

Preliminary Minutes of the April 24, 2008 Meeting Cook Hall 107

Members Present: Anne Alexander, Suzanne Ament, Roann Barris, Richard Bay, danah bella (Deborah McLaughlin), Jolae Brocato, Jack Brockway, Gwen Brown, Paula Brush, Ginger Burggraf, Jack Call, Art Carter, Niels Christensen, Iain Clelland, Betty Dore, Bill Flora, Gerald Gordon, Melissa Grim, Judy Guinan, Lance Gutierrez, Kay Jordan, Jennifer Juul, Kim Kipling, Don Langrehr, James Lollar, Mike Montgomery, Teresa O'Bannon, Alexei Orlov, Tammy Robinson, Melinda Rose, Richard Roth, Wayne Saubert, Sid Smith, Angela Stanton, Skip Thompson, Isaac Van Patten, Craig Waggaman (Matt Franck), Clay Waite, Claire Waldron, Skip Watts, Erin Webster-Garrett, Joseph Wirgau, David Zuschin

Members Absent: Richard Bay (excused), Melinda Rose, Wally Scott, Ed Udd (excused)

I. Call to Order

Dr. Lollar called the meeting to order at 3:30.

II. Approval of Minutes ([04-17-08](#))

Minutes of the April 17, 2008 Faculty Senate meeting were approved.

III. Reports

a. Provost

Provost Stanton reported discussions from the BOV Academic Affairs meeting yesterday regarding the upcoming WTO, the PsyD and DPT programs, and progress on General Education. He reported that at the full meeting today the BOV approved all tenure recommendations, proposed changes in the Faculty Handbook and approved and modified the WTO eligibility period to 15 years service and 50 years of age. An announcement of the WTO will be posted next Monday. President Kyle reported that Radford University subject to SCHEV review is moving from level 1 to level 2 with regard to Procurement and Information Technology procedures. He reported that Radford University has received \$34.6 million for a new College of Business building, \$1.5 million for a planning and design study for an anticipated Science and Technology building, and \$90 million to double the size of the Bonnie, to build three residence halls, and to build a parking garage. He reported that the BOV extended President Kyle's contract for another five years. He reported that at the request of Nancy Agee he will prepare a report for the September 2008 BOV meeting regarding the need for Radford to continue the faculty tenure system.

b. Other

Dr. Lollar discussed the update he provided the BOV at today's meeting regarding workload, General Education, and Internal Governance.

IV. Committee Reports

a. Campus Environment

Dr. Burgraff distributed a summary of the 2007-2008 Faculty Satisfaction Survey.

b. Curriculum

None

c. Faculty Issues

None

d. Governance

None

e. Resource Allocation

None

V. Old Business

a. FSEC Motion: [VHEA Resolution](#)

The motion was discussed and passed.

b. Faculty Issues Motion: [Student Evaluations of Faculty](#)

The motion was discussed and passed.

c. Faculty Issues Motion: [Graduate Student Grievance Policy](#)

The motion was discussed and passed.

d. Curriculum Committee Motion: [Study Abroad](#)

The motion was discussed and passed.

VI. New Business

None

VII. Announcements

Dr. Lollar reported that Dr. Fess Green was seriously injured in an accident yesterday and asked that senators keep him in their thoughts.

VIII. Adjournment of 2007-08 Faculty Senate

The meeting was adjourned at 4:25 p.m.

IX. Call to Order for 2008-09 Faculty Senate

Dr. Lollar called the meeting to order at 4:30 p.m. New senators then introduced themselves.

X. Election of Officers

A. President

Dr. Steve Owen was elected President.

B. Vice President

Dr. Kay Jordan was elected Vice President.

C. Secretary

Dr. Sid Smith was elected Secretary.

D. At Large

Dr. Wayne Saubert was elected as an at large representative.

E. At Large

Dr. Angela Stanton was elected as an at large representative.

F. Parliamentarian

Dr. Jack Call was elected Parliamentarian.

XI. BOV Faculty Representative Nominees

Dr. Jack Call and Dr. Steve Owen were elected as the two nominees for the BOV Faculty Representative.

XII. Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned at 5:30.

Respectfully submitted

Skip Thompson

Secretary

**Radford University Faculty Senate
Meeting Minutes
September 11, 2008**

Members Present: Dr. Anne Alexander, Dr. Suzanne Ament, Dr. RoAnn Barris, Dr. Jack Brockway, Dr. Gwendolyn Brown, Dr. Paula Brush, Dr. Jack Call, Dr. Iain Clelland, Dr. Patricia Easterling Vaccare, Dr. I-Ping Fu, Dr. Gerald Gordon, Dr. Anthony Guest, Dr. Judith Guinan, Dr. D. Gumaer, Dr. Nozar Hashemzadeh, Dr. Katherine Hilden, Dr. Maung Htay, Dr. Kay K. Jordan, Dr. James Lollar, Dr. Deborah McLaughlin, Dr. Garth N. Montgomery, Dr. Michael Moore, Dr. James Newman, Dr. Stephen Owen, Dr. Tammy Robinson, Dr. Richard Roth, Dr. Wayne Saubert, Dr. Gary Schirr, Dr. Susan Schoppelrey, Dr. Reginald Shareef, Dr. B. Sidney Smith, Dr. Laura Spielman, Dr. Angela Stanton, Dr. Jenessa Steele, Dr. Sarah Strauss, Dr. Edward Carter Turner, Dr. Edward Udd, Dr. Claire Waldron, Dr. Chester Watts, Dr. Erin Webster Garrett, Dr. Joseph Wirgau, Dr. David Zuschin

Members Absent: Dr. William Flora

Guests Present: Dr. Wilbur Stanton, Dr. Dennie Templeton, Dr. Susan Van Patten

I. Call to Order and Approval of Minutes

1. Dr. Owen called the meeting to order at 3:30 pm.
2. The minutes of the April 24th meeting were approved.

II. Reports and Announcements

1. Dr. Owen welcomed the senate back and asked each senator to introduce him or herself. Subsequently he discussed our very busy upcoming schedule.
2. After emphasizing the importance of shared governance by reading the Radford University Internal Governance document's statements on shared governance, Dr. Owen introduced the primary matters before the senate this year.
 1. He noted two themes that he saw as important in our work this year. The first is communication. Because of a compressed schedule in the decisions we will be taking, it is especially important that senators keep their constituents well and regularly informed. Second, Dr. Owen noted that increased communication with and from the administration will be very important. As part of this emphasis, the Provost will attend every senate meeting, and his report will be published on the new senate website. Also, there will be a form on the senate web page that will permit senators and indeed all faculty to submit questions and comments that will be read by the senate executive council and also the Provost and other administrators as appropriate.

2. Dr. Owen also noted that this year most especially is an opportunity to create a very positive future for the university.
3. Dr. Owen reported that the Board of Visitors (BOV) meetings he attended were very productive, and he encouraged senators to go to the BOV web site to read about what the BOV and its subcommittees were doing. The highlights: we have four new deans, 34 new teaching and research faculty, and many other new members of the university. Radford's new doctoral program in psychology is underway, and two new doctoral programs, physical therapy and nursing practice will be ready soon. Deborah Templeton reported that Radford met its enrollment targets, and this and other information are available on the Radford Dashboard, linked from the RU Portal. Young Hall's renovation is starting to look very exciting, the Covington Center for the Performing Arts will have a grand opening in November, and planning is under way for the new business and science and technology buildings. The Student Affairs Committee reported that there is a new web site for RU Athletics, and the Radford Rugby Team is now a Division I sport. The Radford University Emergency Preparedness plan is in place. Radford has received substantial gifts: a \$750,000 gift from BB&T to fund programs in the moral foundations of capitalism, and \$500,000 from Medical Facilities of American to create an endowed chair for the doctor of physical therapy program. The challenge facing the BOV and all of us is the upcoming budget crunch. Also, Thomas Fraim was elected the new Rector of the BOV, Nancy Artis was elected the Vice Rector, and Wayne Saubert was named faculty representative to the board. Dr. Owen noted that in the spring the senate forwarded two names, Dr. Jack Call and Dr. Stephen Owen, to be faculty representatives, but the BOV asked for a third name during the summer. The executive council, acting on behalf of the senate, nominated Dr. Saubert.
4. Dr. Owen noted that he had distributed the new committee membership lists and objectives via email, and asked senators to note which committee they are on and whether they have the responsibility to call the first meeting. At the first meetings the committees should select a chair and a recorder and communicate that information to Dr. Owen. Dr. Owen asked that committees review their objectives. Additionally, he said the senate will be meeting weekly through the beginning of November, so committees won't have much time to do their work until after the middle of November. The executive council took this into account in the development of the objectives.
3. Provost Stanton made his report, the details of which are published on the faculty senate web site. The Provost emphasized his commitment to support key academic programs, particularly the new Core Curriculum, regardless of any budget reversion the Commonwealth may dictate to the university.
4. Dr. Dennie Templeton reported on the new Radford Emergency Preparedness Plan. An Office of Emergency Preparedness has been established at RU in the old visitor's center, and it has been very actively coordinating with agencies both on and off campus. Its website, to come online soon, will be have a wealth of information on emergency management at RU. Members of the campus community will see signs of

new technologies being put in place, including the ability to interrupt the students' cable television for emergency announcements, new sirens, new monitors in both academic and residence halls for the display of official information, and so on. Radford has been told that it must be in compliance with the federal National Information Management System (NIMS). On October 22nd a regional emergency preparedness exercise will be held in the Radford area, including on campus. This exercise will involve all on-campus resources and local and state law enforcement agencies will participate. Other agencies at the state and federal level may be observing. A detailed announcement will be distributed and made available on the senate web site. Many students will be participating as volunteers. Faculty are asked not to cancel classes that day, because this will adversely affect the validity of the exercise.

5. Dr. Smith gave a brief report on the new senate web site, outlining its features. The URL for the site is <http://senate.asp.radford.edu>. He noted that there is a bug in the technology used for the new site that causes it to not work correctly in the Safari browser, so Mac users will have to use Firefox instead to make use of the site. An effort will be made to remove this bug for the convenience of Safari users.
6. Dr. Stewart reported on the planned schedule of meetings to meet a November deadline to review and comment on the Core Curriculum proposal. Consequently senate meetings will be held weekly until then. Every other week the meeting will be an informal meeting for the purpose of conducting a forum on the elements of the Core Curriculum proposal. The details of this agenda are published on the senate web site.
7. Dr. Susan van Patten reported on the form of the Core Curriculum framework after work was conducted during the summer in concert with the academic departments, as directed by a motion of the faculty senate passed at the last spring meeting. Changes to the framework and characteristics include the removal of the college seminar, and the designation of the University Core A as a four-semester, multi-disciplinary sequence. The details of the presentation are published on the senate web site. Dr. Owen emphasized to senators that it is critical that they communicate the details to their constituents so that they can contribute to fulfilling the senate's charge to comment and review.

III. Old Business

1. None

IV. New Business

1. A motion from the executive council that the senate recommend the approval of the learning outcomes for the Core Curriculum was read by Dr. Jordan and tabled. This motion with the outcomes attached is on the faculty senate web site. Dr. Owen noted that the senate can recommend approval in whole, disapproval in whole, or approval with amendments.

2. A motion from the faculty senate executive council to amend the senate by-laws to ensure the timely adjournment of senate meetings was read by Dr. Jordan and tabled. This motion is published on the faculty senate web site.
3. A motion from the faculty senate executive council to amend the senate by-laws to ensure the timely publication of the agenda for each regular meeting of the faculty senate on the senate web site was read by Dr. Jordan and tabled. This motion is published on the faculty senate web site.

V. Announcements

1. All members of the faculty senate Resource Allocation Committee are asked to remain for a brief meeting of their committee after adjournment of the senate meeting.

VI. Adjournment

1. The meeting was adjourned at 5:05 pm.

**Radford University Faculty Senate
Meeting Minutes
September 25, 2008**

Members Present: Dr. Anne Alexander, Dr. Suzanne Ament, Dr. Roann Barris, Dr. Gwendolyn Brown, Dr. Paula Brush, Dr. Jack Call, Dr. Art Carter (sub for Dr. Jack Brockway), Dr. Iain Clelland, Dr. Patricia Easterling Vaccare, Dr. William Flora, Dr. I-Ping Fu, Dr. Gerald Gordon, Dr. Anthony Guest, Dr. Judith Guinan, Dr. D. Gumaer, Dr. Nozar Hashemzadeh, Dr. Katherine Hilden, Dr. Maung Htay, Dr. Kay K. Jordan, Dr. James Lollar, Dr. Deborah McLaughlin, Dr. Garth N. Montgomery, Dr. Michael Moore, Dr. James Newman, Dr. Stephen Owen, Dr. Tammy Robinson, Dr. Richard Roth, Dr. Wayne Saubert, Dr. Susan Schoppelrey, Dr. Reginald Shareef, Dr. B. Sidney Smith, Dr. Laura Spielman, Dr. Angela Stanton, Dr. Jenessa Steele, Dr. Sarah Strauss, Dr. Edward Carter Turner, Dr. Edward Uddn, Dr. Chester Watts, Dr. Erin Webster Garrett, Dr. Joseph Wirgau, Dr. David Zuschin

Members Absent: Dr. Gary Schirr, Dr. Claire Waldron (excused)

Guests Present: Dr. Wilbur Stanton, Dr. Susan Van Patten

I. Call to Order and Approval of Minutes

1. Dr. Owen called the meeting to order at 3:30 pm.
2. The minutes of the September 24th meeting were approved.

II. Reports and Announcements

1. Dr. Owen reported that Dennie Templeton has provided the RU Emergency Preparedness Plan to the senate and it will shortly be posted on the senate web page.
2. Dr. Smith reported that the comment and query form had been placed on the senate web site and was now available for all faculty to use.
3. Dr. Owen reiterated that he did not expect that committees would be meeting for non-essential business until after the GECAC proposals had been entirely dealt with. However, he does ask that all committees meet for the purpose of electing a chair and a recorder, and to inform him via email who these people are.
4. Dr. Joe Wirgau reported that the Resource Allocation Committee met, and owing to the urgency of the budget situation sent a list of four budgetary priorities to the Provost and Executive Council. The other committees reported that they had met or were about to meet for the purpose of selecting officers.
5. Dr. Owen reminded senators that the forum on Thursday Oct. 2nd would focus on the Core A proposal, as would the Oct. 16th forum. Debate would be held on Core A at the next regular meeting on Oct. 9th, which will be held in Waldron Hall, room 226. A vote is expected to be taken on Core A at the regular meeting on Oct 23rd.

6. The Provost's report will be posted on the senate web site. The sole item he wished to report on is the budget. He has distributed budget guidelines to the deans and subsequently met with them to talk about how to meet possible budget reversions in each of their colleges. The final budget plan will be submitted to the governor's office on the 26th of September. He and the President determined, with the consent of the cabinet, to avoid trying to pin down too many specifics in the budget. The Provost emphasized that it is a top priority to avoid harming teaching and instruction. Nonetheless, depending on what mandate the governor gives to reduce the higher education budget, it may become necessary to take a careful look at the frequency with which elective courses are offered, the use of adjuncts, reassigned time, and so on. The Provost pointed out that RU remains underfunded relative to its peer institutions in the state, and this gives us a talking point when it comes to protecting our budget in the assembly. Dr. Owen noted that the Resource Allocation Committee had set forth certain budget priorities, including faculty lines and accreditation. The Provost responded that some positions that were opened by the Workforce Transition Option may not be filled this year. The Core Curriculum must be funded, and some positions have already been advertised, specifically an English position and others for the Core A courses. Dr. Wrigau asked if the percentage of the reversion would apply to our whole budget, or just to the part the state gives us. The Provost responded that it applies only to the general fund, which is that portion provided by the state. This is about 55% of our budget. The President agrees with the Provost that Academic Affairs will take a smaller budgetary hit in this respect than the rest of the university's budget.
7. Dr. Susan van Patten reported for the General Education Curricular Advisory Committee (GECAC) on the open forum that took place the previous Thursday on the Core Curriculum Outcomes proposal. Much of the discussion focused on a concern that there was insufficient focus in the outcomes on critical reading and literacy. In response GECAC was prepared to offer a friendly amendment to put this emphasis more explicitly in the outcomes. Dr. van Patten also wanted to emphasize that the outcomes have to be assessable, and that this is a burden that any recommendation to amend the outcomes would have to meet to be accepted by GECAC.

III. Old Business

1. The Learning Outcomes Motion was taken up, and discussion ensued. Dr. Owen noted that motions to amend must be motions to include a recommendation with the senate's recommendation on GECAC's motion. Dr. Owen noted that motions to amend could be tabled, and the effect of this would be to table the entire motion.
 1. Members of GECAC then presented a motion to amend the outcomes to include new proposed language on critical reading. During discussion of this motion, Dr. Webster Garrett was asked to characterize the competing motion that the English department expected to offer. After further discussion the question was called, and the motion to amend offered by members of GECAC was carried by a voice vote.

2. Dr. Laura Spielman offered a motion on behalf of an informal social justice interest group comprised of faculty from many colleges to amend the outcomes motion to recommend new language in the areas of American issues and global issues (College Core A). The new language concerned student engagement with critical contemporary social issues. After reviewing the proposed language Dr. Spielman gave a brief background and rationale, and discussion ensued. Two primary concerns were raised. First, there was a concern that courses in such fields as history and religion that deal with historical issues would be unable to meet these outcomes. Secondly, the proposal included specific types of assessments that would place an onerous assessment burden on faculty teaching certain courses, particularly those with large sections. In particular, the proposals call for students to support their positions in a public or interactive forum, and it was not clear that this was a practical possibility. Dr. Spielman defended the proposals in light of these criticisms. A motion to table the motion to amend was defeated on a voice vote. After further discussion the question was called, and the motion to amend was defeated on a voice vote.
 3. Dr. Michael Moore of the Exercise, Sport, and Health Education department offered a motion to amend that called for the addition of new language to the health and wellness outcomes. After a brief discussion the motion to amend was carried on a voice vote.
 4. A motion to amend on behalf of members of the English department was introduced by Dr. Erin Webster Garrett. The substance of the motion was to recommend the inclusion of a new goal for the outcomes for University Core A that calls for specific outcomes in the areas of critical reading and critical literacy. Ensuing discussion raised several concerns. First, Dr. van Patten communicated the feeling of the majority of GECAC members that the new goal was supernumerary, and in particular was a greater structural change to the outcomes than is need for the desired effect. Several members endorsed the need for the outcomes highlighted by the proposed amendment, but many while endorsing these outcomes insisted that they were already clearly stated in the goals and outcomes for University Core A as presented by GECAC in their proposal, and were also addressed by the recommendation to amend brought forward by members of GECAC that was previously approved. The question was called, and the motion was defeated on a voice vote.
2. No additional motions to amend the main motion were offered, and discussion was opened on the main motion to recommend approval of the Core Curriculum Learning Outcomes. The question was immediately called, and the motion carried on a voice vote.
3. Without objections, the motions for new by-laws were left on the table for consideration at a future meeting.

