased candor in the discussions leading to the department's recommendations as well as increased candor in the written summary statements; (3) increased faculty perceptions that the evaluation process is fair and based on the widest possible input of information; and (4) increased collegiality among department faculty who, for critical decisions and merit, would be better informed regarding the achievements of individual faculty.

The proposed change avoids the potential problems of making critical personnel decisions by all the members of the department while at the same time broadening the base of initial input. Specifically, the proposed change reduces the probability that department members will politicize the evaluation process, pit themselves against each other, or have clearly less qualified junior faculty exercising a disproportionate amount of influence.

This proposed change is the basis for the FRC's recommendation on modifying the structure, policy and procedures regarding merit pay. If the administration is unable to implement the proposed change as described above, the FRC would want to reconsider its recommendations regarding the changes in merit pay.

Merit Pay:

The FRC agrees that the current system for rewarding exceptional service can be improved and expanded in order to recognize the academic and professional achievements of a greater number of faculty. The changes we propose are predicated on the following observations and assumptions:

1. The current evaluation system should be strengthened by adopting the recommendation outlined above.
2. "Exceptional service" for merit pay should be defined as outstanding achievement and performance in the three areas currently included in the evaluation process (-1- teaching effectiveness; -2- service to the department, College, and community; and -3- professional development-scholarship). "Exceptional service should not be defined literally or narrowly to mean only high achievement in the area of service to the department, College or community.
3. Faculty members should have the option of self-nomination or nomination by any other member from the College community.
4. Merit awards should be made for one contract year and then removed from the faculty member's base salary.
5. The names of merit award recipients should be published annually and disseminated to the general faculty.
6. The percentage of salary dollars allotted to merit should remain constant at its current level until the new system has been tried and evaluated by all members of the faculty.

Proposed changes:

The faculty member's annual activity report will serve as the document by which the individual presents his or her case for receiving merit pay.

Prior to a specified date (Nov. 1st in the fall semester), any faculty member may nominate himself or any other faculty from within or outside his department.

Prior to a specified date (Dec. 1st in the fall semester), the department personnel committee would publish a list of those department members to be considered for merit.

The evaluatee would circulate his annual activities report, accompanied by an attachment indicating that he will be considered for a merit award, to each member of his department who does not sit on the department personnel committee. Each department member has the opportunity to submit to the personnel committee his or her signed comments regarding the worth of a particular faculty member's candidacy. The evaluatee also has the opportunity to solicit input from any departmental colleague regarding the merit of his candidacy.

At the time of the annual evaluation (January), the department personnel committee meets to consider the cases of individual faculty to be evaluated for merit. At this time the personnel committee may nominate a faculty member who has not nominated himself or been nominated by another faculty member.

In cases of critical decisions the department personnel committee will have both the dossier and the faculty member's annual activity report. In cases where a faculty member is not being evaluated for a critical decision, the department personnel committee would have his annual activities report. Because of the constitution of the department personnel committee, it would always have access to the evaluatee's department personnel file and dossier if it felt such materials were useful in making its recommendations.

The department personnel committee would be required to formulate its recommendations regarding all personnel decisions other than merit before reviewing those department members nominated for merit awards.

In considering merit, the department personnel committee would be required to rate the candidate in each of three areas: (1) teaching effectiveness; (2) service to the department, College and community; and (3) professional development-scholarship.

We recommend the following weights: teaching effectiveness - 55 percent; service - 10 percent; professional development-scholarship - 10 percent. The remaining 25 percent should be assigned at the discretion of the individual faculty member to categories 2 and 3. Allowing the faculty member the discretion over how much to weight categories 2 and 3 would promote a feeling of some control over how he or she will be evaluated and allow for the recognition of individual strengths in one of the two categories. Weighting categories 2 and 3 at a minimum of 10 percent each would insure that any reward for exceptional service was not solely based on high achievement in one of the two categories.

