

**Radford University Faculty Senate
Committee Objectives
Academic Year 2008-2009**

Introduction

The following committee objectives have been developed by the Faculty Senate Executive Council. Numbers corresponding to an objective do not indicate its importance or priority. All objectives should be considered important, and the committee should attempt to accomplish all objectives. Also, these objectives are not intended to be all-inclusive – any committee member, other Senators, and the Faculty Senate Executive Council (FSEC) may refer other issues to the committee for consideration and action. Feel free to form sub-committees as needed to address specific objectives more expeditiously.

Campus Environment Committee

1. Re-administer the Faculty Survey in the spring semester, and make a report of the results to the Faculty Senate with a comparison to 2001 and last year's survey.
2. Provide a report to the Faculty Senate regarding current admission standards, student profiles, and current recruiting strategies.
3. Report to the Faculty Senate about existing policies regarding instructional space planning (cf. Building and Grounds Committee), the university's Master Plan (cf. 7-17 Strategic Plan), and identify criteria to guide decisions for future planning purposes.
4. Liaise with the University Committee on Childcare regarding the implementation and results of the Childcare Survey, and report to the senate.

Curriculum Committee

1. Select one member to serve on the Undergraduate Catalog Curriculum Committee.
2. Identify and report to the Faculty Senate curriculum implications of RU's 7-17 Strategic Plan.
3. Review the proposals for the University Core A courses and make a recommendation to the Faculty Senate.
4. Review current process used for the approval and awarding of academic credit for Study Abroad courses and programs and report to the Senate any changes needed to enhance programs and student participation.

Faculty Issues Committee

1. Review and report to the Faculty Senate the results from the Faculty Workload Study.
2. Conduct a faculty survey about and recommend changes to the following sections of the *Teaching and Research Faculty Handbook*:
 1. Faculty Evaluation, including the role of collegiality and other non-quantified criteria (§1.4.1);
 2. criteria and processes for promotion (§1.6) and tenure (§1.7);

3. processes for the selection of department chairs and school directors (§1.3.2);
 4. processes and criteria for the evaluation of department chairs and school directors (§1.4.2), including a review of how the chair/director's evaluation form corresponds to chair/director's duties (§4.2.3.1); and
 5. processes and criteria for faculty appeals (§1.8) and faculty grievances (§1.9).
3. Formulate a recommendation for the conduct of exit interviews of departing faculty by an appropriate academic office.

Governance Committee

1. Review and identify any needed modifications to the Faculty Senate Constitution and By-laws, including election processes, committee responsibilities, offices, etc.
2. Complete and report data pertaining to the annual evaluation of Deans.
3. In collaboration with the Provost, provide input to the revision of the university's Internal Governance policy and structure.
4. Review and Report on the development of the Adjunct Faculty Handbook.

Resource Allocation Committee

1. Working with the Provost and the Vice President for Finance and Administration, review the academic goals of RU's 7-17 Strategic Plan and provide recommendations to the Faculty Senate regarding priorities.
2. Working with the University Planning and Budget Committee and the Vice President for Finance and Administration, review and report to the Faculty Senate RU's budget allocations across divisions and colleges for 2003-2008, including a five year trend comparison.

Other Information

Please notify the Faculty Senate President and Secretary of meeting times and rooms for each committee.

At each Senate meeting, the Chair of the committee will be asked to provide a brief report on its most recent meeting, including issues currently being addressed, pending action items, and motions that need Senate review and action. Committee chairs will meet with the FSEC near the end of each semester and provide an update on the committee's current progress.

Please provide as much advance notice as possible to the Senate Secretary regarding motions, resolutions, etc., that you plan to introduce at a meeting. To submit a motion, please use the form posted on the Faculty Senate website. It is the responsibility of the committee chair to make a motion from the committee, and to remove it from the table when scheduled on the Senate Agenda.

If you have any questions regarding your committees, please let me know!

Steve Owen

ssowen@radford.edu

(540) 831-6786

307 Adams Street (next to the Bonnie), Office 6D

On Internal Governance at Radford University

Radford University has a strong commitment to collaborative governance among the constituencies of the University community. We believe in teamwork because the results are longer lasting and of higher quality than what one person can accomplish alone. There must be many leaders on a university campus, leaders who are visible, speak often to articulate both issues and values, stand publicly for what is important, and commit themselves to the overall welfare of the University community.