IV. New Business

1. A motion from the executive council that the senate recommend the approval of the University Core A proposal for the Core Curriculum was read by Dr. Saubert and tabled. This motion is on the faculty senate web site under current → motions, and the University Core A proposal documents are on the senate web site under current → reports → General Education Committee. Ms. Candice Small was invited to present a Power Point on the University Core A proposal. Owing to the shortness of time, it was decided that Ms. Small will present this at the beginning of the forum on Oct. 2nd, and in the mean time it will be posted on the senate web site and can be found under current → reports → General Education Committee.

V. Announcements

1. All members of the faculty senate Campus Environment Committee were asked to remain for a brief meeting of their committee after adjournment of the senate meeting.

VI. Adjournment

1. The meeting was adjourned at 4:53 pm.

Radford University Faculty Senate
Meeting Minutes
October 9, 2008

Members Present: Dr. Anne Alexander, Dr. Suzanne Ament, Dr. Roann Barris, Dr. Jack Brockway, Dr. Gwendolyn Brown, Dr. Paula Brush, Dr. Jack Call, Dr. I-Ping Fu, Dr. Gerald Gordon, Dr. Anthony Guest, Dr. Judith Guinan, Dr. D. Gumaer, Dr. Nozar Hashemzadeh, Dr. Katherine Hilden, Dr. Maung Htay, Dr. Kay K. Jordan, Dr. Garth N. Montgomery, Dr. Michael Moore, Dr. James Newman, Dr. Stephen Owen, Dr. Tammy Robinson, Dr. Wayne Saubert, Dr. Gary Schirr, Dr. Reginald Shareef, Dr. Susan Schoppelrey, Dr. B. Sidney Smith, Dr. Laura Spielman, Dr. Angela Stanton, Dr. Jenessa Steele, Dr. Sarah Strauss, Dr. Edward Carter Turner, Dr. Edward Udd, Dr. Claire Waldron, Dr. Chester Watts, Dr. Erin Webster Garrett, Dr. David Zuschin

Members Absent: Dr. Iain Clelland, Dr. Patricia Easterling Vaccare, Dr. William Flora, Dr. James Lollar, Dr. Deborah McLaughlin, Dr. Richard Roth, Dr. Joseph Wirgau

Guests Present: Dr. Wilbur Stanton, Dr. Susan Van Patten, and members of the University Core A subcommittee.

I. Call to Order and Approval of Minutes

1. Dr. Owen called the meeting to order at 3:34 pm.
2. The minutes of the September 25th meeting were approved.

II. Reports and Announcements

1. Dr. Owen announced that the minutes from September 11th meeting were modified subsequent to approval to correct the spelling of the rector's name.
2. Dr. Owen reported that a few weeks ago he met with Matt Oyos and Bethany Bodo to get updates to revisions to the student evaluation instruments and process. There will be a new hardware/software system to record the evaluation results this fall. The entire process will be controlled by Ms. Bodo in the office of University Assessment. One result is that we should receive the results in a more timely manner. This fall the form will have the same content, but will look a little different. In the spring there will be recommendations to change the content of the questions, and the faculty senate will have the opportunity to review and comment. The new technology will also permit the linking of the written comments with the numerical responses. A senator noted that the new form doesn't include the numbers on the responses in addition to the descriptors. Dr. Owen said he would ask Ms. Bodo about that. Dr. Owen noted that the new hardware is very flexible and will permit a greater degree of customization by departments and even perhaps by individual professors. Another senator asked about what measures would be taken by Ms. Bodo's office to ensure confidentiality. The provost responded that the information would be compartmentalized the same way it is now, and that the information would not be available to anyone to whom it is not already available.

3. Dr. Owen noted that the Q and A page on the website has been getting many submissions, and that a great many new responses will be posted in the next day or so.
4. Dr. Owen reminded the senators that October 22 is the date of the regional emergency preparedness drill, and that the documents concerning the drill are available on the website.
5. Dr. Owen reminded the senators that the forum for the Univ. Core A courses will be in Bondurant auditorium on Thursday, Oct 16th. The materials will be posted on the website by Monday. Senators should print their own copy and come with their questions on Thursday. Also, the next regular faculty senate meeting on Oct. 23rd will be back in the combination room on the second floor of Hurlburt Hall. At that meeting we will vote on the Univ. Core A proposal. Dr. Owen would like to have any amendments to the proposal that senators expect to submit forwarded to him by 5pm on Monday the 20th so that he can prepare an agenda to ensure that we have an orderly meeting.
6. Dr. Smith noted that two documents have been added regarding the Base Budget Adequacy Metrics (Schedule M) under 'links → Commonwealth of Virginia'.
7. Dr. Saubert asked senators to remember to notify him as faculty representative to the Board of Visitors if there are any issues they would like to have brought up to the board.
8. The Provost reported on the budget reversion. He was happy to report that the reversion for this year would be 5%, and that Radford's reversion was the smallest among the higher education institutions in Virginia. There is no hiring freeze for higher education. There is some question about restrictions on travel that we hope to have answered soon. Academic Affairs will account for about a third of the budget reduction. Some programs, including instruction and teaching, are being protected from cuts. The Provost anticipates that we will have more budget reversions in future years, given the state of the economy. In response to questions, the Provost said that he did not anticipate cutting the adjunct budget, but that low enrollment courses may be offered less frequently. There should be no concern about faculty being targeted based on this reversion. There is no hiring freeze, but some open positions may be delayed. There will be additional hires authorized now that we know the size of the reversion. According to the State's numbers, we should be able to justify 423 faculty, and we currently have 400. This doesn't mean we'll have the money to hire all of them, but we can make a case that we ought to be able to increase our faculty. There is an expectation that the 2% pay raise will be delayed until July 2009. Whether there will be pay raises in the next few years is not known, but the legislature knows that Radford needs additional pay increases to meet our target pay rates in comparison to our peers. The salary increase in July will probably be across the board, rather than merit-based, since it is only 2%. With regard to the budget and the Core Curriculum, since there is no program yet recommended, no final decisions can now be made about its budget. However, there is planning. For example, some changes have already been made to the remodeling of Young Hall to ensure that it can

accommodate the new program. Finally, the Provost noted that Donna Van Cleave's last day is Oct. 10th, and encouraged any who had worked with her to share with her their appreciation for her service. Also, President Kyle is ready to meet with the senate as soon as it is convenient for the senate.

9. Senators reported on the concerns of their constituents about the University Core A proposal. Dr. Gwen Brown expressed the appreciation of the UCA subcommittee for the feedback they had already received from many senators and constituents. Dr. Webster Garrett reported that her constituents were concerned about implementation, and wished to know why a pilot program was not a possibility before resources were committed to the full implementation of the program. Dr. Owen pointed out that the Board of Visitor's time line did not allow for a pilot program. Dr. Waldron noted that when the idea of a pilot program was addressed with the BOV, the reaction was very negative. Dr. Rosemary Guruswamy noted that the question of implementation was not one that the UCA subcommittee was in a position to address, and that the administration would have to determine most implementation details. Dr. Sid Smith said that his constituents were also very concerned about resource allocation for the UCA, and in particular the second year courses, which with an enrollment cap of 25 will require more resources per credit-hour than the current system. Dr. Laura Spielman added that there is concern about the impact this may have on hires within the departments in the next several years. Dr. Owen suggested that we will probably not be in a position to get every implementation issue settled before we vote on Oct. 23rd. Dr. Susan Ament said that her constituents had some positive feedback, but that the UCA courses seemed to be taking too much time to do to little, and that the level of the coursework may be too low. Also, Dr. Ament said her faculty were concerned about being mandated to teach these courses, and wanted assurances they would not have to teach them. Dr. Udd remarked that we must as a faculty stay on top of the implementation process even after the Oct. 23rd vote, and that perhaps there should be a committee for doing so. Dr. Owen said that he would address that with Dr. Lerch, and that he thought it would continue to be the senate's role to review the implementation of the Core Curriculum. Dr. Waldron said it seemed sensible to her at this point that somebody should be doing some number crunching, at least as regards staffing requirements for the new program. Dr. Smith said that we can't make an informed decision until somebody does, and that in his view it was not an easy matter to address given how many variables are involved. Dr. Owen said he thought that there had been some preliminary modeling done, and he would check on it. Dr. Guruswamy emphasized that the UCA committee was told not to consider implementation issues. Dr. Anne Alexander said that her constituents were also concerned about the academic level of the courses, and that some of the content being discussed was the same as in the 8th grade Virginia Standard of Learning tests. She said that students need to understand that we expect college-level work. She said her constituents were also troubled by the use of a group grade. Dr. Gwen Brown responded that she understood those concerns, and that a great deal more information would be available when the course details were made available next week. She said that the courses would be increasingly more rigorous, and that college-level work would be expected. Also, the group grade is only for one part of the course, and not for the entire course. Additional discussion ensued regarding the resources needed

for the new program, and Dr. Saubert suggested that the Provost was the one to answer these questions. Dr. Webster Garrett asked if the senate could not recommend that given the difficulties involved in implementation, particularly as regards training of faculty, we endeavor to begin with a pilot program. Dr. Owen said he thought the UCA proposal had addressed faculty training as part of the program. Dr. Waldron reminded us of the likely reaction of the BOV to such a recommendation. Susan van Patten reported that the issue of a pilot program approach was discussed by GECAC, and that it seemed clear to them that attempting to pilot the program raises a whole new set of implementation issues. Moreover, if the new program is going to be a better education, why wouldn't we wish to implement it for all students? Dr. Kay K. Jordan pointed out that we were starting to debate a motion that hadn't been made, and suggested that if the English department wanted to present the motion next week they were free to do so. She also pointed out that the BOV is under no obligation to follow our recommendations; nothing the senate does is binding until the BOV acts on it. Dr. Udd said he thought paying attention to the training of faculty for the program is very important. Dr. Ament took issue with the suggestion that a pilot program would cause more problems or be unfair to students, since we have a gen-ed program in place that works. Dr. Smith reported the concern from several of his constituents that information technology literacy is not given sufficient attention in the proposal. Dr. Maung Htay seconded this point, saying that his ITEC constituents were very concerned that there seemed to be no substantive information technology training in the UCA proposal, and that in the view of his constituents this is very important for all our students. Dr. Sharon Hartline said that she had canvassed faculty regarding the example Dr. Smith had brought forward the previous Thursday regarding relational versus hierarchical databases, and very few of them were familiar with this distinction. These are people who are published so they are active in academic life. So are these matters really important? Dr. Smith said that this was important for many kinds of research, because knowledge was now being organized in new ways. Dr. Brown emphasized that we need to look closely at the detailed information regarding these courses that would be released next week, as many of these issues will be addressed already.

III. Old Business

1. Dr. Owen asked that we forgo old business because there would be a class coming in to use the room, and it was important to get the next Core Curriculum motion tabled. Consequently, the senate proceeded to new business. However, after the new business was finished, it became clear that we would not have to give up the room. Consequently, the senate moved to old business, and took up the motion for a new by-law for the timely adjournment of senate meetings. Dr. Owen opened the floor for discussion, and the question was immediately called. The motion was carried with one "no" vote. Pursuant to the new by-law, Dr. Owen called for a motion to extend the meeting but none was offered.

IV. New Business

1. A motion from the executive council that the senate recommend the approval of the proposed Core Curriculum Characteristics was read by Dr. Jordan and tabled. This

motion is on the faculty senate web site under current → motions, and the University Core A proposal documents are on the senate web site under current → reports → General Education Committee.

2. A motion from the executive council that the senate recommend the approval of the proposed Core Curriculum Courses was read by Dr. Jordan and tabled. This motion is on the faculty senate web site under current → motions, and the University Core A proposal documents are on the senate web site under current → reports → General Education Committee. Dr. Owen noted that there were two courses concerning which departments had written appeals, and that these petitions, GECAC's response, and a rejoinder were published under reports on the web site.

V. Announcements

1. none.

VI. Adjournment

1. The meeting was adjourned at 4:53 pm.

Radford University Faculty Senate
Meeting Minutes
October 23, 2008

Members Present: Dr. Anne Alexander, Dr. Suzanne Ament, Dr. Roann Barris, Dr. Jack Brockway, Dr. Gwendolyn Brown, Dr. Paula Brush, Dr. Jack Call, Dr. Iain Clelland, Dr. William Flora, Dr. I-Ping Fu, Dr. Gerald Gordon, Dr. Anthony Guest, Dr. Judith Guinan, Dr. Nozar Hashemzadeh, Dr. Katherine Hilden, Dr. Maung Htay, Dr. Kay K. Jordan, Dr. James Lollar, Dr. Deborah McLaughlin, Dr. Garth N. Montgomery, Dr. Michael Moore, Dr. James Newman, Dr. Stephen Owen, Dr. Tammy Robinson, Dr. Richard Roth, Dr. Wayne Saubert, Dr. Gary Schirr, Dr. Reginald Shareef, Dr. B. Sidney Smith, Dr. Laura Spielman, Dr. Angela Stanton, Dr. Jenessa Steele, Dr. Sarah Strauss, Dr. Edward Carter Turner, Dr. Edward Udd, Dr. Erin Webster Garrett, Dr. Joseph Wirgau

Members Absent: Dr. Patricia Easterling Vaccare, Dr. D. Gumaer, Dr. Susan Schoppelrey, Dr. Claire Waldron, Dr. Chester Watts, Dr. David Zuschin

Guests Present: Dr. Wilbur Stanton, Dr. Susan Van Patten, and members of the University Core A subcommittee.

I. Call to Order and Approval of Minutes

1. Dr. Owen called the meeting to order at 3:33 pm.
2. The minutes of the October 9th meeting were approved.

II. Reports and Announcements

1. Dr. Owen reviewed the agenda for the next several weeks regarding the timeline of motions and votes on the new Core Curriculum.
2. Dr. Owen reported that the October 31st GECAC deadline for course proposals related to the Core Curriculum is a “soft” deadline, i.e., represents a date by which they would like to see proposals, but they will also consider proposals submitted after that date. February 13th is the last date that course proposals can reach the Undergraduate Catalog and Curriculum Review Committee.
3. Dr. Owen reported that President Kyle has accepted the senate's invitation to attend a senate meeting, and will attend the November 20th meeting.
4. Dr. Owen reported that following up on discussion about the Student Evaluation forms at the previous meeting, he has spoken with Bethany Bodo and the numbers for the responses on the form which had been removed have now been restored.
5. The Provost asked if any senators had questions about the budget guidelines that had been given at the recent leadership meeting. He also indicated that he anticipates a new budget report from the governor's office on December 15th, and that indications now are that it may specify additional budget reversions. Dr. Ament inquired about

the ban on international travel, specifically why it would not be possible for a faculty member to apply their domestic travel allowance to international travel. Dr. Stanton replied that he had received similar questions from other faculty, and would bring that idea to the president. There being no further questions, the Provost announced that there would henceforth be an Opening Dinner every fall for all current and retired faculty, and that this year it would be held when the Dedmon Center reopens. He also announced a December reception for retiring faculty, with the exact date yet to be determined, and voiced his hope that all faculty would turn out to honor retirees. Finally, there is to be another short implementation of the Workforce Transition Opportunity (WTO) for two weeks, beginning either Friday or Monday. The Provost invited all faculty to provide feedback on the recent Emergency Preparedness drill.

III. Old Business

1. The motion for Recommendation of the University Core A proposal was taken up from the table. Dr. Sid Smith offered a motion to amend to specify that the enrollment caps for the second year CORE courses be set no lower than 35 students, in order to prevent other programs being deprived of faculty resources. The University Core A committee responded that the design of the courses made a lower cap necessary, and several senators voiced agreement. The Provost also spoke in favor of the lower cap. Dr. Smith responded that he understood that the course proposals would have to modified, but that the number of written and oral assessments would only have to be reduced by one-third under his motion, and that this seemed to him the same sort of compromise that other programs with much higher gen-ed enrollments have to make. The question was called, and the motion to amend was defeated. Discussion then ensued on the main motion. Clarifications were sought on the relationship of the framework proposal to the course proposals that will be forthcoming, and to the individualized courses in the second year that students will actually teach. A concern was expressed that the framework proposal was too prescriptive to permit the flexibility in implementation that had been promised. Dr. Gwen Brown pointed out that the University Core A (UCA) committee had sought to develop a framework that stuck to the topics and learning objectives that were specified in the framework that was approved in the spring for the UCA courses. Dr. Susan van Patten emphasized that the development of the full course proposals was yet to be completed. Dr. B. Sidney Smith raised a concern that the emphasis on writing in all four courses and the removal of information technology training represented a substantive change from the framework approved in the spring, and Dr. Maung Htay also voiced concerns over the loss of technology training. The UCA committee members responded that it was their conviction that the courses were greatly enhanced by including progressive writing, oral communication, and critical thinking skills across the four semesters, and that this left no room for technology. Dr. Susan van Patten suggested that new clarifications from SCHEV on the nature of technology education expectations had made it possible to change the outcomes on technology literacy while still meeting SCHEV's requirements. Dr. Kay K. Jordan pointed out that students' technology literacy is critical to their success after college. Dr. Hash Hashemzadeh raised a concern about whether certain departments would have "ownership" of the CORE courses, and members of the UCA committee replied

that it was the intent of their proposal that this not be the case. The question was called, and the main motion subsequently passed unanimously.

2. The motion for a new by-law for the timely publication of the faculty senate agenda was taken off the table. Faculty senate secretary Dr. Smith noted that he has been publishing the agenda in the manner specified in the motion, and asked whether anyone had experienced difficulty accessing it. A question was asked about the choice of 72 and 24 hours prior to the senate meeting as the publication window. Members of the faculty senate executive council responded that it was desired to provide time for late motions to reach the FSEC, to ensure that the agenda was published in time for senators to review prior to the meeting, but not bind future executive councils as to when they might meet. It was noted, in response to a question from Dr. Suzanne Ament, that once posted the agenda cannot be changed even by the executive council except by a motion and two-thirds vote in the senate. The question was called, and subsequently the motion was carried unanimously.

IV. New Business

1. none.

V. Announcements

1. none.