The department personnel committee would rate candidates for merit on a four point scale: We recommend the following definitions of scale points:

1. nonmeritorious in this category
2. meritorious achievement in this category
3. highly meritorious achievement in this category
4. exceptionally meritorious achievement in this category.

The personnel committee would be required to share its ratings with the evaluatee and the evaluatee would be required to indicate his or her agreement or disagreement. Both the evaluatee and members of the personnel committee would have the right to attach dissenting or minority statements to the merit rating form.

While the determination of merit necessitates rendering that portion of the annual evaluation in numerical form as well as in prose summary, we feel that the evaluation process should continue to emphasize feedback regarding how peers and administrators perceive the candidate's performance. This is one reason why we have recommended that the personnel committee's consideration of critical decisions other than merit be completed first before making recommendations regarding merit. The numbers used in determining merit should not be invested with more meaning or greater utility than that.

The merit pay rating form signed by the departmental committee would be attached to the evaluatee's annual activities report and then forwarded to the respective dean.

Each school dean would be responsible for reviewing the activities reports of all members of his school. He would have the opportunity to nominate additional faculty from his school who currently were not being considered for merit.

The dean would rate each candidate on the 4 point scale according to the weights determined by the faculty member. Relative to merit, the dean would be specifically responsible for determining that departments within his school formulated their recommendations fairly and uniformly.

The dean would then forward the evaluation materials to the Faculty Review Committee (FRC). After completing its recommendations regarding all other personnel decisions other than merit the FRC would review the materials, the department's and dean's ratings before formulating its own merit ratings in the 3 evaluation categories as weighted by the individual candidate. The FRC would be responsible for insuring that recommendations had been formulated fairly and uniformly by each of the school deans.

The FRC would then forward the materials and merit rating form containing the department's, school dean's and its own ratings to the Vice President for Academic Affairs. The VPAA would review the materials and supporting documents and make his recommendations regarding merit pay awards. The proposed rating system gives the VPAA the opportunity to award 1, 2, or 3 levels of merit. As in each previously described level of the proposed merit process, the VPAA would have the opportunity to nominate any faculty member currently not being considered for a merit award.

In preparing these recommended changes, the FRC assumes that the faculty is still in favor of the concept of merit pay. The FRC strongly recommends that any proposed changes in the merit pay system be brought before the faculty for approval before implementation.

Lee Doerries, Chairman, Faculty Review
Committee

* * * * *

Curriculum Committee

- A. The Curriculum Committee recommends that the faculty approve Theatre 210-211 as a course sequence meeting the "Global View" criteria.
- B. The Curriculum Committee recommends that the College continue to accept Phil 121, 122, 123 (from the Community Colleges) as transferring in as Phil 101 plus lower level elective, which would meet the Letters Degree Requirement but not 1/2 of the Humanities Requirement in the new curriculum.

-- Lee Olson, Chairman

* * * * *

Degrees Committee Report of February 5, 1986

The Committee met with H. Williams, R. Persky, J. Paul, R. Fellowes, and L. Hornback present.

The following student petitions were considered:

