

**Radford University Faculty Senate
Meeting Minutes
April 23, 2009**

Members Present: Dr. Suzanne Ament, Dr. Mary Atwell, Dr. Moira Baker, Dr. Roann Barris, Dr. Paula Brush, Dr. Iain Clelland, Dr. Farrell Doss, Dr. Patricia Easterling, Dr. I-Ping Fu, Dr. Kim Gainer, Dr. Mary Gibson, Mr. Anthony Guest, Dr. Judith Guinan, Dr. Jim Gumaer, Dr. Vincent Hazelton, Dr. Maung Htay, Dr. Kay K. Jordan, Ms. Deborah McLaughlin, Dr. Douglas Mitchell, Dr. Garth N. Montgomery, Dr. Michael Moore, Dr. Judy Niehaus, Dr. Alexei Orlov, Dr. Stephen Owen, Dr. Richard Roth, Dr. Helen Roybark, Dr. Basel Saleh, Dr. David Sallee, Dr. Gary Schirr, Dr. Reginald Shareef, Dr. B. Sidney Smith, Dr. Laura Spielman, Dr. Jenessa Steele, Dr. Patti Talbot, Mr. Kevin Tapp, Dr. Lynne Taylor, Dr. Edward Carter Turner, Dr. Ed Udd, Dr. Erin Webster Garrett, Dr. Joe Wirgau, Dr. David Zuschin

Members Absent: Dr. Skip Thompson

Guests Present: None.

I. Call to Order and Approval of Minutes

1. Dr. Owen called the meeting to order at 4:30 pm.

II. Reports and Announcements

1. None.

III. Old Business

1. None.

IV. New Business

1. Election of faculty senate officers was conducted. The results were:

President: Steve Owen

Vice President: Kay Jordan

Secretary: Sid Smith

At-Large: Tricia Easterling, Judy Niehaus

Parliamentarian: Dr. Mary Atwell

V. Announcements

1. None.

VI. Adjournment

1. The meeting was adjourned at 5:15 pm.

**Radford University Faculty Senate
Meeting Minutes
September 17, 2009**

Members Present: Dr. Suzanne Ament, Dr. Mary Atwell, Dr. Moira Baker, Dr. Roann Barris, Dr. Paula Brush, Dr. Farrell Doss, Dr. Patricia Easterling, Dr. I-Ping Fu, Dr. Kim Gainer, Dr. Mary Gibson, Mr. Anthony Guest, Dr. Judith Guinan, Dr. Jim Gumaer, Dr. Vincent Hazelton, Dr. Maung Htay, Dr. Kay K. Jordan, Ms. Deborah McLaughlin, Dr. Douglas Mitchell, Dr. Garth N. Montgomery, Dr. Michael Moore, Dr. Stephen Owen, Dr. Richard Roth, Dr. Helen Roybark, Dr. Basel Saleh, Dr. David Sallee, Dr. Gary Schirr, Dr. Reginald Shareef, Dr. Laura Spielman, Dr. Jenessa Steele, Dr. Elizabeth Alteiri, Mr. Kevin Tapp, Dr. Lynne Taylor, Dr. Edward Carter Turner, Dr. Ed Udd, Dr. Erin Webster Garrett, Dr. Joe Wirgau, Dr. David Zuschin

Members Absent: Dr. Iain Clelland, Dr. Judy Niehaus, Dr. Alexei Orlov

Guests Present: President Penelope Kyle, Vice President Norleen Pomerantz

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 10th meeting will be approved at the meeting on September 24th.

II. Reports and Announcements

1. None.

III. Old Business

1. None.

IV. New Business

1. Motion to suspend rules; motion carried
2. Motion carried by vote of 39 to 2.

On behalf of its co-sponsors, I move that the Faculty Senate pass the following resolution and that the Faculty Senate Executive Committee communicate this resolution, if approved, to President Kyle, Provost Stanton, Vice President of Student Affairs Pomerantz, and the members of the Board of Visitors, and further request that the President, Provost, Vice President for Student Affairs, and Board of Visitors take whatever actions they deem necessary to address this situation.