VI. Adjournment

1. The meeting was adjourned at 4:45 pm.

**Radford University Faculty Senate
Meeting Minutes
November 6, 2008**

Members Present: Dr. Anne Alexander, Dr. Suzanne Ament, Dr. Roann Barris, Dr. Jack Brockway, Dr. Gwendolyn Brown, Dr. Paula Brush, Dr. Jack Call, Mr. Timothy Channell, Dr. Iain Clelland, Dr. Patricia Easterling Vaccare, Dr. William Flora, Dr. I-Ping Fu, Dr. Gerald Gordon, Dr. D. Gumaer, Dr. Judith Guinan, Dr. Nozar Hashemzadeh, Dr. Katherine Hilden, Dr. Maung Htay, Dr. Kay K. Jordan, Dr. Deborah McLaughlin, Dr. Garth N. Montgomery, Dr. Michael Moore, Dr. James Newman, Dr. Stephen Owen, Dr. Tammy Robinson, Dr. Richard Roth, Dr. Wayne Saubert, Dr. Gary Schirr, Dr. Susan Schoppelrey, Dr. Reginald Shareef, Dr. B. Sidney Smith, Dr. Laura Spielman, Dr. Angela Stanton, Dr. Jenessa Steele, Dr. Sarah Strauss, Dr. Edward Carter Turner, Dr. Edward Udd, Dr. Claire Waldron, Dr. Erin Webster Garrett, Dr. Joseph Wirgau, Dr. David Zuschin

Members Absent: Dr. Anthony Guest, Dr. James Lollar, Dr. Chester Watts

Guests Present: Dr. Stephen Lerch, Dr. Susan Van Patten.

I. Call to Order and Approval of Minutes

1. Dr. Owen called the meeting to order at 3:35 pm.
2. The minutes of the October 23rd meeting were approved.

II. Reports and Announcements

1. Dr. Owen reported that he forwarded faculty feedback on the emergency preparedness exercise to Dr. Dennie Templeton, and that at the debrief held the previous week all of the issues raised by faculty were addressed. A written report will be released soon and posted on the emergency preparedness web site.
2. Dr. Owen reported that Dr. Matt Oyos has prepared a message concerning the new procedure for student evaluation of faculty. Dr. Owen will forward that information to faculty in the next several days to apprise faculty of the new changes to the system and process.
3. Dr. Owen reported that the Board of Visitors will meet next week. The Academic Affairs Committee of the BOV will meet on Nov. 12th at 3:30 pm in the board room on the third floor of Martin Hall. This is the committee where most of the work gets done with regard to academic affairs, and it is an open meeting and faculty are welcome to attend. On Nov. 13th at 9:00 am the full board will meet in the same location. This too is an open meeting. Dr. Owen encouraged senators particularly to attend, and noted that after the previous meetings President Kyle had encouraged faculty to attend.
4. Dr. Owen reported that President Kyle will join our next faculty senate meeting, and will be able to fill us in regarding many issues.

5. Dr. Lerch, standing in for the provost, reiterated the invitation to faculty to attend the board meetings. In response to a question from Dr. Wirgau, Dr. Lerch reported that he was not aware of a hiring freeze at this time, and that he was personally aware of active searches being conducted. In response to a question from Dr. Hashemzadeh, Dr. Lerch reported that no travel requests are currently being approved if the date of travel is more than 90 days in the future.

III. Special Orders

1. Dr. Owen asked Dr. Waldron to characterize the Centennial Advisory Committee. Dr. Waldron replied that this committee is not expected to meet frequently or be extremely time-consuming. The committee will be doing important work on advising the university on plans for the centennial. Dr. Owen opened the floor for nominations. Dr. Jack Brockway volunteered, nominations were closed, and he was elected by acclamation.

IV. Old Business

1. The motion for the recommendation of the Core Curriculum Characteristics was taken from the table, and motions to amend were offered and debated as follows:
 - a) Dr. Sid Smith offered an amendment from the Department of Mathematics and Statistics that the characteristics document be amended to include the addition of statistics among the disciplines included in College Core B but not in University Core B. He noted that there would be a companion amendment for the motion for the Core Curriculum courses to remove STAT 200 from the Mathematical Sciences box in University Core A but kept in the Mathematical Sciences/Natural Sciences box in College Core B. Dr. Van Patten spoke against the amendment on behalf of GECAC on the grounds that departments should have the option to let their students take statistics to satisfy their University Core B math requirement, and that removing statistics from that box would force some departments to include a required science as an add-on rather than satisfying it in the College Core B math/science box. Dr. Ed Udd spoke in opposition on the grounds that the math department should not be given a special opportunity to fine-tune the gen-ed curriculum, and that perhaps this issue could be addressed in the future. Dr. Hashemzadeh spoke against the amendment on the grounds that no single department should control a component of the Core Curriculum. Dr. Anne Alexander expressed a concern about math being included in the box for health and wellness, and it was explained that this was not what was being proposed. Dr. Smith said that the math department has considered the pedagogical issues regarding math in the core, and was unanimously in agreement that statistics did not provide essential tools that students need in general education. Dr. Judith Guinan spoke in favor of the motion on the grounds that students need basic arithmetic and algebra skills reinforced, and that we cannot afford to graduate students who have not had general math as part of their college curriculum. A friendly amendment was then offered to change the language of the amendment to read “with the addition of the areas of health and wellness and foreign languages, and the introduction to statistics course to the area of mathematical

sciences/natural sciences.” Dr. Smith agreed to this friendly amendment. Dr. Alexander expressed the concern, based on experience in her department, that adding the general math requirement would not actually help students with their math deficiencies. Dr. Kay K. Jordan spoke in favor, noting that her children’s professional success had turned out to be dependent on their math skills, and that if the math department believes that statistics is not sufficient then their judgment should be respected. Dr. Laura Spielman spoke on behalf of the math department, noting that the department was very pleased to teach statistics, and that the department was motivated by a concern that to not require general mathematics would adversely impact the students and our programs. Dr. Joe Wirgau expressed concern about violating the integrity of the framework for the sake of a single course. Dr. Michael Moore spoke on behalf of the department of exercise, sport, and health education against the amendment because it would result in an add-on for required science courses, and that this causes them greater difficulty in designing their program to meet accreditation and get students graduated in a reasonable time. Dr. Moore also expressed a concern that some of the gen-ed courses on offer by the math department were at a remedial level. He also noted that while the math requirement had been reduced in the new program, health and wellness requirements had also been greatly reduced. Dr. Smith replied that he had personally met with department chairs, and he and his colleagues are aware that the nursing school, the department of exercise, sport, and health education, and biology would be faced with an add-on for science if their motion is carried. On balance, considering the needs of the university as a whole, the department felt that a general mathematics requirement could not be sacrificed on the grounds that a small number of departments were having accreditation difficulties, and that the department would continue to work with affected departments to try to craft the best math program for their students possible. Dr. Alexander suggested that programs that were not happy with their students’ math preparation could require more math as an add-on, but other programs should not have to suffer for it. Dr. Guinan reiterated the importance of math training, and suggested that our academic standards, which this program has already addressed in the area of writing, must also be addressed in the area of quantitative literacy, for the sake at least of the university’s reputation. Dr. Jack Call moved to call the question. The motion to end debate was seconded and carried, and the motion to amend offered by the math department, with the addition of the friendly amendment regarding the wording, was subsequently carried on a voice vote.

Dr. Kay K. Jordan offered an amendment to the motion calling for a change in the language of Paragraph 6 of the Characteristics document to remove the requirement that courses be offered multiple times each year and be teachable by more than one faculty member, and instead require only that departments offer courses as often and in as many sections as student demand will fill, within the limits of available faculty resources. Dr. Van Patten spoke for GECAC in opposition to the amendment on the grounds that it would place too great a burden on GECAC in determining which courses should qualify to be in the core, and that GECAC believed that special topics courses did not belong in general education. Dr. Sid Smith responded that it seemed to him GECAC’s job to

determine whether any given course qualified to be in the core, and that diversity in subject matter was good not bad. Dr. Waldron spoke against the amendment on the grounds that it opened the door to a proliferation of inappropriate courses, and that a good course should make it on its own. Dr. Udd suggested that the amendment was logically inconsistent with the amendment that was just passed for statistics. Dr. Roann Barris spoke against the amendment on the grounds that the core should represent a common experience for students. Dr. Susan Schoppelray queried whether the University Core A courses already give an opportunity for instructors with special topics to craft one of the 200-level UNIV courses around them. Dr. Jack Call queried whether the foreign language department can meet the requirements of Paragraph 6 as currently written. Dr. Van Patten replied that the foreign language courses would be reviewed after a couple of years and those not meeting the requirement would be removed. Dr. Suzanne Ament spoke in favor of the amendment on the grounds that small departments with limited faculty might like to have a menu of courses that all meet the outcomes so they are not teaching the same course over and over. Dr. Smith emphasized that the amendment is very limited in its aims, and that its sponsors do not envision a plethora of special topics courses to come about as a consequence. In particular, the other paragraphs have requirements that core courses must continue to meet, and these requirements are sufficient to ensure that inappropriate courses don't get in. He offered the example of Math 132, an excellent gen-ed course taught in the Honors Academy, and which can only be taught by one person. Absent the amendment, this course would likely vanish. Dr. Jordan expressed concern that the arguments for many of the characteristics as written were based on abstract bureaucratic concerns rather than the needs of students and departments, and does not provide sufficient flexibility to department chairs. Dr. Udd noted that the purpose of gen-ed is to provide a common educational experience, and that we must keep gen-ed courses from proliferating. Mrs. Candice Small spoke against the amendment on the grounds that we were now choosing a core model in place of a general education model, and that it was more consistent with the new model to restrict the variety of courses in the core. Dr. Laura Spielman spoke in favor of the amendment, noting that the CORE 201 and 202 courses were designed to foster diversity of content, and that this was inconsistent with the objections that were being raised to this amendment. Dr. Lerch spoke against the amendment on the grounds that the amendment would make GECAC's job harder because it is too imprecise. Dr. Smith reiterated that the purpose of the amendment is not to support an explosion of courses in the core, and that it is greatly overstating the case to suggest that the amendment fundamentally changes the philosophical basis of the program. Mrs. Small noted that the UNIV 201 and 202 syllabi enforce a great deal of commonality. Dr. Waldron called the question. The motion to end debate was seconded and carried, and the amendment was subsequently voted down.

- b) Discussion returned to the main motion. The question was called, the motion to end debate was carried, and the main motion was then carried on a unanimous voice vote.

2. Pursuant to the senate by-laws, Dr. Owen noted that we would not be able to finish the days' business without a vote to extend the meeting beyond the 1 hour and 20 minute limit. In a response to a question from Dr. Smith, Dr. Owen reported that if the meeting ended then the time for senate review of the Core Curriculum would have expired before our next regular meeting without senate action. Dr. Smith moved to extend the meeting, and this motion was carried.
 3. The motion to recommend the Core Courses was taken from the table, and amendments were offered.
 - a) Dr. Craig Waggaman offered an amendment to remove two political science courses, POLI 130 and 140, from the list. Dr. Van Patten voiced GECAC's support for the motion. The amendment was immediately carried.
 - b) Dr. Smith offered the companion motion on statistics to remove STAT 200 from University Core B. The motion was immediately carried.
 - c) Dr. Carter Turner offered an amendment on behalf of the department of philosophy and religion to include RLGN 206, Religious Experience, in the Core Courses list in the Humanities area. Dr. Van Patten spoke against the amendment on behalf of GECAC on the grounds that it was not sufficiently introductory in nature, and that the department of philosophy and religion had not ranked their list of courses when it was submitted to GECAC, so it was left to GECAC to make the decision about what to cut. Dr. Smith asked how many courses are offered from the department of philosophy and religion in the humanities area. Dr. Jordan replied that there are three religion courses in the humanities area. She also noted that the amendment has unanimous support in her department, and that she believes it to be introductory in nature. Dr. Turner emphasized that religious experience is the foundation of religious study, and that religion cannot be understood absent some understanding of religious experience. Dr. Gwen Brown asked if the religious experience class was in fact a prerequisite for the other classes. Dr. Turner replied that it wasn't a prerequisite for other courses offered in the core. Dr. Jordan replied that the way courses were structured in their department, this course could form part of a required component, depending on the track a student takes in the major. Dr. Ed Udd spoke against the amendment on the grounds that this was not an appropriate time for departments to be tinkering with the course offerings. Dr. Suzanne Ament replied that every department had submitted a list to GECAC, and that what was currently under discussion was just those cases in which there was disagreement between GECAC and the department, and that this was the appropriate time to discuss that. The question was called, the motion to end debate was carried, and the motion to amend was subsequently carried on a voice vote.
 4. Discussion returned to the main motion. The question was immediately called, and the motion was carried on a voice vote.

V. New Business

1. none.

VI. Announcements

1. Dr. Owen and the entire faculty senate offered its appreciation and thanks to GECAC and the University Core A Committee who had spent many long months working on the new Core Curriculum. Dr. Owen also expressed his appreciation to the senators for their diligence in addressing Core Curriculum issues.

VII. Adjournment

1. The meeting was adjourned at 5:01 pm.

Radford University Faculty Senate
Meeting Minutes
November 20, 2008

Members Present: Dr. Anne Alexander, Dr. Suzanne Ament, Dr. Roann Barris, Dr. Jack Brockway, Dr. Gwendolyn Brown, Dr. Paula Brush, Dr. Jack Call, Mr. Timothy Channell, Dr. Iain Clelland, Dr. Patricia Easterling Vaccare, Dr. I-Ping Fu, Dr. Gerald Gordon, Dr. Anthony Guest, Dr. Judith Guinan, Dr. Katherine Hilden, Dr. Maung Htay, Dr. Kay K. Jordan, Dr. James Lollar, Dr. Deborah McLaughlin, Dr. Garth N. Montgomery, Dr. Michael Moore, Dr. Stephen Owen, Dr. Tammy Robinson, Dr. Wayne Saubert, Dr. Gary Schirr, Dr. Susan Schoppelrey, Dr. B. Sidney Smith, Dr. Laura Spielman, Dr. Angela Stanton, Dr. Jenessa Steele, Dr. Sarah Strauss, Dr. Edward Carter Turner, Dr. Claire Waldron, Dr. Erin Webster Garrett, Dr. Joseph Wirgau, Dr. David Zuschin

Members Absent: Dr. William Flora, Dr. D. Gumaer, Dr. Nozar Hashemzadeh, Dr. James Newman, Dr. Richard Roth, Dr. Reginald Shareef, Dr. Edward Udd, Dr. Chester Watts

Guests Present: President Penelope Kyle, Dr. Wilbur Stanton, Dr. Debra Templeton, Ms. Bethany Bodo.

I. Call to Order and Approval of Minutes

1. Dr. Owen called the meeting to order at 3:31 pm.
2. The minutes of the November 6th meeting were approved.

II. Reports and Announcements

1. President Kyle presented a report to the senate.
 - a) She thanked the College of Business Law and Economics for inviting her to join their faculty as a tenured professor.
 - b) With respect to the budget, President Kyle reminded the senate that there was a 5% reversion before the current academic year, and that an additional 5% reversion had been required of the university in the fall semester. An additional budget reversion is anticipated following the Governor's report in mid-December. No additional planning has been asked of the university in advance of this report. The new reversion, whatever it turns out to be, will have to be implemented on July 1st, 2009. President Kyle is reminding the leaders at the state level that Radford University is not a wealthy school, and that budget cuts are felt immediately, and she believes that they understand this. Also, the Governor's recommended reversion can be adjusted by the legislature. Consequently, she is making the case with both the administration and the legislature. It is her impression that the House Appropriations Committee is going to try to look at the needs of each higher education institution, as well as k-12, in formulating their budget plans. President Kyle also noted that capital projects are not affected by these reversions, and there is no indication that the building projects currently in planning, including the new business and science buildings, will not be

completed as currently scheduled. These projects have a significant impact on the local economy, and this will be emphasized to the governor. Also, the freeze on the equipment trust fund has been released. Finally, the president noted that if there is an additional 10 or 15 percent reduction, there is a possibility that teaching assignments may be affected, but she does not anticipate a loss of full-time faculty positions. The president noted that there is concern about how enrollment will be affected in the spring semester owing to the economic downturn. Different schools may be affected differently. Unfortunately it is impossible to predict, but it may be that maintaining enrollment may be an additional challenge. In response to a question from a senator, President Kyle noted that the university is now much more aggressively represented in Richmond, but there are many factors that affect how universities are able to set their staffing levels, and she does not expect the state government to dictate reductions in staffing. The provost noted that Dr. Templeton's report showed that the university is still well below the staffing levels needed to match our academic requirements. Achieving appropriate staffing is a priority for the university administration. President Kyle noted that this must also include ensuring that staff is distributed correctly among the programs. In response to another question, President Kyle noted that the type of student aid that is currently available to RU students is not affected by the reversions, and that she anticipates that President-elect Obama will protect student aid programs when he takes office. She also anticipates that the small number of foundation scholarships currently on offer will continue. Provost Stanton observed that families who have been using equity loans and other private financing to pay tuition may have difficulty using such means in the future.

- c) The senate president, Dr. Owen, asked President Kyle about the open vice president positions. She responded that the VP of University Relations position is going to be eliminated. She doesn't like doing so, but the budget requires some such cut. The most senior person in that department will serve as director. The search for a new VP of Finance continues, and they are working to get the best candidates possible. There are presently more than 30 applications, but she has not seen them. They want someone with experience in the Commonwealth of Virginia. She is also considering reassigning some of the duties of that position, transferring the legislative (lobbying) responsibilities to someone else, and moving responsibility for capital projects to the CFO position. But she will not make these decisions until the candidates are being interviewed. Getting someone to come mid-fiscal year may be problematic.
- d) Regarding the Dedmon Center, construction is ongoing. Mid to late January is the expected time for the center to become fully operational. Except for the swimming pool and related locker rooms, the facility will be reserved for the sole use of the RU athletes. The swimming pool will be available to students and faculty when the pool is not needed by the swim teams. In addition, local residents will be given the opportunity to buy admission to the pool during limited hours. Faculty, staff, and students are allowed to use the facility in Muse Hall, the facility in Peters Hall, and a planned free-weight room in a second facility in Muse Hall when the athletes move out. In addition, residents of Radford (including student renters) may use the Radford Recreation Center for free.

