

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*

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.

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.