Resolution: The faculty of Radford University, while well aware of and concerned about the current economic constraints faced by the University, nonetheless wish to express their strong disapproval of the recent dismissal of New Student Programs staff. Whatever budget savings are claimed regarding this “reorganization,” the faculty are appalled by the sudden, insensitive, and brutal treatment of these colleagues of ours who have devoted years of service to the University. Having one week ago assured the Faculty Senate that all position changes or layoffs would be handled with sensitivity, respect, and compassion, the Radford University administration has, by its action, further undermined its credibility with the faculty. The behavior of the RU administration in this instance is a public embarrassment. Be it resolved, therefore, that the Radford University faculty strongly condemn that behavior and those administrators involved in this incident.

CO-SPONSORS OF RESOLUTION

Dr. Suzanne Ament, Senator At-Large Department of History

Dr. Mary Atwell, Senator At-Large Department of Criminal Justice

Dr. Moira Baker, Senator At-Large Department of English

Dr. Gwen Brown, Senator School of Communication

Dr. Paula Brush, Senator Department of Sociology

Dr. Tricia Easterling, Senator At-Large School of Teacher Education & Leadership

Dr. Kim Gainer, Senator At-Large Department of English

Dr. Judy Guinan, Senator Department of Biology and Chemistry

Dr. Mike Montgomery, Senator Department of History

Dr. Reginald Shareef, Senator Department of Political Science

Dr. Laura Spielman, Senator At-Large Department of Mathematics and Statistics

Dr. Skip Thompson, Senator Department of Mathematics and Statistics

Dr. Edward Udd, Senator Department of Recreation, Parks, and Tourism

Dr. Rick Van Noy, Senator Department of English

3. Statement by Dr. Kim Gainer

The resolution before us addresses not why the Office of New Student Programs was disbanded but the manner in which it was disbanded, so I will not ask why, in a year that retention is more important than ever, a successful retention program was disbanded.

Nor will I ask why, given that Mr. Dunn and Mr. Jacobsen will continue to draw salary and benefits for six months, the administration chose not to make use of their expertise during a period of orderly transition.

However, given that the Faculty Senate was assured only a week ago that separations would be handled humanely, with sensitivity and professionalism, I would ask why a gentleman with twenty-four years of service, a gentleman who built the Office of New Student Programs, and another gentleman who had a record of ten years of dedicated service to the university, were abruptly informed that they were being relieved of all duties.

I would ask why, in spite of the fact that they were to remain on the payroll for another six months, these gentlemen, who have served this university for a combined thirty-four years, found all their accounts frozen within minutes of being told that they were being put on administrative leave. Did they represent a peril so great to the university that they could not be permitted access to their RU Express and faculty meal plans for even one more day? Would there have been some danger to the university if they had been allowed unbroken access to the computer files that they will undoubtedly need in order to begin the process of seeking employment at universities that, it is to be hoped, will be more appreciative of their contributions than this one has been?

Why were Mr. Dunn and Mr. Jacobsen initially told that they had to clear their offices by 5:00 p.m. Monday? Why were they given only seven hours to remove all traces of, in one case, twenty-four years of service, in the other case, ten?

Why was it necessary for someone to confiscate Mr. Dunn's computer and office keys at 5:00 p.m. on Monday? After twenty-four years of trusting him with our freshman students, had he suddenly become untrustworthy?

Why was it necessary to deny Mr. Dunn the opportunity to meet with his UNIV 100 students, even if only to take his leave of them? Was this fair either to Mr. Dunn or to his students who have had their introduction to this university so abruptly interrupted?

I believe all of the above questions can be rolled into one. With apologies to Joseph Welch, has this administration no sense of decency?

In this instance, I believe that the answer is no, and for that reason I ask you to join the co-sponsors of this resolution in voting to condemn the precipitous and disrespectful treatment accorded to two individuals who have served the university far better than they have been served themselves.

4. Statement in Support of Resolution by Dr. Moira Baker

My fellow senators, I strongly support the resolution we have before us. I respectfully urge you, my honored colleagues, to do the same.