- e) President Kyle noted that there are two events coming up. On December 2nd there will be a Christmas decoration lighting ceremony, followed by an open house with caroling in the Covington Center. On December 11th there will be a faculty/staff/student open house in the Covington Center. At 4pm there will be ceremony honoring faculty who retired in the spring or are retiring after the current semester. The latter will conflict with a planned senate meeting, and Dr. Owen suggested that there was no pressing senate business and consequently the meeting could be canceled. In response a question from a senator, President Kyle promised that a menorah would be included in the lighting ceremony.
 - f) Regarding the weather policy, President Kyle emphasized that RU will not be using the local school systems to set its policies. In addition, since VT gets different weather, RU may not always follow their example either way. The decision will be made independently following consultation with state and local law enforcement. She opined that faculty and staff are responsible for making it to work regardless of where they live, since each has chosen to live wherever they live, when RU is open. President Kyle said that whenever she has canceled classes she has gotten calls from parents whose children live on campus or nearby complaining about the closure. The provost said that the procedure for making the decision will be undertaken at 4:30 am whenever there is inclement weather. President Kyle also emphasized that ensuring a safe campus remains a top priority, so parking lots and sidewalks will be cleared very early. One senator noted that many of our students commute, and one in particular in the recent inclement weather had suffered an auto accident on Jefferson Street. President Kyle said that the decision will not be made on the basis of commuter students' needs, but that special attention will be paid to the state of Tyler, Main, and Jefferson Streets in the decision-making process, and that the city will be checked with regarding these streets before a decision to open campus is made. The provost noted that there is a procedure in place in the event of inclement weather during exam week.
 - g) In response to a question, President Kyle noted that the master plan for the university is still being developed by a consulting firm that was hired for the purpose. The master plan consultants are reviewing all existing and planned facilities. She will ask the Board of Visitors to call a special meeting in the spring to review the master plan proposal. It is the board's purview to review and approve the master plan. With respect to a second campus, such as RU West, the consultants have recommended, based on experience with Mary Washington University, that a split campus does not serve the campus community well. Consequently, any needed growth (and growth is anticipated) will come around the main campus. Green spaces are to be maintained in this process.
 - h) Dr. Owen thanked President Kyle for her time, and she responded that the senate should send for her any time they want her to come back.
2. Dr. Owen reported that the faculty senate's recommendation on the Core Curriculum as been formalized and forwarded to the provost's office. The Student Government Association has apparently not made a recommendation. The General Education Curriculum Advisory Committee (GECAC) reports that it will have completed its

review of the CORE-prefix course proposals by December 5th, at which point the proposals will come to the senate and be immediately forwarded to the senate curriculum committee, which will then report to the senate. Dr. Owen reported on the report that Dr. Saubert made to the Board of Visitors regarding faculty productivity. This report indicated that in the past three years faculty at RU had 928 publications, 1,207 presentations, 239 grants, and 267 performances and exhibits.

3. Provost Stanton reported on the meeting of the Academic Affairs Committee of the Board of Visitors, now chaired by Mr. R. J. Kirk. The Provost reported to the committee that the Core Curriculum proposal represents an outstanding effort on the part of the faculty. The provost does not anticipate any difficulties for the proposal at any point in the recommendation and approval process. The provost reported that despite the current budget constraints searches and recruitment of new faculty will continue for the time being. Moving expenses will be paid in the form of a \$4,000 stipend to all new faculty. In addition, new faculty will continue to enjoy a one-course reduction in the first year. Also, start-up costs will remain. All offers are contingent on future budgets, and this language is included in all contract offers. On December 3rd there will be an Academic Affairs Leadership Team meeting at 3pm to which all faculty are invited. The method for calculating Base Budget Adequacy will be reviewed. In response to a question, the provost noted that recruitment ads have all been posted.
4. Dr. Owen introduced the report from Dr. Templeton and Ms. Bodo on the new Student Evaluation of Faculty form by noting that they and he and Dr. Lerch and Dr. Oyos will be meeting after this semester's administration of the new form to review how it went, so this is an evolving process. He then invited senators to ask any questions about the new form they wished. The first question was why there is not a set of instructions for the form to be read to students regarding anonymity, protocol, etc. Ms. Bodo suggested that the same instructions could be used this time. It was noted that such instructions used to be included in the packet. Dr. Owen reported that for the spring implementation, the senate will take up the issue of standardized procedures and instructions. Provost Stanton noted that when you change the evaluation instrument you change the outcome, so the senate should consider running old and new evaluation forms in parallel to calibrate the changes in outcomes. It was noted that how the student evaluations are used in evaluating faculty is an issue that needs to be addressed. The provost affirmed this need since there is little uniformity among departments and colleges in how the evaluations are used. A concern was raised about what happens if there is a shortage of forms for a section, given that the forms are now preprinted with course information (so no blank forms are available). Ms. Bodo asked that all such glitches be brought to their attention so that solutions can be devised. In response to a new question, the provost noted that evaluation data comes to the deans and to his office, and the numbers are reviewed in the aggregate, but individual evaluations are not assessed in these offices, and at all times the data is kept secure.

III. Old Business

1. None.

IV. New Business

1. None.

V. Announcements

1. None.

VI. Adjournment

1. The meeting was adjourned at 4:50 pm.

**Radford University Faculty Senate
Meeting Minutes
January 22, 2009**

Members Present: Dr. Anne Alexander, Dr. Suzanne Ament, Dr. Roann Barris, Dr. Jack Call, Mr. Timothy Channell, Dr. Iain Clelland, Dr. Patricia Easterling Vaccare, Dr. I-Ping Fu, Dr. Gerald Gordon, Dr. Anthony Guest, Dr. Judith Guinan, Dr. Vincent Hazelton, Dr. Maung Htay, Dr. Kay K. Jordan, Dr. James Lollar, Dr. Deborah McLaughlin, Dr. Garth N. Montgomery, Dr. Michael Moore, Dr. Teresa O'Bannon, Dr. Stephen Owen, Dr. Tammy Robinson, Dr. Richard Roth, Dr. Wayne Saubert, Dr. Gary Schirr, Dr. B. Sidney Smith, Dr. Laura Spielman, Dr. Angela Stanton, Dr. Jenessa Steele, Dr. Sarah Strauss, Dr. Lynn Taylor, Dr. Edward Carter Turner, Dr. Susan Van Patten (for Dr. Udd), Dr. Claire Waldron, Dr. Erin Webster Garrett, Dr. Joseph Wrigau, Dr. David Zuschin

Members Absent: Dr. Jack Brockway, Dr. Paula Brush, Dr. William Flora, Dr. D. Gumaer, Dr. Nozar Hashemzadeh, Dr. Katherine Hilden, Dr. Reginald Shareef, Dr. Chester Watts

Guests Present: Dr. Wilbur Stanton.

I. Call to Order and Approval of Minutes

1. Dr. Owen called the meeting to order at 3:31 pm.
2. The minutes of the November 20th meeting were approved.

II. Reports and Announcements

1. Dr. Owen called senators' attention to the senate meeting schedule this semester, which is somewhat irregular and is posted on the senate web page. Dr. Owen encouraged senators to meet with their committees during the next two weeks to further their committee objectives. Dr. Owen announced that he will be meeting with Bethany Bodo regarding the new student evaluation process, and asked senators to bring any concerns their constituents have about the new form to his attention. Dr. Owen noted that the executive council was concerned to inform senators and their constituents of the details of RU's budget structure, and that senators could expect a packet of material on this subject at some point. Dr. Owen reported that Candice Small, Dr. Lerch, Susan van Patten, and other members of the Core A team will be creating a web resource to educate faculty members about the new Core program. Also, departments are welcome to request a meeting with members of the team to discuss the program.
2. Provost Stanton reported that he had reviewed the Core Curriculum proposal and was very pleased with it, with the caveat that ongoing assessment of the program would be important, and that he had forward his recommendation in favor of the proposal to the president and the Board of Visitors. Dr. Stanton then turned to the budget reversion and the measures planned to meet that reversion. He noted that the economy continues to decline, and that the governor's \$2.9 billion reversion may have been too optimistic, and that the eventual reversion may be even greater than

currently known. He also noted that RU had begun preparing for the reversion last July, that the governor had given us the largest reversion he could by law, but that the legislature could dictate an even larger reversion. The current reversion involves reducing the Academic Affairs budget by \$4.85 million. At the beginning of the holiday break, Provost Stanton was given a deadline of January 9th to provide a detailed plan for implementing this reversion, and he will soon have to present this plan to the Board of Visitors. The reversion could be realized by eliminating 65 faculty positions, but he feels that would be stupid and counter-productive. He is concerned to make those adjustments that will protect current filled positions and which will position the university for realizing its strategic goals. All programs will be examined, and those central to the strategic plan and which are strong will be supported. Programs that are not central, not supportive of the strategic plan, or which are weak and unproductive, will come under scrutiny for downsizing or elimination. Some majors will have to be eliminated. The number of concentrations with very few majors will have to be reduced. Courses with low enrollment will be offered less often or eliminated. Elective courses will be offered less often, and their number reduced. Reassigned time will be reduced, lowering the number of full-time faculty-equivalents in reassigned time from 50 to 40. There will be few substantive reductions in the non-personal service budget, because classroom materials and professional travel are needed. All hiring is now on hold with the exception of a few positions. No positions have been eliminated, but empty positions are on hold. Some administrative lines will be lost owing to restructuring. Some details include:

- a) The Faculty Development Center, the Technology in Learning Center, and the Office of Distance Education will be reorganized. Paula Stanley will be rejoining the faculty in counselor education. The Office of Academic Outreach will also be reorganized.
- b) We will be merging the Center of International Education within Academic Affairs and the Office of International Student Services and Student Affairs.
- c) We are going to realign the Office of New Student Programs from Academic Affairs to Student Affairs. The Learning Assistance Resource Center will also be moved to Student Affairs. Financial Aid will be moving from Student Affairs to Academic Affairs.
- d) Responsibility for Academic Review will be placed under Institutional Research. Faculty Research Support will be in the Office of Graduate Studies. A Center for New Student Testing will be created in the Office for Institutional Research. Every student accepted to Radford University will be tested before being placed in critical courses.

Although not all of these changes will save money, they will give us a better structure for moving ahead with our strategic goals.

- e) Some technical support in the colleges will move to ITR. Departments are being encouraged to use distance education modalities in place of putting faculty on the road.

f) Some departments will be merged. Chemistry and Biology will become a single department. A School of Environmental and Physical Sciences will be created in the College of Science and Technology, which will include the Forensic Science Institute, Geology, Physics, and Geography. It will also include moving the two physical anthropology faculty into that new structure. An increased focus within the College of Science and Technology on environmental science is anticipated. Dance and Theatre will be merged. Recreation, Parks, and Tourism will be moving to the College of Education. Foods and Nutrition will move from the School of Nursing to the Dept. of Exercise, Sport, and Health Education. Some articulation agreements that are no longer healthy for us will be eliminated, primarily in the area of business at Virginia Western Community College. We have reduced four positions in Sponsored Programs and Grants Management to two positions. The Waldron College has proposed changing its name to the Waldron College of Health Sciences. The extended campus budget will be restructured.

g) On the revenue side, the provost will propose to the Board of Visitors that RU have differential tuition for its graduate (not undergraduate) programs. The application fee for graduate programs may also be raised. The undergraduate application fee will be evaluated relative to our peers to ensure that it is not lower than at other colleges. Lab fees will be introduced in the science courses. Other courses will be evaluated to determine if additional fees are appropriate. The provost noted that there seems to be a general agreement among state institution presidents and the general assembly that tuition increases will be needed. RU will not make a decision on tuition increases until it is known what increases, if any, are being made by other institutions.

The provost emphasized the contribution of the college deans in helping to formulate the difficult decisions needed to meet our budget requirements. The provost then responded to questions from senators:

a) The time-line for budget decisions and restructuring: the changes will likely occur very soon after the Board of Visitors meeting, assuming the board chooses to act on the recommendations. The revenue projections for the state will not be known until late February. Some of the reorganizing will not be finally determined before July and our final budget is determined.

b) Regarding the elimination of majors, how programs will be assessed for continuation or elimination, there are a number of factors, including the role of the program in mission-critical areas and the productivity of the program. There will be an expedited program review process for programs being considered for elimination.

c) Dr. Claire Waldron asked about the Planning and Budget Committee, which has not convened. The provost responded that that committee is convened by the president at her discretion, and she had not chosen to do so.

d) In respect to concerns about lost faculty positions, the provost reiterated that he did not intend to eliminate any faculty positions, or to change expectations about faculty workloads. Some administrative positions will be eliminated. The Director of

Admissions position will remain vacant. He also noted that at this time every division within the university is facing the same percentage cut. The provost's position is that academic affairs should take a smaller share of the reversion, and he will be advocating that position to the administration.

- e) In response to a question from Jim Lollar, the provost said there are no current discussions about outsourcing services such as IT, but that such ideas might be examined.
 - f) In response to a concern for rising costs for students, the provost ruled out differential tuition for the undergraduate programs, but said that lab fees and so on were common practice and that financial aid would cover those. There is also discussion about using e-books and so on to mitigate student costs.
 - g) In response to a request for clarification on review of concentrations or programs for budgetary cutting, the provost responded that he would be looking at concentrations that involve many low-enrollment courses for ways of combining or otherwise mitigating the cost of such courses.
 - h) In response to a question about the hiring of Sharon Hartline for the Core A director position, the provost responded that because the College of Humanities and Behavioral Sciences was going to be largely responsible for teaching the courses, and because of the short time-frame for implementing the program, it was felt that she was best suited for that position at this time.
3. There were few committee reports other than to announce plans to meet in the near future. The Internal Governance Committee is reviewing the internal governance document and expects to make a report soon. The Resource Allocation Committee is analyzing the previous year's budget.

III. Old Business

1. None.

IV. New Business

1. Dr. Claire Waldron moved that the faculty senate recommend to the president that she convene the Planning and Budget Advisory Committee so that it can fulfill its internal governance role at this important time. A motion was made and seconded to amend the agenda to include Dr. Waldron's motion on the agenda, and this was carried by a voice vote. A motion was made to suspend the rules so that the motion could be considered immediately. The motion was seconded and carried by voice vote. Discussion was opened on the main motion. There was no discussion, and the motion was carried on a voice vote.

V. Announcements

1. None.

VI. Adjournment

1. The meeting was adjourned at 4:45 pm.

**Radford University Faculty Senate
Meeting Minutes
February 12, 2009**

Members Present: Dr. Anne Alexander, Dr. Suzanne Ament, Dr. Roann Barris, Dr. Jack Brockway, Dr. Jack Call, Mr. Timothy Channell, Dr. Iain Clelland, Dr. I-Ping Fu, Dr. Gerald Gordon, Mr. Anthony Guest, Dr. Judith Guinan, Dr. Vincent Hazelton, Dr. Maung Htay, Dr. Steve Lenhart, Dr. James Lollar, Dr. Deborah McLaughlin, Dr. Garth N. Montgomery, Dr. Michael Moore, Dr. Teresa O'Bannon, Dr. Stephen Owen, Dr. Tammy Robinson, Dr. Richard Roth, Dr. Basel Saleh, Dr. David Sallee, Dr. Wayne Saubert, Dr. Gary Schirr, Dr. B. Sidney Smith, Dr. Laura Spielman, Dr. Angela Stanton, Dr. Jenessa Steele, Dr. Sarah Strauss, Dr. Patti Talbot, Dr. Lynne Taylor, Dr. Edward Carter Turner, Dr. Edward Udd, Dr. Erin Webster Garrett, Dr. Joseph Wirgau, Dr. David Zuschin

Members Absent: Dr. William Flora, Dr. D. Gumaer, Dr. Kay K. Jordan, Dr. Mary Lalone, Dr. Reginald Shareef, Dr. Claire Waldron

Guests Present: Dr. Wilbur Stanton.

I. Call to Order and Approval of Minutes

1. Dr. Owen called the meeting to order at 3:31 pm.
2. The minutes of the January 22nd meeting were approved.

II. Reports and Announcements

1. Dr. Owen had a number of things to share. First, the previous week a group of students, faculty, and administrators participated in Advocacy Day in Richmond. There were 36 students, 7 faculty, 2 staff, and 5 members of the Board of Visitors, the largest number ever. Dr. Owen wanted to remind senators, and asked them to remind their constituents, that in speaking to elected officials and other government officials, employees of RU must not represent their views as representing those of the university without direct authorization from the president's office. In particular, employees should not use RU letterhead or their RU email account to communicate with government officials. Dr. Owen noted that paper copies of the catalog will no longer be distributed to students, but will be distributed to faculty, advisors, and others who have a need to use it as a frequent reference. Regarding the motion passed at the previous meeting calling on the president to convene the Planning and Budget Committee, Dr. Owen has communicated with the president on two occasions about it, conveying how important faculty feel it is to convene that committee. She indicated that she requested background information about the committee from the provost, which he then provided, and that she would make a decision once she has reviewed that information. Dr. Vince Hazleton expressed concern that the president, after two years, was not already acquainted with our shared governance procedures. Dr. Hazleton asked if we could have a report on all the committees, specifically on how regularly they meet. Dr. Owen said he thought that could be done, and that he

agreed with the substance of Dr. Hazleton's remarks, and that it was up to us to revise the internal governance procedure.

2. On the issue of internal governance in particular, Dr. Owen had some prepared remarks: Over the past few weeks, I have heard a number of faculty raise concerns about the process by which recent budget reversion and restructuring decisions were made, as I'm sure you have, as well. Reflecting on these concerns, one Senator posted anonymously to the Faculty Senate Q&A Website the following: "What is the Executive Committee's take on this process (or lack of process) and what should the Faculty Senate be doing about it?"

The Faculty Senate Executive Council has taken these concerns very seriously, and I would like to share how we have worked to address them. I will preface my comments with three observations about the context of our current situation.

First, the Faculty Senate is charged with – and I'm reading from the Preamble of our Constitution – assuring "forceful and articulate representation of faculty interests and of the faculty view of the common good of the university community, in accordance with recognized principles of university governance." The Executive Council and I have heard and articulated faculty concerns, and we will continue to do so. However, it is also important to acknowledge that the Faculty Senate is not a substitute for a functioning internal governance system. Meeting only every other week, and with many areas of responsibility, the Faculty Senate is designed to provide oversight and comment, but not to supplant the various committees that have been established to provide detailed study of, and to craft recommendations regarding, the functional areas of the University. When the internal governance system "breaks down" – even partially – then processes of effective communication and consultation can "break down" with it.

Second, I believe it is important for us all to understand that the current situation is difficult, on a number of levels. One consistent theme that emerges just from reading the newspapers and from listening to our elected officials is that there are many "unknowns" that confound the planning process. Changing budget projections, uncertainty about the General Assembly's final actions on the Governor's proposals, and uncertainty about the federal stimulus package, to name a few, confound planning. Internal to the University, rapid deadlines have necessitated quick action, even as final reversion targets remain unknown. These are constraints over which we do not have control.

Third, we are facing a potential 20% reduction in our state appropriations over this biennium. In the zero-sum game of budget reductions, Provost Stanton has difficult decisions to make, and while those decisions may not please everyone, they have to be made. This causes the process informing those decisions to take on an added importance. Now more than ever, it is essential for faculty to have a voice in the process. The Faculty Senate Executive Council is committed to ensuring that faculty do have that voice, in spite of the unknowns and the inefficiencies of the current internal governance system.

Here then, are some answers to the question of what the Faculty Senate Executive Council, and the Faculty Senate as a whole, can do to ensure that the planning process for reversions and restructuring occurs in a way that promotes transparency and faculty involvement, within this context. There are two things that this year's Faculty Senate has done, and will continue to do, as well as four new ways of ensuring that faculty voices are heard.

I'll start with the two things we will continue to do.