Through a collaborative governance process, individuals and the University can harmonize their goals and set a course for mutual achievement. The willingness to listen to all ideas, to respect competing concerns, to evaluate the merits of many alternatives, and to communicate helps build consensus.

A successful collaborative governance process enables the programs and services of the University to improve in an atmosphere of trust, respect, and open decision making among colleagues. It allows the University to address complex issues, to remain open to discovery, to adapt to changing needs.

(Source: Radford University Internal Governance System Document)

2008 Faculty Satisfaction Survey – Comments Summary

The following represents the Campus Environment Committee's content analysis of the **2008 Faculty Satisfaction Survey**. This survey was based on the objectives set for it by the Senate's Executive Committee during summer 2007. The survey tried to replicate as closely as possible the 2001 Faculty Satisfaction Survey. Of those who responded, 80 individuals made comments.

The initial numerical results were presented to the Faculty Senate in the spring of 2008. Due to an agenda dominated by the General Education Curriculum the reporting of the COMMENTS from this survey were delayed.

Categories were determined by the committee as being representative for the spectrum of persons/objects represented in the comments. As with most content analyses these categories and responses might differ with other raters. But they represent the consensus of the members of the Campus Environment Committee.

The contents were analyzed by identifying the positive and/or negative comments of each respondent's comment and the person/object of their comments. To give each respondent equal weight multiple comments per category were only counted once no matter how many times within a respondent's comments that individual has positive or negative comments written down. We did not attempt to quantify multiple positive or negative comments.

The comments were summarized as there was the expectation that respondents' identity would be kept confidential. By summarizing the comments and including only short excerpts any possible identification with an individual was further reduced.

UPPER LEVEL ADMINISTRATION

Comments About President

Positive comments – 0
Negative comments - 22

Doesn't communicate, micro-manages, "ineffective", "appalling lack of leadership", no vision, disconnected from the faculty, no background in academia and does not understand it, faculty feel "ignored and railroaded" concerning academic issues, turning Radford into a "corporate-structured trade school, "has cultivated a culture of fear", an "inclination to significantly increase the number of highly paid administrators at RU", "there are very serious communication issues that must be addressed", "has no clue what academic administration is about"

Comments About Provost

Positive comments – 5
Negative comments - 2

"Academics and that leadership is great", "I like Will Stanton..."

"micromanaging"

Comments About BOV

Positive comments – 0
Negative comments - 8

"R.J. Kirk is running the university", gen ed being "dictated from on high by the BOV", the administration is "catering" to the BOV

Comments About VPs

Positive comments – 0
Negative comments 2

VP of Admin and Finance has "more access to the President than the Academic Provost"

General Comments About the Administration:

Positive comments – 0
Negative comments - 16

lacks "true vision" in "gen ed issue", not collegial, governance is not transparent, needs to be streamlined, many faculty feel that the administration is "hostile" to the faculty, morale has never been lower, there has been "blatant manipulation of the governance by the administration" who disregard faculty and student input, "unaware and unappreciative" of faculty's efforts, administration is "top-heavy" and growing, "so centralized that it takes forever to get things done", "reasons for change are seldom communicated", Martin Hall is "out of touch and disconnected from the university community. "Radford University is a shambles"

COLLEGE AND DEPARTMENTAL ADMINISTRATION

Comments About Dean

Positive comments – 5
Negative comments - 2

faculty kept informed and have ability “to affect change” at department and school level.

Comments About Chair

Positive comments – 3
Negative comments - 1

supportive of faculty

Comments About the Department

Positive comments – 18
Negative comments - 1

“very collegial”, supportive, faculty have input in decision-making at this level, faculty feels loyal to department but not to RU and administration

Comments about the Faculty Senate

Positive comments – 0
Negative comments - 2

“too eager to give into demands of administration”, “total failure in the leadership of the Faculty Senate to act responsibly on behalf of the faculty”.