This is an unprecedented moment in the history of our University. We are being asked to consider what kind of university we are becoming—what kind of university we want to be. The manner in which Mr. Dunn and Mr. Jacobsen were dismissed calls into question the very character of our university. It tears at the moral fabric of our community. And, I believe, we cannot let it stand without rebuke. We have an obligation to try to reclaim the reputation of the University that has been sullied by the way in which these decent men were treated. This resolution makes the first step in that direction.

There is no way to undo the profound damage done to Mr. Dunn, Mr. Jacobsen, and their families. There is no recompense for the harm done to their professional reputations by dismissing them in this way.

Despite the shame and moral outrage that many of us feel because our administration has chosen to act as it has toward Mr. Dunn and Mr. Jacobsen, this event presents an opportunity to define the quality of moral leadership we demand. It presents us with an opportunity to demonstrate to our students and to citizens of the Commonwealth the principles of human conduct for which we, as a faculty, stand.

This resolution demonstrates that we demand more of our leaders. We may never know who knew what and when about the plan to dismiss these two colleagues. And that is not the point—at least not today. The facts about the manner in which they were dismissed are not in dispute. And these facts illuminate, it seems to me, a stunning failure of humane leadership that should emanate from the President and shape the behaviors of her leadership team.

If ever a person embodied the principles of humane leadership within an academic community, it was Mr. Dunn. If ever a person embodied the commitment to students, reverence for teaching, and respect for colleagues that we would like to characterize our University, it was Mr. Dunn. I refer you to the resolution of appreciation passed by the Board of Visitors on Feb. 26, 2003, in recognition of Mr. Dunn's extraordinary contributions to his University, our students, and his profession. I request that the Board's resolution be read into the minutes of this meeting.

What have we said about the character of our university, if we allow the treatment of these decent and humane colleagues to go unrebuked? What have we said about our own? I urge you, honored colleagues, to vote yes on the resolution before you

5. Below are the minutes from a Board of Visitors Meeting on Feb 26-27, 2003, when a Resolution was passed commending Mike Dunn and the New Student Programs Office. Minutes are available at <http://www.radford.edu/bov/minutes022703.html>

Resolution in Appreciation

WHEREAS, Mr. Michael A. ("Mike") Dunn has served Radford University with distinction since 1985 — since 1993 as Director of the Office of New Student Programs; and

WHEREAS, he is the articulate and passionate voice for new students at the University, continually reminding everyone that the academic, social, and personal welfare of our students, especially those new to and therefore unfamiliar with RU, must be kept at the forefront of the University's mission; and

WHEREAS, Mr. Dunn has served as the creative genius and driving force behind the implementation of effective programs and services to benefit first-year students, including Quest, UNIV 100, freshmen learning communities, community service days, the "Success Starts Here" seminar series, the "FIRST" and "SORTS" retention programs, and other activities; and

WHEREAS, he has served as an inspirational mentor to hundreds of student leaders who have assisted with the delivery of these programs; and

WHEREAS, he has shared his expertise about first-year students with numerous faculty and staff in workshops on the RU campus and with high school guidance counselors and others beyond Radford University, so that others might facilitate the success of first-year students; and

WHEREAS, Radford University's freshman-to-sophomore retention rate has increased by approximately fifteen percent in the ten years since the Office of New Student Programs was established under Mr. Dunn's leadership, improvement that can be attributed both to him and his staff and to the many individuals and offices who have enthusiastically collaborated with New Student Programs' initiatives; and

WHEREAS, in 2002, in recognition of the quality of RU's initiatives to serve new students, the Policy Center on the First Year of College at Brevard College recognized Radford University as one of only 11 national semi-finalists among institutions of its size in their project to identify "Institutions of Excellence in the First College Year"; and

WHEREAS, on February 23, 2003, Mr. Dunn was recognized by the National Resource Center for the First-Year Experience and Students in Transition at the University of South Carolina as one of ten national "Outstanding First-Year Student Advocates," the most prestigious award bestowed upon individuals in his profession; now therefore be it

RESOLVED, that the Board of Visitors of Radford University commends Mr. Dunn upon his receiving this significant honor which brings credit to him and to the University, and expresses its sincere gratitude for his exceptional leadership of RU's efforts to invest in the lifetimes of first-year students; and be it further

RESOLVED, that this resolution be made a part of the official record of Radford University, and that a copy thereof be presented to Mr. Michael A. Dunn.