First, as I expressed at the beginning of the year, one important role of the Faculty Senate is to facilitate communication. I encourage you and your constituents to utilize the Q&A forum online. It is my goal to secure answers to as many posted questions as possible, and Provost Stanton has reaffirmed his commitment to assist in securing those answers. Even when a question is not answered directly on the web page (although most are), you can be assured that I have represented to the administration the concern noted in the question. Provost Stanton has also been willing to attend all Faculty Senate meetings, and to answer any questions that are posed at that time. If you have a question but do not want to ask it publicly, contact me, and I will convey it. In addition, Provost Stanton has held a number of open forums on issues related to planning and budgeting, and it is likely that future forums will be held later in the Spring. I have also communicated with President Kyle about hosting a "no holds barred" forum after the conclusion of the legislative session, which will include a profile of the University's budget and any questions, on any subject, that you may wish to pose – anonymously or publicly.

Second, the Faculty Senate serves as the voice of the faculty, and as such, the Executive Council has worked to express faculty concerns. This occurs, in part, through the fora described above, but also through the Senate's actions. On today's agenda, there is a motion that, if passed, I will convey to Provost Stanton, President Kyle, and Rector Fraim, as a statement of faculty priorities in the budget planning process. At our last meeting, we passed a motion calling for the University Planning and Budgeting Committee to be convened. In the fall semester, the Resource Allocation Committee met and identified four areas that should be preserved as we faced our reversions, which I communicated directly with Provost Stanton. These types of action give us an opportunity to convey, in an official capacity, our sentiments, and we should do so – in fact, we have an obligation to our constituents to do so.

This sort of communication is good, but it is not good enough. Therefore, the Executive Council has discussed the current budget situation at some length, and we recently met with Provost Stanton, Vice Provost Lerch, and Vice Provost Slavings to discuss the concerns that we have heard faculty articulate. I would like to report on the four new strategies for ensuring that faculty voices are heard.

First, I want to return to my opening observation, regarding internal governance. Internal governance can only be effective to the degree that our internal governance system is sound. One concern has been the University Planning and Budget Advisory Committee, the subject of the motion at our last meeting. I have advocated strongly that the committee needs to be convened, and that it is the appropriate venue by

which faculty can provide input into the budget and planning decision making processes. The Executive Council and I will continue to advocate this.

However, our discussions in the Executive Council have led us to conclude that the current internal governance system is inadequate. Internal governance reform has been on the Senate's agenda for years. This system has been virtually unchanged since its creation in 1994, and we believe that the time has come to correct its inadequacies. But we must do so carefully, and deliberately. While not neglecting other constituencies of the University, we must move forward only if reforms will reflect faculty primacy in internal governance. I have spoken with President Kyle, and the Executive Council has spoken with Provost Stanton, about this. I plan to advocate strongly for a meaningful internal governance reform, reflecting faculty primacy, that will identify a set of values and structure a system in which faculty can have meaningful input into the decisions that affect us. My goal is to move forward with all deliberate speed, and I would like to see us have a fully developed proposal – one supported by faculty and administration alike – no later than April 2010. I have communicated this desire to President Kyle and Provost Stanton; now is the time to move forward to ensure a stable and effective system of governance.

Second, in the meantime, we must make due within the constraints of our current system. As noted earlier, we are moving rapidly toward making decisions of consequence in an environment with many unknowns. We must, not should, but must, ensure that faculty voices are represented. While not a substitute for the Planning and Budget Advisory Committee, Provost Stanton has invited the Executive Council and Resource Allocation Committee to meet regularly with him, to provide a faculty perspective on budget planning as it affects academic affairs. I support this recommendation.

Third, Provost Stanton has committed to strengthening communication as decisions are made. As Wayne reported, the Board of Visitors has approved the department mergers presented at our previous Senate meeting. To the extent that mergers impact existing or potential curricula, they should have been reviewed and commented upon by the Senate, consistent with the curriculum path document. That was not done in this case. However, we must move forward from here, and Provost Stanton has committed that the Senate will be kept apprised of any future changes so that we can utilize our review and comment authority, as appropriate. In addition, the items regarding potential new degree programs were removed from the Board of Visitor's agenda. We have received from Provost Stanton assurance that if and when any new program are developed, it will occur only after deliberate study, and following procedural guidelines, which include review and comment from the Senate. Returning to the theme of difficult decisions, some current programs will be undergoing expedited program review processes to guide decisions about their future. I sit on the Program Review Committee, as do other faculty, and we will be deliberative and mindful of the consequences of our recommendations as we study the data. The Faculty Senate, following curriculum path policies, will have the opportunity to review and comment upon any recommendations for program elimination that may result. Therefore, as far as curricular matters go, both the constituent departments and the Faculty Senate will have input on important decisions.

Fourth, the Executive Council discussed with Provost Stanton concerns about a lack of communication with units impacted by restructuring decisions. From our conversations, it became clear that much communication had actually occurred – although the degree to which *all* communications “filtered down” to *all* faculty is unclear. To that end, I would stress to all parties – Provost, deans, department chairs and school directors, and faculty – the importance of ensuring that relevant information is transmitted to those who are impacted by it. Provost Stanton has given us an assurance that he will, even as decisions are required under time pressures, increase his vigilance to ensure that this happens. I would also like to caution against being drawn into rumor mills, where information can be distorted or fabricated. I will reiterate the multiple means at your disposal for getting answers to questions; the more they are utilized, the more readily we can identify concerns, and the more accurate information we can dispense, the better off we all will be.

To sum up, the Executive Council and I have represented your concerns, and those concerns have been heard. As we continue to move through these challenging times, decisions will be made through a process that allows input from impacted departments, as well as multiple lines of oversight from the Faculty Senate. And, I remain committed to reform of internal governance to strengthen the ability of faculty to participate and provide input. I would also like to personally thank you all for your continued work on the Senate as we address these matters.

3. Dr. Owen invited senators to direct questions to him or the provost. In response to a question by Dr. Alexander, Dr. Owen said that whenever a program is slated for elimination the faculty senate has a “review and comment” responsibility regarding that decision, but not a veto authority over such decisions. The provost added that the internal review process of programs that would be followed would be that specified in our internal governance documents, but on an expedited timetable. Regarding concentrations, the provost said that there are six or seven concentrations with very few students, and in which there is a question about coursework-overlap meeting the 25% requirement set by the state. These concentrations will be scrutinized by the deans regarding their viability. In response to an additional question, the provost said that the restructuring that had already been decided upon was meant to serve two purposes; to find efficiencies, and to prepare the university for growth in strategic areas. The provost also noted that he was given the budget expectations on December 22nd, and he was told by the president's office to have a plan ready by the end of the first week of the semester. This was a short timetable. He emphasized that he would always share what information he could, and that he would try in all cases to be fair. He said that the programs that were to undergo review would be notified on Monday. Dr. Ament expressed a concern that humanities were being short-changed in this process. The provost said that was not a correct impression. In particular, the changes coming about in anthropology and geography did not mean those subjects wouldn't still be taught. Although the Planning and Budget Committee had not met, the provost intended to share as much information as he could about the budget with the Resource Allocation Committee and with other senators, opening the entire budget so that it could be seen exactly what is going on. What the provost can't say because he doesn't know is what the trade-offs will be between academic affairs and the other divisions on campus. The provost added that he and the president had

discussed having an open forum to discuss the budget in the near future, and again after the general assembly ends its session.

4. Dr. Saubert reported on the Board of Visitors meeting in Richmond. The board discussed the status of the budget and how the final numbers will depend on the federal bailout and the general assembly. RU has requested approximately \$268,000 and three FTE positions for operation and maintenance of the Covington Center. The new buildings for the College of Science and Technology and the Graduate and Professional Degree are included in the governor's six year capital outlay plan. Numerous bills regarding voter registration and out-of-state students are pending. There is a bill pending that would allow faculty with concealed-weapon permits to carry guns on campus. (Currently weapons may not be carried on campus.) A bill is pending to allow employees with retirement plans other than the Virginia Retirement System (VRS) may make a one-time irrevocable election to transfer their retirement to VRS. A bill authorizing a feasibility study for a 4-year state school in Virginia Beach is pending. Dr. Call asked about whether the faculty senate president or the faculty representative should be making the report to the board. Dr. Saubert responded that the president made a report to the Academic Affairs committee of the board. Dr. Lollar noted that up until last year the faculty had time in front of the board but that R.J. Kirk, in his tenure as rector, had changed that. Dr. Owen suggested that we could advocate to the board a reversion to the *status quo ante*.
5. Dr. Smith reported that the Faculty Senate Executive Council is working on reapportionment for the spring elections, and asked senators to review the information provided on the sign-in sheet regarding when their current term expires, to ensure that it is correct. He also noted that committee reports and minutes will be posted to the senate web page if they choose to send them to the secretary.
6. The Campus Environment Committee reported that they had met, elected a new chair, and were progressing on their objectives. The Curriculum Committee reported that they had met to review the Core A course proposals and report them back to the full senate. The Faculty Issues Committee reported that they met and are working to revise the procedures for student evaluations of faculty. The Governance Committee met, reviewed the By-Laws for accuracy and reported some corrections to the secretary, and has prepared a motion to be brought before the full senate today. The Resource Allocation Committee reported that they met and reviewed the budget from the last five years to identify budget trends.

III. Old Business

1. None.

IV. New Business

1. The Motions for the Core Curriculum Courses numbered CORE 101, 102, 103, 201, and 202 listed under "Current, Motions" on the faculty senate website were offered by the Curriculum Committee and were tabled.

2. The Motions for Core Curriculum courses ITEC 112 and CVPA 266 listed under “Current, Motions” on the faculty senate website were read by the secretary and tabled.
3. A Motion from Academic Policies and Procedures on exceptions to academic suspension listed under “Current, Motions” on the faculty senate website was read by the secretary and tabled.
4. A Motion from Academic Policies and Procedures on the withdrawal policy listed under “Current, Motions” on the faculty senate website was read by the secretary and tabled.
5. A Motion from the Governance Committee regarding deans evaluations listed under “Current, Motions” on the faculty senate website was read by Dr. Angela Stanton and tabled.
6. A Motion from the Faculty Senate Executive Council recommending to the administration a set of principles for guiding the university during budget reversions, listed under “Current, Motions” on the faculty senate website, was read by the secretary. Dr. Smith moved to suspend the rules to pass directly to consideration of the motion. This was seconded and passed, and the motion was discussed. The provost expressed his support for the motion. Some expressed a concern that the paragraph calling for academic affairs to take a smaller budget reduction than other campus divisions would be seen as self-serving or strident. An amendment was offered to remove this wording, but this amendment was defeated on a voice vote. A friendly amendment was offered to change the wording of point three of the motion to “To promote transparency in decision making processes, changes directly impacting an academic unit *or having curricular impact* should be made only after the faculty in that academic unit have been consulted and given the opportunity to provide feedback” (change in italics) by Dr. Webster-Garrett was agreed to. The motion was then passed on a voice vote.

V. Announcements

1. Senators were reminded that there is currently a library survey available on the library website, and they and their constituents are encouraged to use it to provide feedback to the library to help them improve services.

VI. Adjournment

1. The meeting was adjourned at 4:48 pm.

**Radford University Faculty Senate
Meeting Minutes
February 26, 2009**

Members Present: Dr. Anne Alexander, Dr. Suzanne Ament, Dr. Roann Barris, Dr. Jack Brockway, Dr. Jack Call, Mr. Timothy Channell, Dr. I-Ping Fu, Dr. Gerald Gordon, Mr. Anthony Guest, Dr. Judith Guinan, Dr. Vincent Hazelton, Dr. Kay K. Jordan, Dr. Steve Lenhart, Dr. James Lollar, Dr. Garth N. Montgomery, Dr. Michael Moore, Dr. Stephen Owen, Dr. Tammy Robinson, Dr. Basel Saleh, Dr. David Sallee, Dr. Wayne Saubert, Dr. Gary Schirr, Dr. Reginald Shareef, Dr. B. Sidney Smith, Dr. Laura Spielman, Dr. Angela Stanton, Dr. Jenessa Steele, Dr. Sarah Strauss, Dr. Patti Talbot, Dr. Lynne Taylor, Dr. Edward Carter Turner, Dr. Edward Udd, Dr. Erin Webster Garrett, Dr. Joseph Wirgau, Dr. Claire Waldron

Members Absent: Dr. Iain Clelland, Dr. William Flora, Dr. D. Gumaer, Dr. Maung Htay, Dr. Mary Lalone, Ms. Deborah McLaughlin, Dr. Teresa O'Bannon, Dr. Richard Roth, Dr. David Zuschin

Guests Present: Dr. Wilbur Stanton.

I. Call to Order and Approval of Minutes

1. Dr. Owen called the meeting to order at 3:31 pm.
2. The minutes of the February 12th meeting were approved.

II. Reports and Announcements

1. Dr. Owen informed the senate that his full report is written and posted on the senate web site under “Current”, “Reports”, “Senate President.” He drew attention to the highlights, in particular information regarding the expedited review process. Programs under review would be recommended for either continuance, reconfiguration, or discontinuation. Recommendations from the Academic Program Review Committee will come to the senate for review and comment. Dr. Claire Waldron noted that in the past the options were continue, “enhance”, or discontinue. Dr. Joe Wirgau asked why the information from departments was restricted to 5 pages. Dr. Slavings responded that time constraints made the abbreviated reports necessary. Dr. Owen added that many faculty seemed poorly informed about the process, and this was the purpose of his written report. He urged senators to direct their own or their constituents' questions to him after they had read his report.
2. Dr. Owen noted that there would be a budget forum on Thursday March 19th to provide an update about the budget and answer questions about the budget or anything else that seems appropriate. Dr. Owen offered to accept questions on any faculty member's behalf and submit it at the forum.
3. Dr. Owen will be meeting with President Kyle on Friday the 27th of February to talk about the Planning and Budget Advisory Committee, the motion passed at the

previous senate meeting on transparency, and the need to address a revision of internal governance.

4. There will be another open form hosted by the Student Government Association on Monday, March 2nd, at 4pm in the Bonnie Auditorium regarding wellness facilities on campus. The Vice President of Student Affairs and the Athletic Director will be present.
5. The Governance Committee reported that they had begun the process of reviewing the Faculty Handbook language in view of some of the ambiguity that has been brought to the senate's attention. They are also reviewing the validity of the questions for the department/school chairperson's evaluations. They will send out an email to senators to solicit questions that faculty feel would be more relevant on that evaluation. They will also be bringing a motion on this matter at the next senate meeting.

III. Old Business

1. The Motion for changing the Evaluation of Deans to an electronic process was taken from the table and read. The survey will be done on the Qualtrix system and anonymity will be protected. In response to a question whether it is possible to track the submitter, there was not a clear answer. However, the raw data collected by the system does not include any identifying information. Dr. Jordan expressed her support for concerns about anonymity. Dr. Udd called the question. This motion was carried. The main motion was then approved.
2. The motions for the Core Curriculum courses were next on the agenda. Dr. Owen made some remarks concerning the timeline, and pointed out that this was the final piece of the new Core Curriculum to come before the senate before its implementation. He then invited Dr. Hartline to make remarks about the structure for the sequence these courses comprise to refresh senator's memories, which she did.
3. The motion for CORE 101 was taken from the table. Dr. Webster-Garrett asked what our approval of the course would entail, and were we approving the courses as written and reported on the senate web site. Dr. Owen noted that the senate has final approval authority. If we did not approve any course, it would go back to the GECAC committee for revision or reinvention. In response to a further question from the senator, Dr. Owen said that these proposals have been reviewed by the senate curriculum committee since they did not go through any college or university curriculum committee. The CORE 101 course was then brought to a vote and approved.
4. CORE 102 was taken from the table. Dr. Van Patten noted that in response to concerns received about an assignment in the syllabus on informative speech, they recommend rewording that section to change the reference to Wikipedia on the bottom of page 4 of the proposal to "a variety of online resources." Dr. Hazleton raised a concern about plagiarism on the assignment, or on any assignment this

specific built into the syllabus. Dr. Webster-Garrett shared that many members of her department had concerns about the nature of the assignment, and whether voting to approve the course now would lock instructors into the syllabus as written.

Discussion ensued concerning the flexibility of the instructors and departments to revise the syllabus in the future. Dr. Hazleton reiterated his concern that the assignment was too narrow. Further discussion ensued regarding whether there were sufficient difficulties with the course proposal to permit us to support the course at this time. Dr. Van Patten challenged the assertion that the assignment was necessarily narrow, and provided an example from her own experience with such assignments. New language was then proposed to make clear that the assignment was not about the reliability of online sources *per se*, but only involved such an analysis as a part of the assignment. This change was agreed to by a show of hands. Dr. Smith asked if the changes the English department still wanted couldn't still be made by normal revision processes after the course was approved. Dr. Webster-Garret felt she couldn't commit her department on that issue. After further discussion and assurances by members of the Core Curriculum committee that they would work to meet the English departments concerns, the question was called. This motion passed, and then the main motion was passed.