- Case 1: Student petitioned to be allowed to waive the natural science distribution for a major in Information Science, based upon information given by the adviser from an earlier catalog and worksheet and not the one the student re-entered the college under.
Committee recommends: Approval of the request based upon documentation received from the department concerned.
- Case 2: Student petitioned to be allowed to substitute 200-level Biology anatomy courses with labs for the Biology 101-102 sequence to satisfy the natural science distribution as a non-science major.
Committee recommends: Approval based upon documentation from departments concerned and the demonstrated success of the student to complete the courses.
- Case 3: Student petitioned to be allowed to waive the activities Leisure Studies requirement for medical reasons and present one non-activities leisure studies course instead.
Committee recommends: Approval under faculty guidelines and medical documentation on file.
- Case 4: Student petitioned to be allowed to present for the humanities distribution requirement English 201 and 207 (non-sequence) because of scheduling problems.
Committee recommends: Approval based upon the recommendation of the English Department and that the student will be leaving the area after May and also intends to graduate then.
- Case 5: Student petitioned to be allowed to waive the activities leisure studies requirements for medical reasons and present two studio art courses instead.
Committee recommends: Approval based upon faculty guidelines and medical documentation.
- Case 6: Student petitioned to be allowed to take the last 4 hours of degree requirements (in the distribution area) at the University of Connecticut for reasons of employment relocation.
Committee recommends: Approval based upon recommendation of department concerned.
- Case 7: Student petitions to be exempted from the 30 hour residency requirement as a classified student. The student initially transferred to CNC and has taken 39 hours as an unclassified student, and has since become classified. The student will complete 22 hours (8 short of residency) as a classified student.
Committee recommends: Approval based on the total number of CNC hours, 61, the student will be presenting.
- Case 8: Student petitioned to be allowed to present 3 of the last 30 hours in residence in transfer. The course is an elective.
Committee recommends: Approval based upon documentation on file.
- Case 9: Student petitioned to be allowed to take 8 hours of distribution requirement coursework (natural science) at ODU to complete degree requirements by May 1986 at CNC, because of work, travel and scheduling problems.
Committee recommends: Approval based upon Physics Department's recommendation and above problems.

The Committee denied one request and tabled two.

Respectively submitted by
Linda Hornback, Chairman

CORRESPONDENCE SUBMITTED FOR PUBLICATION

Agenda for Faculty Meeting

1. College motto chosen by balloting...
"At the helm of the future"
Faculty approval is solicited.

2. College song...
"We Will Cherish Christopher Newport"
Music by Glen Winters of the Music Faculty
Lyrics by Jay Paul of the English Department
Faculty approval is solicited.

Lyrics

We will cherish Christopher Newport...
Morning dew, wooded path and lawn;
Bright walks, friendly faces, talk and laughter;
Pines that tower to the evening sun.

Gathered in every season, welcome at any hour,
Laboring in the light you steady for us,
We know clearer ways to venture,
Quickened by you, CNC.

The music is being transposed for easier singing. Work will be completed soon. A tape will be prepared for the faculty meeting with Glen Winters at the piano and Cayce Benton singing.

-- Rita Hubbard, Chairman, Department of A&C
* * * * *

Pending Legislation

There are bills in the hopper of the General Assembly that will/may have significant impact on the operations of the College if they are inacted into law. Among others:

HB 97 Grayson-Require immunization and physicals for student admissions to four-year public colleges and universities. (Implication: considerable cost and effort to implement, possible enrollment effect negative).

HB 194 Cranwell-Extends to campus police the right to carry concealed weapons while off duty. (Implication: liability and institutional policy).

SB 114 Marye-Extends VSRS coverage to hourly employees with more than three years service (Implication: direct costs and costs of administration).

Senate Document #10. Reports DPT policy which, if promulgated, would require that hourly employees be limited to 1,000 annual work hours after the first year of continuous employment. (Implication: additional costs of administration and severe retention problem in hourly category.)

-- Vice President for Financial Affairs
* * * * *

To: Faculty and Staff
From: President Anderson
Subject: Budget Update

I presented testimony to the full House Appropriations Committee on January 30, 1986.

It was similar in nature to mine of January 20, to the subcommittee. Thereafter, legislative attention this week was directed to two major topics. The first, drunken driving penalties, has been well covered by the media. The second, revenue projection for the Commonwealth, is beginning to surface as the critical element against which budget amendments are matched. In addition the ripple effect of the federal Graham-Rudman-Hollings bill is also being assessed. As a firm figure is developed for the Governor, he will transmit it to both Houses as their maximum appropriations limit. Priorities will then be established within those limits. Lobbying will begin again in earnest. Your continued support is solicited.

-- J.E.A.