V. Announcements

1. None.

VI. Adjournment

1. The meeting was adjourned at 5 pm.

**Radford University Faculty Senate
Meeting Minutes
October 8, 2009**

Members Present: Dr. Suzanne Ament, Dr. Mary Atwell, Dr. Moira Baker, Dr. Roann Barris, Dr. Gwen Brown, Dr. Paula Brush, Dr. Farrell Doss, Dr. I-Ping Fu, Dr. Kim Gainer, Dr. Mary Gibson, Mr. Anthony Guest, Dr. Judith Guinan, Dr. Katie Hilden, Dr. Maung Htay, Dr. Kay K. Jordan, Ms. Deborah McLaughlin, Dr. Douglas Mitchell, Dr. Garth N. Montgomery, Dr. Michael Moore, Dr. Judy Niehaus, Dr. Alexei Orlov, Dr. Stephen Owen, Dr. Richard Roth, Dr. Helen Roybark, Dr. Basel Saleh, Dr. David Sallee, Dr. Gary Schirr, Dr. Reginald Shareef, Dr. Lauren Smith (sub Waldren), Dr. Sid Smith, Dr. Laura Spielman, Dr. Paula Stanley, Dr. Jenessa Steele, Mr. Kevin Tapp, Dr. Lynne Taylor, Dr. Skip Thompson, Dr. Edward Carter Turner, Dr. Ed Udd, Dr. Richard Van Noy, Dr. Joe Wirgau, Dr. David Zuschin

Members Absent: Dr. Patricia Easterling, Dr. Iain Clelland

Guests Present: SGA President Matt Clem, Dr. Bill Hrezo

I. Call to Order and Approval of Minutes

1. Dr. Owen called the meeting to order at 3:30 pm.
2. The minutes from the September 17th meeting were approved.

II. Reports and Announcements

1. Dr. Owen noted that his reports on the Academic Affairs Leadership Team and on the budget had already been forwarded to senators.
2. Matt Clem, the President of the Student Government Association reported that the SGA had voted to designate Fridays as days when students and faculty would be encouraged to wear red as a show of support for the university, and asked that faculty participate in this effort.
3. Dr. Bill Hrezo answered questions from senators concerning the report of the Ad Hoc Investigative Committee. In response to a question from Gwen Brown, Dr. Hrezo affirmed that the problems identified were not confined to issues of communication, but included other issues such as process. He also noted that the report was as conservative as it could possibly be, in the sense that the committee confined its consideration to only those issues with well-documented support. Dr. Roybark asked why the Ad Hoc Committee had not made the documents available online so that everyone could review them. Dr. Hrezo reported that they could not get a clear response from the university's legal counsel regarding the advisability of such an action. Dr. Waldren remarked that the submitters should be asked if they want their allegations posted. Dr. Brown said that access to the allegations may be useful to fill in gaps. Dr. Stanley asked if "submissions" to the committee included the responses of administrators. Dr.

Hrezo responded that administrators were told their responses would be handled in exactly the same way as other submissions. Dr. Mary Atwell asked about the provenance of the RU Strategic Plan, specifically who had written the final form of the plan. Dr. Hrezo responded that the committee had not examined that question. Dr. Van Noy asked about a reference in the committee's report to "relevant legislation" governing the use of foundation funds. Dr. Hrezo responded that some endowments came with limitations specified by the donor that were not consistent with the law. Dr. Jim Lollar noted that one example is when a donation specifies payments to an individual, because such payments must then be counted as income. In response to another question, Dr. Hrezo repeated that the committee was unwilling to address concerns and issues that were not brought forward as part of a written, signed allegation.