5. CORE 103 was taken from the table. Without discussion the motion was approved.
6. CORE 201 was taken from the table. Without discussion the motion was approved.
7. CORE 202 was taken from the table. Without discussion the motion was approved.
8. ITEC 112 was taken from the table. Without discussion the motion was approved.
9. CVPA 266 was taken from the table. Discussion ensued. Dr. Ament reported that her constituents were against including this course in the Core Curriculum, since that curriculum is supposed to be available to all and a study abroad is necessarily limited to a small number of students. Dr. Alexander expressed concern about the sketchiness of the proposal and how rigor would be controlled. Dr. Joe Scartelli, Dean of the College of Visual and Performing Arts, was invited to speak to these concerns. He noted that the course was modeled on the study abroad courses that had previously been done. Dr. Alexander wondered how the course would be different from a vacation, noting that she was sure it would be different, but didn't know how it would be. Dr. Lollar asked to confirm whether students from other colleges would be able to take this study abroad. Dr. Burriss affirmed this, and said that any student would be eligible. Regarding the rigor, Dr. Burriss noted that there will be pre and post-trip classroom sessions with analysis, reporting, and other academic activities. Dr. Burriss also noted that the course could be used by any given student for either the fine arts component of the Core or the global perspectives component, but not both. Dr. Lollar asked if it was the position of the senate that, if this passes, any college could design a study abroad for the Core. Dr. Waldron asked why such a course should be in the Core. Dr. Jordan expressed a concern whether this course, with a visit to only a single country, could be deemed sufficiently global to meet the criteria of the Core for international issues. Dr. Smith countered that in terms of getting a global perspective, there was nothing to compete with traveling abroad, and that it would provide our

students with a very powerful “globalizing” experience. Dr. Scartelli added that he believed this was true, and that in addition the course was designed in such a way as to require students contextualize their experience with respect to additional other cultures. Dr. Van Patten reported that these issues had been debated in GECAC and that they had come to the same conclusion, that the direct experience afforded by a study abroad provided an educational experience that rose to the requirements of the learning outcomes for the global perspectives component of the Core Curriculum, and they ensured that there was sufficient academic rigor built into the course. Dr. Udd also spoke in support, and expressed that every college should be creating a similar course for the global studies component. Dr. Ament reiterated her concern about inclusiveness, citing the expense to the student of such a course. Dr. Basel Saleh seconded this point, emphasizing that particularly in the Core Curriculum accessibility to all students should be a requirement for any course. Dr. Judy Guinan said she didn't understand the fairness concern. If there is a concern about fairness for study abroad courses, that concern applies equally to non-Core courses. Dr. Guinan also seconded the value of the experience for students. Dr. Mike Montgomery countered that the fairness issue is of greater concern for the Core, because the rhetoric surrounding the Core was that it would be a “common experience.” Dr. Smith replied that his understanding regarding the “common experience” rhetoric was that it applied to the CORE-prefix courses, but not to the Core as a whole, since not everyone will be taking calculus, biology, and so on; the commonality is in that first set of four courses, not overall. This perspective was seconded by Dr. Burris. Dr. Udd said that he very much sympathized with the accessibility issue, but that he felt the way to approach that issue is to get the university to step up with funding, not to limit the offerings to students. Dr. Saleh responded that when it comes to the Core, the issue of affordability just cannot be ignored. Dr. Hazleton noted that financial aid is available for study abroad, and that the cost of the course depends in part on faculty decision. Therefore, the only question we should be addressing is whether this course meets the requirements to be in the Core. Dr. Waldron noted that one of the rationales for reinventing the Core curriculum was that there were too many courses in gen-ed, and are we headed down that road again? Dr. Owen noted that a vote to continue would be required since the clock had expired. This vote was taken and the senate continued discussion. Dr. Spielman spoke in support of the motion on the grounds that it was the right level, met the requirements, and provided an opportunity for students in majors, like math, that don't have their own study abroad program, to get that valuable experience. Dr. Alexander said she didn't feel we should rely on financial aid since not all students want it and some students have already maxed it out with their basic personal and educational expenses. She also asked how many students are required to “make” a course for study abroad. Dr. Scartelli replied that the usual requirement is 15-20. He added that he doesn't believe affordability is an issue that should prevent this course being adopted for the Core. Dr. Burris responded to Dr. Waldron's point by noting that the current menu of courses for the Core is much smaller than the old gen-ed menu. Dr. Steve Lerch responded to Dr. Alexander's question about the minimum number of students, saying that there was some flexibility, and that there are some variables, but that the usual minimum number was ten students. Dr. Owen, noting that no further discussion was offered,

called for the vote. The motion was carried on a division of the house.

10. The Motion to amend the Withdrawal Policy was taken from the table. Dr. Lerch rose to note that the Student Government Association was in favor of shortening the deadline to 10 weeks rather than the 8 weeks specified by the motion. Without further discussion the motion carried on a voice vote.
11. The Motion for Exceptions to Academic Suspensions was taken from the table. Without discussion the motion was carried on a voice vote.

IV. New Business

1. A Motion from the Academic Policies and Procedures Committee for plus-minus grading was introduced. Dr. Waldron asked for a clarification about whether the motion was for undergraduate grading, graduate grading, or both. Dr. Owen replied that there was a mis-wording in the motion and that it does pertain to both. This change will be made in the language as a friendly amendment. The motion was then tabled for the next meeting.
2. A Motion from the Academic Policies and Procedures Committee for Revisions to the Incomplete Grading Policy was introduced and tabled for the next meeting.
3. Dr. Roann Burriss introduced a Motion for Student Evaluation of Faculty to standardize procedures. The motion was tabled for the next meeting.
4. A Motion from the English Department was introduced for access to data involved in designations of programs for possible elimination. Dr. Owen invited a motion to suspend the rules to consider the motion, and this was offered, seconded, and approved. Dr. Webster-Garrett spoke to the rationale for the motion, citing our responsibility to provide oversight of the processes being used to identify programs for expedited review. Dr. Smith asked for clarification from Dr. Templeton concerning the current availability of information. Dr. Templeton replied that her office was already working to make sure that all of the information being used was available to faculty. Dr. Call asked whether conversations between the president and the provost about restructuring of academic affairs falls under the intent of the motion. Dr. Lollar noted that presidential working papers are confidential. Dr. Templeton said that she doesn't have any such documents. Dr. Owen said that he will raise the issue with the provost. Dr. Waldron noted that when she was on the Academic Program Review Committee the data provided to the committee was overwhelming, and that usually nothing came of it. However, her experience was that the committee always acted in good faith. It did not appear to her that the recommendations of the committee were often acted upon. She did not feel there was any need to suggest that the committee couldn't be trusted to be transparent. Dr. Smith suggested that the motion goes beyond the data used within the committee, and speaks to how the programs chosen for review were selected, and what criteria was used. Dr. Owen noted that much of this information was already contained in his written report. Dr. Alexander said that she was very interested in learning how it is that her department [Foods and Nutrition] is always getting flagged for review. Dr.

Owen noted that what the senate will receive is the results of the votes of the APR committee. The question was called and that motion was carried. The main motion was then carried on a unanimous voice vote.

V. Announcements

1. Dr. Owen announced that our next meeting is scheduled for March 26th.

VI. Adjournment

1. The meeting was adjourned at 5:13 pm.

**Radford University Faculty Senate
Meeting Minutes
April 2, 2009**

Members Present: Dr. Anne Alexander, Dr. Suzanne Ament, Dr. Roann Barris, Dr. Jack Brockway, Dr. Jack Call, Mr. Timothy Channell, Dr. Iain Clelland, Dr. I-Ping Fu, Dr. Gerald Gordon, Mr. Anthony Guest, Dr. Judith Guinan, Dr. D. Gumaer, Dr. Vincent Hazelton, Dr. Maung Htay, Dr. Mary Lalone, Dr. Steve Lenhart, Dr. James Lollar, Ms. Deborah McLaughlin, Dr. Garth N. Montgomery, Dr. Michael Moore, Dr. Stephen Owen, Dr. Tammy Robinson, Dr. Basel Saleh, Dr. Wayne Saubert, Dr. Gary Schirr, Dr. B. Sidney Smith, Dr. Laura Spielman, Dr. Angela Stanton, Dr. Jenessa Steele, Dr. Sarah Strauss, Dr. Patti Talbot, Dr. Lynne Taylor, Dr. Edward Carter Turner, Dr. Edward Udd, Dr. Jeffrey Vanlooy (sub Roth), Dr. Susan Van Patton (sub O'Bannon), Dr. Craig Waggaman (sub Jordan), Dr. Claire Waldron, Dr. Erin Webster Garrett, Dr. Joseph Wirgau, Dr. David Zuschin

Members Absent: Dr. William Flora, Dr. Kay K. Jordan, Dr. Teresa O'Bannon, Dr. Richard Roth, Dr. David Sallee, Dr. Reginald Shareef

Guests Present: Dr. Wilbur Stanton.

I. Call to Order and Approval of Minutes

1. Dr. Owen called the meeting to order at 3:33 pm.
2. The minutes of the February 26th meeting were approved.

II. Reports and Announcements

1. Dr. Owen announced that WebCT is disappearing as of 2012. There is currently a committee on campus looking into options for a replacement. Krista Terry is the person to contact about that. Dr. Owen also reported that he was asked by Sharon Hartline to remind everyone that on April 6 and April 7 there will be meetings discussing how to integrate various content areas into the 200-level Core Curriculum courses. Anyone who is interested in that should attend.
2. Dr. Stanton wished to give some background on program review. He reviewed the history and noted that SCHEV mandated program review in 1996. The program review procedures we follow were created then and revised in 2003, and there was an expectation that there would be ongoing revisions every year. Some programs have been reviewed on a 5-year cycle, and some more frequently. The time has come, after 5 years, to review the procedures again, and the provost has asked the committee to do this. However, the downturn in the economy has intervened. The provost reviewed his response and his notifications to the colleges to examine ways to save money by increasing efficiency, including reducing some programs to strengthen others. The actual budget notification of a 15% reversion came in mid-December, and the provost again notified the deans of the need to examine all programs carefully to find ways of saving money. He also held forums and spoke to the senate about what was happening with the budget and his intentions regarding how to respond to the

reversion. He has found ways of saving sufficient money without actually cutting any programs, but this does not mean that program review is no longer necessary. He expressed his concern about preventing programs from ending up on a SCHEV hit-list, so he wants to ensure that programs that need support get it. He emphasized the importance of getting faculty input during this time. The provost then turned to a second matter, announcing that there would be money available for enhancements around campus, including for the Covington Center, to support the Core Curriculum development during the summer, manikins for the nursing program, travel funds for students presenting research, to put an automated dome on the Sale Selu observatory, and to provide \$500,000 for summer research grants for faculty. The provost ended his remarks by saying that he thought the budget forum held most recently had been very productive, and he invited faculty present to ask any questions they liked. Dr. Smith asked how many of the program under expedited review had not been reviewed within the previous three years. Dr. Stanton responded that when the budget crisis arose, everything that fell below a certain level on the SCHEV metrics was put back on review regardless. Dr. Templeton showed Dr. Smith a table with that information that indicated that three of the programs were reviewed in 2003/2004, and that all of the remaining had been reviewed since the fall of 2005. Dr. Webster-Garret noted that some programs under review had just been reviewed, such as the interdisciplinary minors, in fact had literally just gotten their report back. Dr. Stanton responded that when they were reviewed previously he had not noted their resource needs, and that he thinks he knows what they need, but he wanted someone else to review it also. Dr. Ament then asked whether the provost could provide the rationale for moving the handling of foundation scholarships from the foundation office to the office of financial aid. The provost responded that he felt it was better for people who could evaluate the students from an academic viewpoint to be making the decisions about awards. Dr. Lerch added that some scholarships were offered to highly qualified students to entice them to RU. Dr. Udd remarked that the time-frame for this review has been very stressful. Dr. Stanton replied that there is budgetary pressure that made the shortened time-frame necessary. Dr. Alexander asked whether this new process would be the standard for programs for the next five years, and the provost said no. She then asked if those that have been under expedited review will get another opportunity to go through normal review. The provost said yes, unless the program is eliminated. In particular, any restructured programs would be on a schedule for review. The current process was focused solely on viability according to SCHEV standards. Dr. Alexander noted that "enhance" had been an option for previous reviews, and wondered if that would be an option in the future, and the provost said it would be. Dr. Alexander noted that her program, Foods and Nutrition, had met all of the SCHEV viability standards. The provost said that he wanted to be sure that programs that were close to the line were reviewed, and he felt it was important to use a single metric in choosing the programs to review. Dr. Alexander reiterated that her program had exceeded the criteria he had set for the review. The provost said that if a program had been mistakenly included on the list that he would look at that. Dr. Webster-Garret noted that there was some concern about the cutbacks on adjunct budgets and how that would affect department productivity and their evaluation in future reviews. The provost noted that he has had some concerns communicated to

him by students about class availability, and that his approach has been to look at courses with low enrollment, or that do not need to be offered every semester because they are electives, to save resources for classes that must be offered so students can graduate. Dr. Carter Turner mentioned a student who is a double major including religion, who had communicated a concern to him about the advisability of finishing her degree at RU if the program she was in was going to be discontinued. The provost replied that the student should stay at RU because every course that is needed for a program will continue to be offered until every current major has graduated. In the case of religion, the major had not been discontinued. Enrollments had been suspended pending reconfiguration. The provost said that he would be happy to talk to the student. Dr. Turner said that part of the concern was that if she goes on to graduate school she doesn't know if her major will have value if it is from a school that has discontinued the program. The provost said the concentration was not going to dropped, just reconfigured. Dr. Udd said he thought there had been a communication breakdown, and asked the provost if he had ideas about how to get a dialogue going in a way that everyone feels more included. The provost said that he had made a commitment at the start of this year to communicate more, and that he had held forums, put Q&A on the web site, talked to the senate at every meeting, etc., and asked for people to send him ideas on anything else he could do. The provost then excused himself.

3. Dr. Smith drew attention to his written report on the senate web site on reapportionment of the senate for the coming academic year. He noted that the numbers were based on the assumption that the restructuring already approved by the Board of Visitors will take place. In response to several question, Dr. Smith emphasized that the FSEC doesn't determine how many faculty are departmental representatives and how many are at large, but only how many total representatives are apportioned to each college, and it is up to the colleges to run their internal elections as they see fit.
4. Dr. Udd on behalf of the Campus Environment Committee drew attention to their report summarizing the written comments in the faculty survey conducted in 2008 that is available on the senate web site. He noted that the delay in bringing this report was a consequence of the press of other business the committee's members had to cope with this year. The committee was careful to protect the identities of commentators by classifying the comments as positive or negative and arranging the aggregate numbers by category of question. Dr. Owen noted that the survey for this year would be implemented in April.
5. Dr. Barriss reported on behalf of the Faculty Issues Committee that the motion introduced at the last meeting and the motion to be introduced at this meeting were essentially the same, except that the new motion calls for a change to the handbook. She asked if the new motion could be considered in place of the current motion. Dr. Owen replied that it would be necessary to withdraw the first motion, introduce the second motion, and give senators the opportunity to review the new motion.
6. Dr. Angela Stanton reported on behalf of the Governance Committee that the dean's evaluations are ready to go.

III. Old Business

1. The motion for Plus/minus Grading was taken from the table and discussion ensued. Dr. Hazleton spoke against the motion on the grounds that it “makes a mud puddle into a swamp” by making a simple system that has worked for many years more complex. He noted that one of his colleagues at an institution where this change was made reported that there was grade inflation as a consequence and far more student complaints. He also doubted the justifications offered for the motion, and wondered if the vote really had been overwhelming in the committee bringing the motion. Dr. Smith responded that he was the senate representative on the Academic Policies and Procedures Committee and that the vote was in fact unanimous. He also noted that the motion does not require any faculty member to use plus/minus grading. Also, many feel that contrary to Dr. Hazleton's suggestion plus/minus grading would reduce rather than increase student complaints. Dr. Waldron asked if an instructor's choice to use or not use plus/minus grading would be grounds for student grade appeals. Dr. Lerch said that this would not be the case. Dr. Lerch also reported that the SGA was not in favor of plus/minus grading for fear that it would devalue the standing of our students with outstanding grade point averages. Dr. Jack Call spoke in opposition, saying that when he taught at an institution that had plus/minus grading he got many more student complaints. Dr. Lollar affirmed this from his own experience. In response to a question from Dr. Saleh, it was affirmed that the pluses and minuses would appear on student transcripts. In response to a question from Dr. Ament, Dr. Lerch reported that about three-quarters of our peer group uses plus/minus grading, and that while many schools had gone to plus/minus grading, none had gone back and dropped plus/minus grading. Dr. Guinan reported that her constituents in the College of Science and Technology were generally in favor of plus/minus grading, but that some junior faculty were concerned about the consequences of their choice to use or not use plus/minus grading on their student evaluations. Mr. Channell questioned the fairness to the student of different professors using different systems. Dr. Barris noted that different instructors use different grading scales, and that this is part of academic freedom. Students should not have an expectation of uniformity of grading practices. Also, different subjects are bound to be graded differently. The question was called, and the motion was defeated on a voice vote.
2. The motion on the incomplete grading policy was taken up. Dr. Udd raised a concern about the time table for incompletes for students on internships whose grade cycle is out of sync with normal semesters. Dr. Lerch said that he thought that such cases would be treated as exceptions to the policy in the normal way allowed for in the wording of the new policy. The question was then called, and the motion was carried on a voice vote.
3. A motion was offered to extend the meeting beyond 4:40, and was carried on a voice vote.

4. The motion for student evaluation of faculty was then taken up. In response to questions by Dr. Webster-Garrett and Dr. Van Patten, it was reported that there would be ways to increase the available space for comments. The motion was then carried on a division of the house.

IV. New Business

1. A motion from the Faculty Senate Executive Council calling for a recommendation to the provost that all programs identified for expedited review be continued was introduced by the senate secretary and tabled.
2. A motion from the Faculty Senate Executive Council directing the establishment of an ad hoc investigative committee was introduced by the senate secretary and tabled.
3. A motion to clarify handbook language on annual chair evaluations was introduced by Dr. Angela Stanton on behalf of the Governance Committee and tabled.
4. A motion to clarify handbook language on quadrennial chair evaluations was introduced by Dr. Angela Stanton on behalf of the Governance Committee and tabled.
5. A motion to clarify handling of annual chair evaluation letters was introduced by Dr. Angela Stanton on behalf of the Governance Committee and tabled.
6. A motion to clarify handling of quadrennial chair evaluation letters was introduced by Dr. Angela Stanton on behalf of the Governance Committee and tabled.
7. A motion for review of admissions criteria was introduced on behalf of the Campus Environment Committee and tabled.
8. A motion regarding student evaluations was introduced by Dr. Roann Barris on behalf of the Faculty Issues Committee and tabled.
9. A motion for the course ENGL 200 was introduced on behalf of the Faculty Senate Executive Council and tabled.
10. A motion for the President's Climate Commitment was introduced on behalf of the Faculty Senate Executive Council and tabled.

V. Announcements

1. Dr. Owen announced that our next meeting is scheduled for April 9th.

VI. Adjournment

1. The meeting was adjourned at 5:02 pm.

Radford University Faculty Senate
Meeting Minutes
April 9, 2009

Members Present: Dr. Anne Alexander, Dr. Suzanne Ament, Dr. Roann Barris, Ms. Margaret Bassett (sub Strauss), Dr. Jack Call, Dr. Iain Clelland, Dr. Don Davidson (sub Saubert), Dr. William Flora, Dr. I-Ping Fu, Dr. Gerald Gordon, Mr. Anthony Guest, Dr. Judith Guinan, Dr. Vincent Hazelton, Dr. Corey Herd (sub Waldron), Dr. Rhett Herman (sub Brockway), Dr. Bill Hrezo (sub Shareef), Dr. Maung Htay, Dr. Kay K. Jordan, Dr. Mary Malone, Dr. Steve Lenhart, Dr. James Lollar, Ms. Deborah McLaughlin, Dr. Garth N. Montgomery, Dr. Michael Moore, Dr. Teresa O'Bannon, Dr. Stephen Owen, Dr. Tom Pierce (sub Steele), Dr. Richard Roth, Dr. Basel Saleh, Dr. David Sallee, Dr. Gary Schirr, Dr. William Scott (sub Gumaer), Dr. B. Sidney Smith, Dr. Laura Spielman, Dr. Angela Stanton, Dr. Patti Talbot, Dr. Brett Taylor (sub Wirgau), Dr. Lynne Taylor, Dr. Robert Trent (sub Channell), Dr. Edward Carter Turner, Dr. Susan Van Patton (sub Udd), Dr. Craig Waggaman (sub Jordan), Dr. Erin Webster Garrett, Dr. David Zuschin

Members Absent: Dr. Jack Brockway, Mr. Timothy Channell, Dr. D. Gumaer, Dr. Tammy Robinson, Dr. Wayne Saubert, Dr. Reginald Shareef, Dr. Jenessa Steele, Dr. Sarah Strauss, Dr. Edward Udd, Dr. Claire Waldron, Dr. Joseph Wirgau

Guests Present: None.