FACULTY LEVEL CONCERNS

Comments About Benefits/Salaries

Positive comments – 0
Negative comments - 11

adjuncts not offered health insurance, no insurance for domestic partners – “discriminatory” on marital status, orientation, gender, salaries not competitive, free or reduced tuition needed for spouse, children, despite survey showing RU faculty are underpaid, raises are still 2 – 4%, while the president gets bonuses larger than faculty make in a year.

Comments About Teaching Load

Positive comments - 0
Negative comments - 11

4-4 load too high, would leave university for lower teaching load, when will faculty workload be reduced?, workload limiting to productivity and negatively impacts job satisfaction

Comments About Funding/Resources

Positive comments - 0

Negative comments - 5

higher priority given to money concerns (“cheapness”) than to support of quality education, faculty has to supplement support from personal funds, funding lacking for summer scholarship

RADFORD UNIVERSITY BUREAUCRACY

Comments About RU Policies or Procedures

Positive - 0

Negative - 11

lack of input in dean hires; paperwork bottleneck on President’s desk, process for Gen Ed development needs “a more critical look...”, no incentive to donate to Foundation due to restrictive policies, RU is “red-tape happy”

Comments About Facilities/Computers

Positive – 1

Negative - 10

multi-media is “excellent”

shared offices, too many classrooms offline, classrooms inadequate, don’t have proper climate control, research laboratory space inadequate – too small and ill-equipped

Comments on Image/State of University as a whole

Positive comments – 2

Negative - 6

“Radford University has been very good to my program and me. I appreciate the opportunity to work at this fine institution”

No vision or leadership to move RU forward like JMU, Radford viewed as a “party” school by many students, gen ed courses too easy, community people who supported RU for many years have been “disenfranchised”.

Comments About the Survey Itself

Positive comments – 1

Negative comments - 11

“inadequate number/range of choices”, some questions out of university control – appear biased, difficult to maintain anonymity, ambiguous question, “I am concerned about my position if I answer the question above”

Other (include any other comments that seem valuable)

Positive comments – 1

Negative comments - 7

“Radford University has been very good to my program and me. I appreciate the opportunity to work at this fine institution”

“I will not answer above in fear of retaliation”

“too many slack and incompetent profs”

Radford University Faculty Survey Comparisons

Very Untrue	Untrue	Neither	True	Very True	Not Applicable
1	2	3	4	5	0

Question	Mean		Median	
	2001	2008	2001	2008
1 My work environment is collegial.	3.96	4.10	4.00	4.00
2 RU Provides good health benefits.	3.90	4.06	4.00	4.00
3 I feel a sense of loyalty to my department.	4.22	4.30	4.00	5.00
4 I am given the opportunity to participate in decisions that affect me.	3.36	3.25	4.00	4.00
5 I am kept well informed of matters important to faculty.	3.56	3.18	4.00	3.00
6 The university facilitates my professional development.	2.97	3.30	3.00	4.00
7 RU provides the equipment and materials needed to do my job well.	3.20	3.63	4.00	4.00
8 I am dedicated to my profession.	4.77	4.77	5.00	5.00
9 My office is adequate for my needs.	3.95	3.91	4.00	4.00
10 The classrooms where I typically teach are conducive to learning.	3.40	3.52	4.00	4.00
11 I feel appreciated by my department chair.	4.09	4.17	4.00	5.00
12 My dean facilitates the work and development of my department.	3.09	3.69	3.00	4.00
13 I am satisfied with my pay.	2.61	2.73	2.00	3.00
14 I find that my values and RU's are similar.	3.00	3.11	3.00	3.00
15 The future of RU is important to me.	4.24	4.43	4.00	5.00
16 I am happy with the leadership of the university.	2.49	2.26	2.00	2.00
17 I don't hear much complaining from my colleagues about the university.	1.99	1.99	2.00	2.00
18 Our administration does all it can to meet the needs of my department.	2.18	2.19	2.00	2.00
19 I feel that the RU administration values my opinion.	2.22	1.99	2.00	2.00
20 My job allows me to express my special talents.	3.87	3.81	4.00	4.00
21 RU is responsive to the needs of my family.	3.11	3.15	3.00	3.00
22 RU has family-friendly employee benefits.	3.39	3.35	4.00	3.00
23 RU offers programs to help invest/manage my finances effectively.	3.42	3.39	4.00	4.00
24 I feel a sense of loyalty to RU.	3.84	4.01	4.00	4.00
25 If I had it to do over again, I would not work for this university.	2.40	2.28	2.00	2.00
26 Morale among faculty is not a problem.	2.01	2.02	2.00	2.00
27 Overall, I am satisfied with my job.	3.43	3.51	4.00	4.00