4. The Campus Environment Committee gave its report on the 2009 Faculty Satisfaction Survey and took questions. Dr. Schirr noted that the committee took over the administration of the survey from the administration, and that this was the first time the survey was given online. Dr. Guinan noted that the email notification for the survey did not go to most adjuncts, as it had done in the previous survey, any comparison between the two must take this into account. She also noted that almost half of respondents made written comments. These comments were categorized by the committee and counted so as not to double count repeated comments of the same type by the same respondent. The comments were generally positive at the departmental level, and the negative comments mostly had to do with university-wide issues. Dr. Moira Baker if there was any way someone could have skewed the survey by making multiple submissions. Dr. Schirr responded that the new, online system ties each response to a unique email address, so this would not be possible. In response to another question, Dr. Smith said that he had sent the committee the Teaching & Research Faculty roster that he maintains for the senate, and that this included the chairs and the librarians. In response to another question, Dr. Guinan reported that the committee intends to give the next survey in time to report the results before the end of the spring 2010 semester.
5. Dr. Brown reported that the Curriculum Committee met and has begun addressing its objectives.
6. Dr. Barriss reported that the Faculty Issues Committee met and has begun addressing its objectives.
7. Dr. Niehaus reported that the Governance Committee met and is working on the IG Decision Matrix submitted to the senate by the Provost.
8. Dr. Wirgau reported that the Resource Allegations Committee met and is working with Richard Alvarez to build an accurate understanding of the current budget.

III. **Old Business**

1. The members turned to the selection of members of the Internal Governance Faculty Task Force. Kim Gainer from Faculty Issues, Skip Thompson from Governance, and Sid Smith from the Executive Council were put forward by their respective committees. Nominations were then taken for the at-large members and an election held. Laura Spielman, Gary Schirr, Chris Hermann, and Matt Franck were elected.

IV. **New Business**

1. Dr. Smith introduced a motion on behalf of the Faculty Senate Executive Council commending the Ad Hoc Investigative Committee. It was moved and seconded to suspend the rules to consider the motion. The question was called and the motion was carried without objection.
2. Dr. Gwen Brown introduced a motion to commend the Campus Environment Committee for their work on the Faculty Satisfaction Survey. Discussion ensued between the senate president and the parliamentarian regarding whether a vote was needed to put Dr. Brown's motion on the agenda, and it was agreed that because the motion was brought forward during new business such a vote was not required to allow the motion to be introduced. It was moved and seconded to suspend the rules to consider the motion. The question was called and the motion was carried without objection.
3. Dr. Gwen Brown introduced a motion for a Vote of No Confidence in the leadership of Provost Wilbur Stanton.
4. Dr. Baker asked if it might be appropriate to make a motion to make the written allegations to the Ad Hoc Committee available to senators, subject to the willingness of the writers in each case. Out of order discussion ensued. Dr. Smith expressed his unwillingness to publish the allegations on the senate web site, in part owing to questions of liability, and out of concern for the reputation of the university. Dr. Waldren, Dr. Udd, and Dr. Gibson reiterated these concerns. Dr. Jordan noted that members of the AAUP may, as an extra benefit, may obtain professional liability insurance. Dr. Baker noted that the sunshine laws apply. Dr. Udd asked if documents would have to be made available upon a Freedom of Information Act request. Dr. Owen said that such a request would go to the university, and it is unclear how the university would respond, and noted again how troubling it was that the university's attorney was unwilling to provide guidance. Dr. Brown introduced a motion to ask the writers of the allegation if they are willing to have their allegations shared among the faculty senate. This motion was not seconded. Several members asked about the meaning of a vote of no confidence. Dr. Baker then returned to the issue of distributing the allegations, and introduced a motion that the FSEC contact those who submitted documents to the AHIC to ask them if they would give permission for their document to be uploaded by someone other than a member of the FSEC to a secure web site accessible by invitation only to any Senators who wish to review the documents before having to decide upon a vote of no confidence in the

academic leadership of Provost Wil Stanton. The motion was seconded and tabled.

5. It was moved and seconded to continue the meeting for three minutes beyond its mandatory adjournment time. This motion did not receive the required two-thirds majority on a division of the house.