I. Call to Order and Approval of Minutes

1. Dr. Owen called the meeting to order at 3:31 pm.
2. The minutes of the April 2nd meeting were approved.

II. Reports and Announcements

1. Dr. Owen asked for a motion to conduct today's votes by secret ballot. The motion was made and seconded, and passed by a voice vote.

III. Old Business

1. The Motion for Continuation of All Programs Identified for Expedited Review was taken from the table. Dr. Smith read the motion. Dr. Jim Lollar asked what specific aspects of internal governance were not met by the expedited review. Dr. Smith referred him to the statements in the rationale. Dr. Lollar noted that when he was on the Academic Program Review Committee they changed the guidelines. Dr. Owen responded that he was a current member, and that as a point of information the current committee did not vote on the expedited program review criteria or process. Dr. Jordan said she believed that the truncated time-frame created a lack of due process, noting the very short notice that many programs received to defend their programs, that they were not furnished with accurate information, and that with so little time they couldn't do the research to correct the misinformation. In response to a question from Dr. Lollar, Dr. Owen noted that the information used in the expedited review was the same for programs of the same type. Dr. Jordan noted that the

information used for the expedited review was not that same as that used for ordinary reviews, and that programs were responding to their most recent recommendations from program review when they had to drop what they were doing to respond to this one. Dr. Alexander noted that the data that was used to put Foods and Nutrition under review was erroneous. Dr. Lollar asked if she had received a response from the provost on that issue, and she said she was still waiting for his complete response. No other comments were offered, and voting commenced. Dr. Smith collected the ballots and he and Dr. Jack Call tabulated the ballots. The motion was declared to have passed with 36 yes votes and 6 no votes.

2. Statements were offered on behalf of the following programs: Anthropology (Dr. Paula Brush), Appalachian Studies (Dr. Grace Edwards), Biology (Dr. Judy Guinan), Chemistry (Dr. Rhett Herman), Foods and Nutrition (Dr. Anne Alexander), Geography (Dr. Richard Roth), Mathematics (Dr. Laura Spielman), Peace Studies (Dr. B. Sidney Smith), Philosophy and Religion (Dr. Kay Jordan), and Physics (Dr. Brett Taylor). These statements are included as addenda to these minutes.
3. The Motion for an Ad Hoc Investigative Committee was taken from the table. Dr. Smith read the motion, and noted that the phrase specifying that the committee protect the confidentiality of those offering information had been deleted from the motion because it conflicted with Virginia's sunshine law. He then spoke on behalf of the motion, saying that we wanted to make sure that no one considered the motion in any sense his; that to his knowledge more than fifty faculty members had contributed to the discussions that produced the motion, and that dozens had asked to be named sponsors of the motion, including current and former chairs of departments, past presidents of the faculty senate, and others who are elders of our community whose only interest is the academic integrity of RU. He also referenced the Internal Governance Document's specification of the function and purpose of the faculty senate, and the passages in the senate's own constitution regarding its purview and methods, including the establishment of committees to achieve its purposes, saying that if the resolution is adopted the senate will be acting in accordance with its purpose and its procedures. Dr. Vince Hazleton spoke against the motion on the grounds that it is wrong to initiate an investigation into unnamed persons for unknown reasons, and that any allegations faculty have should be taken to the Faculty Grievance Committee (FGC), since that is the purpose of that committee. Dr. Bill Hrezo spoke in favor of the motion, saying that he had been at RU for 32 years, that he does not have a grievance, but that he feels strongly that morale, the level of trust, and the level of confidence in what is going on at the university is lower than he has ever seen it. He said that those who thought there were problems should vote for the motion, and those who think everything is fine should also vote for the motion. Dr. Dan Davidson spoke against the motion for several reasons. First, he believed that it was the job of the faculty senate executive council to resolve things with the administration, and he was unaware if such efforts had been made. He said the motion was like an indictment but without explicit charges and that as a lawyer he opposes that, that he believed it would try to find wrongdoing whether it was there to be found or not, that the committee would have no legal authority to require anyone to show up, so the only people who would show up would be those with an axe to grind.

There will be no privilege to protect the committee's members from charges of slander, and that in his opinion this would be a cross between a star chamber and a kangaroo court. Any activity by the committee would only embarrass the university. Dr. Kay Jordan noted that it is entirely possible that the committee may find that whatever allegations are brought before it are false, and in that case they would be able to clear the air. There is nothing in the motion that assumes that there is an indictment of anyone. Dr. Spielman introduced an amendment to change the requirement for membership on the committee to include any tenured professor, not necessarily a full professor. The amendment was seconded and discussion ensued. Dr. Smith noted that the reason for the original language was to ensure that the members of the committee would have great experience and wide knowledge of the university. Dr. Hazleton noted that there are plenty of lifetime senior associates. Dr. Easterling-Vaccare rose to speak in favor of the amendment, noting that in her college there were very few full professors. Dr. Ament spoke in favor of the amendment, expressing the concern that if a college with few full professors had none willing to serve, then that college would not be represented on the committee. No further discussion was offered, and the amendment passed on a voice vote without opposition. Discussion on the main motion resumed. Dr. Iain Clelland spoke in opposition to the motion, stating that he thought the first and fifth whereas clauses were contradictory, and asking why whatever the concerns were couldn't be handled by the executive council. Dr. Owen responded that in his role as faculty senate president he had been expressing the concerns of faculty on a very regular basis to both the president and provost, and that this would continue. He also noted that a great many faculty had brought support for the motion to the executive council, and that it had then voted to introduce it on its own behalf. Dr. Hazleton challenged Dr. Owen to answer yes or no whether he thought the allegations he was aware of were in fact grievable allegations, i.e., things that could be brought before the FGC according to its charge. Dr. Owen said that he thought the answer was yes, but noted that he has no experience of that committee. Dr. Ament asked why Dr. Clelland held that the first and fifth whereas clauses were contradictory. Dr. Clelland responded that the first speaks of serious allegations, but the fifth cautions against letting fear and rumor dominate our deliberations. Dr. Alexander asked why we could not discuss what the allegations are. She also noted that when she served on the grievance committee it was to hear concerns from individual faculty members. Dr. Smith noted that precisely because we don't wish to bring out allegations that may or may not have merit and create a stink about them (he noted the presence of the press) he believed we needed a group that could examine them and determine whether they have merit, so that we could then be dealing with a substantive report that could be deliberated upon by the senate. He noted that the committee might very well find that any allegations brought before it should be taken to the FGC and make that finding in its report to the senate. He also spoke to Dr. Hazleton's question for Dr. Owen, noting that of course some or all of the allegations may include matters that could be brought before the FGC, "just as skin cancer affects the skin – but you don't go to a dermatologist for the cure because the matter is more serious." He said that the purpose of the committee established by the motion is to deal with questions of governance, of how this university is being run. Dr. Hazleton reiterated that if shared governance is not being

followed it affects faculty, and that the FGC is obligated to do something about it, but that the committee in the motion has no authority, and its findings can be ignored. Dr. Davidson noted that if we are worrying about things being made public, the doings of this committee would be public and that the press can show up for their meetings too. Dr. Ament said that we had heard much with regard to the previous motion to indicate what some of the problems are, and that there is bad morale, and there is mistrust in the administration, and that this faculty is trying to take responsibility and ensure that RU is properly run. Dr. Saleh said that he and his constituents shared the concerns of faculty, but that they had problems with the way the motion was worded and constructed, that it seemed combative, that for example the title of the motion should specify “review of allegations” rather than “investigation of allegations” and that the word “credible” with respect to the allegations suggested an indictment of the administration. He also asked why the administration is not included among the membership of this committee. He said that his biggest concern was that the committee might establish a precedent that anytime faculty are unhappy with the administration there would immediately be some sort of investigation. In response to questions raised by Dr. Burriss, Dr. Smith said he was sure that some of the allegations that had been circulated belonged in front of the FGC, but that some had to do with the governance of academic affairs, and that the faculty have primary responsibility for academic affairs. If there is a problem in academic affairs, we have a responsibility to find out what the problem is, and that really is what this committee comes down to. Is there really something wrong in academic affairs? Let's find out. And if there is, let's find out what it is. And if it's a matter that should go before the FGC we'll send it there, and if it's a matter that we should debate and take action on in this body we'll do so. That's what this is really about. Dr. Hazleton responded that he would argue that any administrative action that interferes with the faculty's right to control academic affairs is a grievable action. Dr. Davidson reiterated that such matters should be handled by the executive council, rather than have a committee to air all of our dirty laundry that may or may not be valid. Dr. Lollar spoke at length, reminiscing about a prior investigation that led to a president moving on. He noted that when he came here the issue of how decisions were made was a concern. He said that to his knowledge the executive council did not receive specific allegations. Dr. Smith said “not formally.” Dr. Lollar reiterated that as a point of information the executive council did not have specific allegations on which to act. Not all members of the executive council were aware that this motion was going to be debated at their meeting on Tuesday. Dr. Lollar said he agreed that it was not clear that another committee was the solution. The solution lies in “true collaborative communication.” He said that he doesn't know how the committee will operate, and that such practical questions should be answered before we proceed. Who is included in “the administration” as construed by the motion? He said it's like approving a course when all we have is the title but no syllabus. He noted that the last time the senate brought a resolution about shared governance it was after many conversations and efforts. He said he didn't see how this committee was going to solve the real, longstanding problem. Dr. Alexander noted that since the executive council voted to introduce the motion, they evidently feel that other avenues have been exhausted. She also noted that the proposed committee includes representation from every college, and that the

executive council does not, that the sunshine laws apply equally to the executive council. She said it seemed to her the point of the motion was to take a look at what “everyone is hearing,” that something is wrong, and to bring information back to the senate so that the senate could take a look at the situation. Dr. Smith said in response to Dr. Lollar's points that the motion left it to the committee to determine the best way to conduct its business, that they could hear from any member of the greater Radford community, and that the “end game” is to report to the senate. He then called the question. The call for the question passed on a voice vote. Voting on the main motion proceeded. Dr. Smith and Dr. Call tabulated the results, and Dr. Owen announced that the motion had passed with 27 yes votes and 15 no votes.

IV. New Business

1. None.

V. Announcements

1. Dr. Owen announced that our next meeting is scheduled for April 16th and will take place in the Bonnie Auditorium.

VI. Adjournment

1. The meeting was adjourned at 4:50 pm.

The Anthropology major was eliminated prior to the expedited review process. While the program appeared on the list for expedited review, our only response was a statement saying the major had already been eliminated.

Paula S. Brush, PhD
Chair, Department of Sociology and Anthropology

Resolved that the Faculty Senate recommends the continuation of the post-baccalaureate Certificate in Appalachian Studies

Rationale for Continuation of the Certificate:

- The certificate offers the **only graduate-level program in Appalachian Studies in the Commonwealth of Virginia.**
- The certificate was established at the request of Southwest Virginia teachers in public schools and community colleges seeking an 18-credit advanced study program in Appalachian Studies. (SCHEV requires 18 credits in a specific discipline in order to teach in that discipline at college level.)
- The certificate program, therefore, supports *RU 7-17*'s core values of “being an **active partner in the viability of our region**” and providing “diversity and the richness it adds to our University.” It helps to fulfill Goal 3.2: “Develop a strong relationship between RU, the surrounding region, the Commonwealth, and the nation that **fosters academic opportunities**, good citizenship, ethical behavior, and civic engagement....”
- The certificate program began in summer of 2005 – thus **in existence only 3.5 years.**
- The program **takes 2 years to complete** for part-time students who typically enroll in only one course per semester, including summer.
- Since May of 2007, **8 students have completed the certificate** (verified by Registrar's office). **5** students are enrolled at present or for summer (verified by Graduate College). **2** additional requests for admission are pending in the Graduate College.
- The certificate is offered at **no additional cost** to the university. All courses, other than directed study, are already taught in disciplines supporting other degree programs.
- The university **realizes income** from certificate students who take additional courses beyond degree requirements to complete the certificate.
- Every certificate student **publishes** at least one original research document for inclusion in the Appalachian Archives in the Appalachian Regional Studies Center.
- Every certificate student is encouraged to **present research** in professional venues. To date, **85%** of those who have completed the program or are currently enrolled have presented in international, national, and regional professional conferences on behalf of Radford University.
- The certificate program is in the process of being restructured with expansion of course offerings in a wider array of disciplines and colleges.
- With support from the Dean of the College of Humanities and Behavioral Sciences, the Certificate in Appalachian Studies has potential to grow and increase its value to citizens of Southwest Virginia, particularly teachers in public and private institutions, health care providers, and social workers.

*Submitted by Grace Toney Edwards
Chair, Appalachian Studies Program
Director, Appalachian Regional Studies Center
Professor, Appalachian Studies and English*

April 7, 2009

Resolved that the Faculty Senate recommends the continuation of the undergraduate Appalachian Studies Minor

Rationale for Continuation of the Minor:

- The interdisciplinary Appalachian Studies Minor has been in place at Radford University since 1981. It has been revised as appropriate through the years and is currently being restructured by Appalachian Studies faculty following recommendations from Academic Program Review in 2008. The specific aim is to strengthen the program and to increase the number of students completing the Minor.
- The Minor serves as a corollary to majors in a variety of disciplines and as an academic foundation for multiple outreach programs to the community and region.
- Virtually all courses serving the Minor may also be used either within major disciplines or as part of Core requirements. These courses are generally fully enrolled.
- Among the co-curricular programs that the minor enhances and interacts with are AASIS (Appalachian Arts and Studies in the Schools), the Highland Summer Conference, the Farm at Selu, the Appalachian Events Committee, the Appalachian Teachers' Network, Appalachian Folk Arts Festival, Appalachian Awareness Day, and others. These programs directly engage approximately 150 RU students per year, and through the outreach efforts they are part of, they influence hundreds more. All APST Minors participate in one or more of these programs.
- The Minor in Appalachian Studies supports RU 7-17's core values of "being an active partner in the viability of our region" and providing "diversity and the richness it adds to our University." It helps to fulfill Goal 3.2: "Develop a strong relationship between RU, the surrounding region, the Commonwealth, and the nation that fosters academic opportunities, good citizenship, ethical behavior, and civic engagement...."
- The APST Minor also supports RU 7-17's Goal 3.1 regarding the fostering of international relations. Because of close cultural ties among Scotland, Northern Ireland, and Appalachia, these are the international cultures APST students have studied most closely and have visited most often in study abroad programs. They also have the privilege of learning from international visitors on the RU campus. Two projects are currently underway in Appalachian Studies to bring international scholars and artists to RU during the 2009-2010 academic year.
- Every APST Minor publishes at least one original research document for inclusion in the Appalachian Archives in the Appalachian Regional Studies Center.
- Every APST Minor is encouraged to present research in professional venues. As an example of this process in action, on March 27-29, 2009, 23 Radford University students presented research at the annual national Appalachian Studies Association Conference. All students currently enrolled in the APST Minor were part of the various presentations.
- With support from the Dean of the College of Humanities and Behavioral Sciences, the interdisciplinary Appalachian Studies Minor has potential to grow and increase its value to Radford University students as they seek ways to navigate local to global cultures.

*Submitted by Grace Toney Edwards
Chair, Appalachian Studies Program
Director, Appalachian Regional Studies Center
Professor, Appalachian Studies and English
April 7, 2009*

Biology Department Resolutions
4/8/09

Resolution 1: The Department of Biology supports the continuation of majors in the basic sciences of biology, chemistry, geology, physics, and mathematics.

Resolution 2: The Department of Biology encourages interdisciplinary teaching and scholarship, both within and among departments, but only in ways that maintain the intellectual integrity of the independent disciplines of biology, chemistry, geology, physics, and mathematics.

Rationale: Successful collaborations involve teamwork among specialized researchers. Thus students must receive specialized training before they can apply this training to interdisciplinary pursuits. The Sciences at Radford University have a long history of cooperation in interdisciplinary projects, but the impetus has always come, as it should, from the faculty. The University is encouraged to support these collaborations by purchasing equipment and supplies that meet the needs of researchers from collaborating departments.

Although the Chemistry Program has been recommended for continuation by the Expedited Program Review Committee, a restructuring of the program has been mandated by the Board of Visitors and includes the dissolution of the current Chemistry and Physics Department and merger of the Chemistry program with the Biology Department.

In 1995, the Vice President of Academic Affairs recommended the merger of the Chemistry and Physical Science Departments to form the Department of Chemistry and Physics. After many weeks of faculty input and debate, all parties involved decided that this combination of programs would better serve our students. Only after a faculty vote in each Department did this merger move forward.

Contrast this with the current merger of the Biology and Chemistry Departments where not one meeting between Department Chairs or faculty ever occurred to discuss the negative impact such a move would have on each program. While the Chemistry Department fully supports interdisciplinary work and strong collaborative teaching and research efforts between programs, it is unanimous in its support for the continuation of independent science programs in Physics, Geology, Chemistry and Biology. Of particular note is the importance our program places on the continuation of the Physics program which provides the foundation our students need for success in Chemistry.

Statement to the Faculty Senate about Foods and Nutrition

Although the faculty in Foods and Nutrition, do not believe that our program statistics failed the benchmarks set by RU, we filed the necessary documents for the Expedited Program Review.

- Using the data provided by RU:
 - 450% of SCHEV mandated enrollment in program
 - 184% of SCHEV mandated number of graduates
 - 27% credit hour production at upper division (SCHEV requires 25%)
 - According to Bureau of Labor Statistics, dietitians and nutritionist positions are expected to increase at about average (9-13%); job prospects are good.
- In the document sent to the program review committee, we gave evidence of our centrality to the RU mission and vision, our alignment with the strategic plan, our involvement in the Core Curriculum and our role in the greater good of society.
- Minutes from the Program Review Committee had a number of errors and did not reflect an understanding of the program:
 - It is our understanding that Foods and Nutrition is the only program at RU with our current CIP code. We are not aware of any program in CEHD with the same CIP code. However, the existing CIP code is out of date.
 - We have not discussed the possibility of connecting with other RU majors such as gerontology, since we are unaware of the gerontology major. However, we have been in discussion with faculty in ESHE about the possibility of sharing a few classes, possibly 2 or 3.
 - We are accredited for a 10 year time frame (not 1 year). We just completed the 5 year midpoint progress report which was signed by Dean Linville and Provost Stanton in the fall. We are waiting final approval from the accrediting body of that report.
 - Rationale for discussing the Human Nutrition, Foods and Exercise Department at VT was not given.
 - Information provided about the number of majors at VT as a comparison to RU is irrelevant.
 - The Human Nutrition, Foods and Exercise department at VT is a consortium of programs with different CIP codes.
 - It includes 5 undergraduate majors, several concentrations within those majors and 25 full time faculty members.
 - RU's FDSN program consists of a single concentration representing just one of those majors. We have distinguished our program with an emphasis in medical nutrition therapy, as opposed to a generalist or foodservice oriented program.