Responses by Faculty Rank

Faculty Rank	2001	2008
Full Professor	102	85
Associate Professor	75	55
Assistant Professor	51	87
Instructor	45	57
No Response	43	25
Total Responses	316	309

Responses by Classification

Classification	2001	2008
Tenured	177	120
Tenure-Track	26	80
Special Purpose	13	29
Full-Time Temporary	12	5
Adjunct	37	43
No Response	51	32
Total Responses	316	309

Faculty Issues Committee, 2008/09

Members:

Dr. Anne Alexander
Dr. Suzanne Ament
Dr. Roann Barris (chair)
Dr. Iain Clelland
Dr. Patricia Easterling (fall)
Dr. Maung Htay
Dr. Kay Jordan
Dr. Jenessa Steele
Dr. Erin Webster-Garrett
Dr. David Sallee (spring)

Our objectives, as developed by the FSEC, asked for a review and report of the Faculty Workload study; a survey with subsequent recommendations for changes to the TRF Handbook concerning criteria used in faculty evaluations, promotion and tenure; evaluation of department chairs and school directors; and processes for faculty appeals and grievances. We were also asked to formulate a recommendation for conducting exit interviews of departing faculty. Shortly after this list of objectives was given to us, we were asked to create instructions for the administration of student evaluations of faculty and to develop a policy for dealing with compromised student evaluations (as a follow-up to our successful accomplishment in spring 2008 of passing a motion to require that student comments be linked to student numeric ratings).

For obvious reasons, we were not able to address all of these objectives. With respect to faculty evaluations, we did formulate a survey and send it to school directors, asking them to send it to department chairs. Our questionnaire asked if departments had a written description or elaboration of criteria used in evaluations which provided more information than what was included in the handbook, to send us a copy if it existed, to indicate if activities were weighted in any fashion, and to describe the method of sharing this material with faculty (assuming that it exists). It then included a set of questions about the process used in each department for the administration of student evaluations of faculty. I received replies from 15 departments. Without tabulating the data, it was easy to see that some departments relied solely on the description included in the faculty handbook whereas others had developed sophisticated systems for differentiating between a) types of activities and their relative importance for professional accomplishments; b) activities and weighted importance for the area of service; c) contributing weights of data for assessing teaching. In those departments which had developed rating scales, the material appeared to be distributed to all faculty. In departments which had not substantially altered the material in the handbook, there did not appear to be any attempt to distribute anything to faculty. I think we were all highly motivated to address this issue and consider approaches to a solution which would simultaneously acknowledge necessary differences across departments while at the same time provide greater comparability and consistency but could not given the truncated schedule of committee

meetings and the more immediate need of addressing student evaluations.

We did do the latter, using some of the material we had collected when it came to revising the handbook section on student evaluations. Our motion for a revision took into account the different procedures used, identified and eliminated both a lack of clarity in the language used in the handbook and some incorrect attributions (with respect to who was responsible for what), and most significant, developed a procedure for responding to the presence of compromised evaluations. The motion passed, bringing to a successful conclusion an issue which the committee had been dealing with for two years.

At the last minute, we were also asked to draft a motion for a handbook change with respect to the submission deadline for FARs. That was completed and passed.

Recommendations for next year's committee:

- to use the data collected about criteria for faculty evaluation, tenure and promotion and draft a revision or addition to the handbook which provides more specific instructions, perhaps including examples from other departments
- to return to the issue of FAR submission deadlines in light of the existing variation in the policy as currently written
- to follow up on the Faculty Workload study – I requested this material twice and never received a reply
- to address the objective related to policies for faculty appeals and grievances