V. Announcements

1. None.

VI. Adjournment

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

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

Members Present: Dr. Mary Atwell, Dr. Moira Baker, Dr. Gwen Brown, Dr. Paula Brush, Dr. Iain Clelland, Dr. Farrell Doss, Dr. Patricia Easterling, Dr. Alan Forest (sub Stanley), Dr. I-Ping Fu, Dr. Kim Gainer, Dr. Mary Gibson, Mr. Anthony Guest, Dr. Judith Guinan, Dr. Katie Hilden, Dr. Maung Htay, Dr. Kay K. Jordan, Dr. Glen Martin (sub Turner), Ms. Deborah McLaughlin, Dr. Douglas Mitchell, Dr. Garth N. Montgomery, Dr. Michael Moore, Dr. Judy Niehaus, Dr. Stephen Owen, Dr. Richard Roth, Dr. Helen Roybark, Dr. Basel Saleh, Dr. David Sallee, Dr. Gary Schirr, Dr. Reginald Shareef, Dr. Lauren Smith (sub Waldren), Dr. Sid Smith, Dr. Laura Spielman, Dr. Jenessa Steele, Mr. Kevin Tapp, Dr. Lynne Taylor, Dr. Skip Thompson, Dr. Ed Udd, Dr. Richard Van Noy, Dr. Joe Wirgau, Dr. David Zuschin

Members Absent: Dr. Suzanne Ament (excused), Dr. Roann Barris (excused), Dr. Paula Stanley (excused), Dr. Alexei Orlov, Dr. Edward Carter Turner (excused)

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 from the October 8th meeting were approved.

II. Reports and Announcements

1. Dr. Owen reported on the Board of Visitors retreat. The consultant, Tim Sullivan, gave a presentation on what makes an effective board, and there was another presentation on the budgetary outlook for higher education. The gist of the budget presentation was that the outlook for higher education funding in the Commonwealth of Virginia remains bleak for at least four years. These reports will be posted on the Board of Visitor's web page soon.
2. Dr. Gwen Brown reported for the Curriculum Committee that the committee is reviewing the 7-17 plan.
3. Dr. Judy Guinan reported for the Faculty Issues Committee that they are examining a survey that was conducted of department chairs regarding evaluations.
4. Dr. Judy Niehaus reported for the Governance Committee that they continue to review the proposed IG Decision Matrix for Academic Affairs.
5. Dr. Joe Wirgau reported that the Resource Allocation Committee met and continues its work on the university budget.

III. Old Business

1. The Motion for a Vote of No Confidence in the Leadership of Provost Wil Stanton was taken from the table and debate ensued. Dr. Gwen Brown spoke in favor of her motion, quoting from the Ad Hoc Investigative Committee Report and emphasizing the need to repair trust and working relationships in Academic Affairs. She outlined several of the allegations that were submitted to the AHIC. She said that the provost's attitude was non-responsive, and that he seems unwilling to acknowledge the problems. She characterized the motion as the only way the faculty can make the necessary statement about the state of academic affairs to the president and board. Dr. Kay Jordan introduced a subsidiary motion to limit debate, permitting members to be recognized an unlimited number of times, but that individual speeches be limited to five minutes in length. This motion passed without objection. Dr. Paula Brush read a statement in support of the vote of no confidence, saying that it was important that there be consequences for not following established governance principles. Dr. Sidney Smith introduced a subsidiary motion to amend the main motion by designating that the vote of no confidence, if it passed, be referred to the general faculty for ratification. Dr. Gwen Brown offered a point of order that the amendment was not germane to the central issue of the main motion. Dr. Owen judged that Dr. Brown's objection was incorrect, and this decision was supported by the parliamentarian, Dr. Mary Atwell. Dr. Brown offered a second objection, on the grounds that the motion would be contrary to the senate constitution. Dr. Owen also overruled this objection, and was supported in doing so by the parliamentarian. The motion was then seconded, and Dr. Smith spoke in support of the amendment, saying that past responses by the Board of Visitors to votes taken in the senate expressing dissatisfaction with the administration had been to dismiss those votes as unrepresentative. Consequently, in order to ensure the Board was not able to respond in the same way to the vote of no confidence, if it passed the senate, it was necessary to ensure that the whole faculty was behind it. He also dismissed suggestions that junior faculty members might be afraid to vote, or that the amendment was intended to nullify the vote of no confidence. He asserted that senators should be unwilling to seek to terminate a colleague's career except by a process that is seen to be unimpeachable. Dr. Brown spoke against the amendment on the grounds that the senate was constituted in order to represent the voice of the faculty, and that it is the duty of the senate to speak for them. Dr. Atwell spoke against the amendment on the grounds that the general faculty can review and overrule the vote of the senate if they wish to. Dr. Waldron spoke against the amendment, saying that it would delegitimize the senate to send the vote to the general faculty. Dr. Jim McDonel spoke in favor of the amendment, saying that the message would be strengthened by the affirmation of the general faculty. Dr. Judy Guinan spoke against the amendment, saying that we already had the general faculty's answer in the Faculty Satisfaction Survey results. Dr. Gary Schirr spoke against the amendment on the grounds that it would affirm the charge of critics that the faculty senate is not representative. Dr. Moira Baker asserted that if the general faculty do not use their constitutional right to challenge the vote of no confidence, they can be presumed to support it. Dr.