The faculty of the Foods and Nutrition program wish the following to occur:

1. Continue the realignment with ESHE. Although we were not involved in the decision initially, we are optimistic that this can be of mutual benefit.
2. Change the CIP code. We have requested this several times in the past, we are pleased that this is being considered now.
3. Approve the curricular changes, name change and institution of admission standards. These motions have passed at the college and some at the university level (others are pending). We ask that the provost approve them as well.
4. Allow us to re-fill the full time position which will be vacated this June. Although we understand other majors are down more than one faculty member, this represents 33% of our existing full time faculty positions. We have not been able to find adjuncts who meet all our criteria (MS and RD) and we are concerned what effect this will have on our accreditation. This year 43% of our credit hour production was taught by adjuncts, next year it will be even higher.

The Base Budget Adequacy Matrix projects five full time faculty are needed for our program; next year we will have two.

5. Support our efforts to investigate and potentially develop a 5 year masters degree. Our preliminary research suggests this could be accomplished without any additional faculty lines.

The **Department of Geography** promotes broad-based geographic awareness, global understanding, and proficiency in spatial analysis for all students. The inculcation of a global perspective among members of the R.U. community is cited in RU 7-17 as both a core value and a specific value under Goal 1.1. The Department further contributes to RU 7-17 goals:

- by teaching courses that help create in students “an awareness of and appreciation for cultural differences and an understanding of relationships among peoples and nations” (RU 7-17 Goal 1.2);
- by teaching courses that foster “cross-cultural awareness among all students” (RU 7-17 Goal 3.1);
- through scholarship (RU 7-17 Goal 1.2). Geography faculty are among the University’s most productive, as measured by professional contributions;
- through faculty research that expands “study abroad, [and]...international faculty research and scholarship collaboration...” (RU 7-17 Goal 3.1). Several faculty collaborate actively with colleagues abroad as exemplified by Dr. Ioffe’s numerous external grants to facilitate his work on the former Soviet Union; and
- by teaching and modeling civic engagement (RU 7-17 Goal 1.1: “Inspiring in all students a strong sense of values, ethics, and civic engagement”). *E.g.*, Dr. Roth has taken a leadership role in environmental problem-solving at local, regional, and state levels.

Elimination of the program would impoverish R.U.’s aspiration to be an outstanding liberal arts university, its ability to provide a rich core curriculum, its ability to offer students access to cutting-edge technologies and skills, and its ability to be an active partner in the development of Southwest Virginia.

Geographic understanding is foundational for a liberal education. Lack of geographic literacy among U.S. citizens of all ages, and especially the young, has been amply demonstrated and its effects are all too obvious, from misguided foreign policy decisions to flawed environmental policies.

Geography has a long-standing and regionally prominent program in geospatial techniques. Increasingly, other departments are making use of our expertise and course offerings in GIS and field research methods. Eliminating the program would decentralize technical education and likely lead to the duplication of efforts in several programs across the campus. Furthermore, Geography has a long-standing program in environmental studies, an area of increasing concern both among students and in the larger society.

Geography is unique as a discipline with its two inter-related subject areas, one a social science (human or cultural geography) and the other a physical/environmental science (physical geography). It is the holistic, integrative nature of geography that explains why geographic education resonates so much with the goals and objectives of RU 7-17 and why geography has more courses in general education than any other program. At a time when Geography’s value is growing across the country, the program should be enhanced rather than eliminated.

Statement by the Department of Mathematics and Statistics

The Department of Mathematics and Statistics supports the continuation of majors in the basic sciences (biology, chemistry, geology, and physics) and mathematics. The Department of Mathematics and Statistics supports efforts to encourage interdisciplinary teaching and scholarship, both within and among departments, in ways that maintain the intellectual integrity of universally recognized disciplines.

On behalf of the faculty in Peace Studies, I move that the Peace Studies Program be continued, and that it continue restructuring according to the recommendations of the Program Review Committee and Provost who assessed our extended program review study as of May 2008.

Glen Martin

Glen T. Martin

Professor, Philosophy and Religious Studies
Chairperson, Program in Peace Studies
Radford University
gmartin@radford.edu 540-831-5897
www.radford.edu/~gmartin fax 540-831-5919

"Resolved that: The Faculty Senate recommends that the major and minors in Philosophy and Religious Studies be continued. Philosophy and Religious Studies are the heart and soul of the liberal arts."

Kay

Kay K. Jordan, Ph.D.

Department of Philosophy and Religious Studies

Radford University

Vice-President, Radford University Faculty Senate

Treasurer, Radford University Chapter of the AAUP

Newsletter Editor, Virginia Conference of the AAUP

**Senate Response - Expedited Program Review
2008–2009**

Throughout the EPR process Physics, and presumably other programs, discovered many errors and problems with the way we were reviewed. While individual errors might be construed as simple mistakes and explained away, we believe that the large number of these problems indicates a pattern of deceit on the part of the administration to do what they want without the appearance of impropriety.

1 Expedited Program Review

Physics was given its own CIP code for majors in 2006. Each program is allowed a 5-year period in which to prove themselves as a viable and crucial program to the University. The most recent program review was completed in 2007, one year after the program gained its CIP code. The program was then put under Expedited Program Review, primarily for not satisfying the 150% of the number of graduates SCHEV states is “viable.” Regardless of the fact that the Committee used a binary ranking for this guideline (5 points if you made it, 0 if you didn’t), we feel there were many mistakes in putting us into this category:

- In the second public forum, it was stated that physics received a 7 on the scoring of these viability guidelines and that 8 was the value needed to be counted as viable. This is false as physics received a 4. This gave the attendees the impression that physics just missed being viable and were not in trouble as a major.
- Of those points that we missed, 5 were from the number of graduates. It is obvious that we do not meet the new guidelines put in place this previous summer of 9, but we had been satisfying the guideline of 8 up to that time. In addition, the national average for institutions which only offer Bachelor’s degrees in Physics is currently 5.2 graduates per program based on the American Institute of Physics data referenced below. RU’s Physics program clearly exceeds this number.
- They gave us no points for job prospects when this is incorrect and the Bureau of Labor Statistics, which they claim to have used, predicts for 2006-2016 a 6.8% growth for “physicists.” This classification represents primarily faculty positions and doesn’t include the jobs our students actually get in areas such as teaching, environmental engineering, and work at national laboratories. A large fraction of our graduates go to graduate school as well in preparation for professional positions in research and academia. The American Institute of Physics shows the employment statistics for Bachelor’s classes from 2005 and 2006 (the most recent data available) and the fields their jobs are classified in here:

<http://www.aip.org/statistics/trends/highlite/emp2/figure6.htm>

They also have a partial list showing who in the Commonwealth is hiring physics majors here:

<http://www.aip.org/statistics/trends/states/virginia.html>

You can find the information from the Bureau of Labor Statistics at

<http://www.bls.gov/emp/emptabapp.htm>

Physics majors, both nationally and locally, are very versatile and work in a large number of STEM fields. If the APRC was not able to find this information, the program would have been pleased to provide the information and additional comments concerning the employment and schooling of recent graduates.

- During the EPR, the APRC seemed to discount second majors as compared to first majors. We argue that those majors should count equally and SCHEV agrees. In SCHEV’s own document in section V. B. it explicitly states :

“In the case of double majors, enrollments and graduates may be counted in both programs.”

The document can be found at:

<http://www.schev.edu/AdminFaculty/ReviewPublicAcademicProg.pdf>

- Members of the APRC explicitly stated that SCHEV's visit in the fall explicitly targeted the program as being non-viable. In conversations with SCHEV, we were told that even during the last visit, we were not targeted. If SCHEV is targeting non-viable programs, then there are an additional 18 programs in the Commonwealth which do not satisfy SCHEV's viability guideline for graduates (based on numbers from the American Institute of Physics from the 2006–2007 year - this data can be found at

<http://www.aip.org/statistics/trends/reports/physrost.pdf>

These programs include schools such as George Mason which has a far larger faculty. Is it likely that SCHEV is targeting all of these programs in the state for elimination or restructure?

- Immediately following the Monday program review meeting, the Dean contacted the Program and told us that he was changing his recommendation from “continue” to “reconfigure continue.” As stated in the meeting, the Dean stated that his reasoning was the low number of graduates. The department currently has 6 graduates slated for the academic year. When questioned further, the Dean stated, “The data that I received about May’s graduates applications being just 5 is not a promising trend. A further analysis reveals there are 10 majors at the junior level. That’s not promising either. So I’m looking at 2 more years of downward projections.” The Dean’s comments don’t include a summer graduate. When considering next year’s graduates, he notes that there are 10 at the junior level. When these graduate, that year will satisfy the SCHEV viability guidelines. Note the use of “when.” The program loses majors at the freshman and sophomore level. Students who stay with the major until their junior year are very unlikely to change their major as they have made it through the initial difficult classes and will be able to succeed in the rest of their coursework and graduate. Again, any discussion or investigation of enrollment trends would have made this clear.
- While SCHEV has the number of graduates as a guideline, there are also other ways that a program that is not viable by that single standard, can be considered a vital part of the University. The other items which can indicate viability of a program are:
 - Number of students served which looks at the average FTE majors OR the average FTE enrollments in upper division courses - as noted in the APRC report, physics satisfied this requirement.
 - Program effectiveness which looks at the student achievement in terms of knowledge and skills, graduate school acceptance rates, or other evidence. As shown in the Expedited Program Review document, the RU physics program graduates more students with Bachelor’s degrees per faculty member than any other institution in the Commonwealth. From the 2007 Program Review, the programs at peer institutions are also less productive except for the University of Wisconsin, River Falls.
 - Budgetary considerations can be used to determine whether the program involves a significant cost to support the program. The cost data provided to the APRC shows that the majority of the programs undergoing Expedited Program Review cost more per graduate than Physics. The administration has stated repeatedly that this process is not related to the budget.
- Even if a program does not meet any of these viability standards, an institution may request that a program be exempt. In particular, if the program is central to the institution’s mission, then it can be held exempt. The Physics program is vital to the institution as the administration has said itself:
 - As noted by the administration, President Obama specifically noted that the country needs to promote and improve STEM programs and encourage more students to enter these fields.
 - As noted in the Core Curriculum in the Core B requirements and the inclusion of Physics and Astronomy.
 - As espoused in the values espoused in the 7-17 Strategic Plan which encourages the institution to bring in and graduate higher quality students. Our current graduates are in jobs working at national research laboratories, teaching physics and other sciences in schools throughout the Commonwealth, and at graduate schools such as Cornell studying physics and the University of Arizona studying astronomy at one of the very best schools for astronomy in the country to name only a few.

- As stated in the 7-17 Strategic Plan to have all programs which can be accredited do so. The lack of a physics major may affect the likelihood of such accreditation. Professional programs to be developed at the institution such as Pharmacy and Physical Therapy will look weaker if the institution doesn't have a Physics program.
- When comparing RU to any of our peer institutions, top Master's-granting universities, or any of the other top 50 programs in the US News & World Reports college rankings, all of them except small private institutions have a physics major. The elimination or restructuring of such programs would diminish, or end, efforts to make RU a leading Masters-granting university (a centerpiece of the Strategic Plan). Current leaders among Masters-granting institutions universally offer and support such programs – eliminating them at RU is tantamount to refusing to compete with such universities.

2 Restructuring and What It Means

When the program was told it would be separating from Chemistry and moving into the new school, there was no talk of losing the major. The combining of the programs into the new school was decreed and we had very little input or choice in the matter. The reason given was that it was a matter of saving money by reducing the support personnel for the involved programs. At the time of the writing of this document, there has been no explicit discussion about how these programs will be combined. What we've been told so far is that the combined programs will be put under a single CIP code with which all new majors would graduate. When we asked, it was not clear that this is even possible and we have seen no documentation from the administration suggesting this is possible under SCHEV nor that we can even create our own CIP code. In addition, if said programs are to be combined under a single CIP code, the concentrations within that code must share 25% of the major requirements. While this would not be a significant problem with Physics and Geology, there is not a clear manner in which Geography could be combined with these two.

**Radford University Faculty Senate
Meeting Minutes
April 16, 2009**

Members Present: Dr. Anne Alexander, Dr. Suzanne Ament, Dr. Roann Barris, Ms. Margaret Bassett (sub Strauss), Dr. Paula Brush, Dr. Jack Call, Dr. Iain Clelland, Dr. Don Davidson (sub Saubert), Dr. William Flora, Dr. I-Ping Fu, Dr. Gerald Gordon, Mr. Anthony Guest, Dr. Judith Guinan, Dr. Vincent Hazelton, Dr. Corey Herd (sub Waldron), Dr. Rhett Herman (sub Brockway), Dr. Bill Hrezo (sub Shareef), Dr. Maung Htay, Dr. Kay K. Jordan, Dr. Mary Lalone, Dr. Steve Lenhart, Dr. James Lollar, Ms. Deborah McLaughlin, Dr. Garth N. Montgomery, Dr. Michael Moore, Dr. Teresa O'Bannon, Dr. Stephen Owen, Dr. Tom Pierce (sub Steele), Dr. Richard Roth, Dr. Basel Saleh, Dr. David Sallee, Dr. Gary Schirr, Dr. William Scott (sub Gumaer), Dr. B. Sidney Smith, Dr. Laura Spielman, Dr. Angela Stanton, Dr. Patti Talbot, Dr. Brett Taylor (sub Wirgau), Dr. Lynne Taylor, Dr. Robert Trent (sub Channell), Dr. Edward Carter Turner, Dr. Susan Van Patton (sub Udd), Dr. Craig Waggaman (sub Jordan), Dr. Erin Webster Garrett, Dr. David Zuschin

Members Absent: Dr. Jack Brockway, Mr. Timothy Channell, Dr. D. Gumaer, Dr. Tammy Robinson, Dr. Wayne Saubert, Dr. Reginald Shareef, Dr. Jenessa Steele, Dr. Sarah Strauss, Dr. Edward Udd, Dr. Claire Waldron, Dr. Joseph Wirgau

Guests Present: None.

I. Call to Order and Approval of Minutes

1. Dr. Owen called the meeting to order at 3:30 pm.
2. The minutes of the April 9th meeting were approved with a minor edit.

II. Reports and Announcements

1. Dr. Owen reported the times and places of the upcoming meeting of the Board of Visitors and its committees.
2. Dr. Owen reported that he has forwarded the motion from the Academic Policies and Procedures Committee on plus/minus grading to the provost, with the senate's recommendation against adoption of the motion. Dr. Owen expects the provost to recommend that plus/minus grading be approved for the graduate school, but not for undergraduates.
3. Dr. Owen reported that next week is the final meeting of the current senate and the first meeting of the new senate will be on the 16th of April. The only business for the new senate will be election of officers.

III. Old Business

1. The Motion of the Governance Committee to Clarify Handbook Language of Chair/School Director Evaluations (annual) was taken from the table and passed on a voice vote.
2. The Motion of the Governance Committee to Clarify Handbook Language of Chair/School Director Evaluations (quadrennial) was taken from the table. Discussion ensued on the quadrennial evaluation process. Questions were raised about how can someone evaluate a chair on a quadrennial evaluation if they did not, for example, work at Radford for 4 years. The motion was tabled pending review of the quadrennial evaluation process.
3. The Motion of the Governance Committee to Clarify Handling of Chair/School Directors Evaluation Letters (annual) was taken from the table and passed on a voice vote.
4. The Motion of the Governance Committee to Clarify Handling of Chair/School Directors Evaluation Letters (quadrennial) was taken from the table and passed on a voice vote.
5. The Motion of the Campus Environment Committee on Review of Admissions Criteria was taken from the table and passed on a voice vote.
6. The Motion of the Campus Environment Committee for Timely Action on the Child-Care Report was taken from the table. Dr. Theresa Burris discussed the survey that was created. She and her group want the survey conducted. Theresa checked and said that the Provost does not need to approve this survey. Dr. Hazleton cautioned that there are other considerations other than what faculty and staff think about the need/desire for child care. Dr. Saleh expressed his feelings about the need for child care for faculty and staff and stated the survey was a step in the right direction. Paula Brush noted that we have a younger faculty to whom this issue may be more important. The motion passed on a voice vote.
7. The Motion of the Faculty Issues Committee for Student Evaluations was taken from the table. Dr. Barris noted that there was a substitution of language in the instructions to change the wording from "Return completed sheets to the faculty member administering the evaluation..." to "Return completed sheets to the person administering the evaluation...". The motion passed on a voice vote.
8. Motion of the General Education Curricular Advisory Committee for ENGL 200 was taken from the table. Erin Webster Garrett explained that this course was to reduce the number of offerings in the Core Curriculum; it will replace ENGL 201, 202 and 203. Suzanne Ament asked if creating this course would merge American, British and World Literature. Kay Jordan said that this would create a topics course that would provide a framework for which an instructor could use to teach in an area of interest. The motion passed on a voice vote.

9. The Motion of the Faculty Senate Executive Council for President's Climate Commitment was taken from the table. Steve Owen noted that this was forwarded from the Sustainability Committee. Discussion ensued about whether or not it was a good idea to commit to specific dates, especially since we're already doing many of these things, in tough economic times. Questions were asked about climate neutrality. The motion passed on a voice vote.

IV. New Business

1. A motion was introduced by the Faculty Issues Committee to revise the faculty handbook regarding the submission date for the Faculty Annual Report, shifting it to a couple of weeks after the start of the fall semester. A secondary motion to suspend the rules to allow immediate consideration of this motion was made and passed. Dr. Ament asked if this would change dates for when the chair's evaluation was due and Dr. Owen replied that the provost had signaled his willingness to adjust the timeline in accordance with this motion. The motion passed on a voice vote.
2. A motion was introduced by Dr. Hazleton for a resolution calling on the president of the university to prepare and submit a report on the status of shared governance. The motion was tabled until the next meeting.

V. Announcements

1. In response to a question from Dr. Ament, Dr. Owen noted that the deans of the undergraduate colleges would be holding the elections for the ad hoc committee, but that the elections may not be entirely completed by April 20th.
2. The Campus Environment Committee announced that the Faculty Morale Survey will be coming out in the next week.
3. Dr. Wirgau announced that the University Planning and Budget Advisory Committee is meeting regularly and working on generating ideas for spending the \$5.5 million in stimulus money Radford University anticipates receiving in the 2009-2010 academic year.

VI. Adjournment

1. The meeting was adjourned at 4:30 pm.