Niehaus called the question, and the amendment failed on a voice vote. Debate returned to the main motion. Dr. Helen Roybark said that she needed to better understand the purpose of the vote of no confidence, and what the outcome was expected to be by those who supported it. Dr. Brown replied that the intent was to inform the president that the faculty agrees that there are such problems that we no longer feel we can work with the provost. That our colleagues have been treated badly, and that we want someone to work with us in a better fashion. In response to a further question from Dr. Roybark, Dr. Brown said she could not imagine circumstances in which it would be possible to work with the current provost in the future, citing her department's experience with the decision making processes that were imposed on them. Dr. Mary Hope Gibson said it is important to realize that the problems have been around for a long time, not just in the last year. Dr. Glen Martin said that one consequence of the poor governance we had seen is that the professional and teaching lives of the faculty have been adversely affected. He said he doesn't believe the provost understands how to create a serious academic environment. Dr. Richard Roth read a statement in support of the motion, saying that his constituents were overwhelmingly in favor of the motion. He noted that his college was the most affected by the hasty restructuring, and that his colleagues had been both directly and indirectly threatened. He said that although the impetus for some of the provost's most controversial decision may have come from members of the board, the provost's attitude does indicate that there would be any change in his methods in the future. He asserted that the motion is not a bill of particulars, or a pink slip, but an expression of the faculty's lack of confidence in his leadership. Dr. Joe Wirgau spoke in support of the motion, saying that his constituents are extremely disturbed about the state of academic affairs at RU. He pointed out that the merger of his department, Chemistry, with the department of Biology, was forced over the objection the faculty, and was undertaken in an autocratic way that dismissed the concerns of faculty regarding the effect on their programs. Dr. Mary Atwell spoke again, saying that it was necessary to vote in favor of the motion out of respect for the faculty's calling and responsibility for academics at RU. Dr. Claire Waldron said that she would have to speak against the motion on behalf of her faculty, but further said that she was very much moved by the concerns of her colleagues across campus, and was also concerned about the long history of trying to improve governance at RU, citing a motion she had introduced in 2003. She asserted that the problems we face are systemic, and that we need to come up with real solutions, and that she doesn't see the vote of no confidence as a solution. Dr. Sidney Smith noted that debate up to this point had been focused on the case against the provost, and that he would like to hear debate on the consequences of the vote before we are asked to vote on it. Dr. Baker asserted that senators should vote solely on the question of whether we should have confidence in the provost, not on question of what the consequences of the vote may be, and that a vote of no confidence would call the board, the provost, and the faculty to their "better angels." Dr. Maung Htay spoke against the motion, saying that his colleagues in the School of Information Technology are concerned about the consequences of the vote, about the effect

on the university's reputation and its future. He suggested that the Faculty Senate Executive Committee should be communicating the faculty's concerns to the administration and seeking solutions. Dr. Gary Schirr spoke against the motion on behalf of his colleagues in the Marketing Department. He said it was his sense and that of his colleagues that since the spring there had been a great effort on the part of the provost and the administration to reach out to the faculty and to work with them on improving governance, and that consequently this is an inopportune time to have a motion with such negative connotations. Dr. Mike Montgomery said that he wished that the motion could be tabled for another two weeks so that the many substantive arguments on both sides that had been voiced at the current meeting could be considered by his constituents. Dr. Judy Niehaus read a statement given her by Dr. Rhett Herman. Dr. Herman in speaking with the provost asked him what he thought had gone wrong in the past year, but the provost insisted that nothing had gone wrong. Dr. Herman found this stunning, and in consequence feels no confidence that the provost can work constructively or collaboratively with the faculty. Dr. Niehaus further said that she respects the hope that the "leopard can change his spots", but that we have seen the real provost, and that faculty should not hope for any real change in him. Dr. Judy Guinan said that the members of her department were unanimous in having no confidence in the provost, citing the results of the Ad Hoc Investigative Committee and his continued refusal to recognize or take responsibility for the problems that resulted in the formation of that committee in the first place. Further, the faculty of the Department of Biology and Chemistry do not trust the provost in consequence of his misrepresentation of an email sent by a colleague as representing the will of the faculty of the department in order to impose a restructuring that was actually opposed by the faculty and was contrary to the interests of their programs, and his continued refusal to acknowledge the position of the faculty on this issue; she asserted that their trust in him can never be restored. She said that if the senate does not act then it is tacitly accepting what has happened, that the problems will not go away but continue to fester. She asserted that the senate is the voice of the faculty, but that the faculty had already spoken in the Faculty Satisfaction Survey and the statements of many submitted to the Ad Hoc Investigative Committee. Consequently, she said, we owe it to them to act now. Dr. Tricia Easterling spoke in favor of the motion. She said she had, as a member of the Faculty Senate Executive Council, sat in meetings with the provost and tried to communicate the concerns of the faculty, but that he had shown a troubling managerial style, including the use of threats. She added that the problem wasn't his and the president's style of communication but their lack of communication. She also noted that senators would be inconsistent to support the provost simply because they have not been affected by his decisions in light of the near unanimous support of the senate for the administrators in New Student Programs a month earlier. Dr. Reginald Shareef read a statement from his colleagues in the Department of Political Science in support of the motion, stating that the motion is not a legal indictment but a statement to all constituencies about the view of faculty concerning whether the university is being competently led. Dr. Kay

Jordan said that she wanted to address some of the concerns raised by Maung Htay. She asserted that the Faculty Senate Executive Council had been very active in representing the view of faculty, and in particular had pressed the provost at the time on the controversial decisions made in the spring semester. However, she said, it became clear that the provost's responses and explanations were inconsistent with the reports of affected faculty and departments. She said that contrary to his assertion that he has been trying to work with the faculty for six months, he stood before the Board of Visitors on April 23rd and offered a "prebuttal" to the faculty concerns that were expressed in the motions debated and passed in the senate concerning restructuring and the expedited program review, in the letter signed by 65 senior faculty delivered to the board at the same meeting, and the letters of the campus AAUP on the same issues. Dr. Owen pointed out that the clock was running late. A motion was offered to extend the meeting, and this passed on a voice vote. Debate continued. Dr. Jim McDonel said that the last several speakers had in fact eroded his confidence in the efficacy of the vote of no confidence, since if it didn't result in the removal or resignation of the provost then it's only consequences were likely to be negative for faculty interests. Dr. Laura Spielman said that she thought doing nothing was not an option, and that if faculty have no confidence in the provost we should vote accordingly. She noted that she had attended the morning coffee with the provost in the last few weeks, in which she raised the issue of how the Board of Visitors could have the impression that only a few faculty were disgruntled in the spring in light of the letter signed by 65 senior members and delivered to the board at their meeting. She said that the provost responded that it was his understanding that at least one signer had been coerced to sign by their department chair. Dr. Glen Martin said that he thinks the best thing that could happen to this campus is to get a good provost, and that he does not think that this is so unlikely, noting that although the decision concerning how to respond to the vote of no confidence would rest with the president, the faculty still have many options for creatively working for positive changes in the governance of the university, including through the efforts and interest of the AAUP. He noted that universities fear the possibility of censure by the AAUP, and that there is also concern about the university's accreditation. He said that we should look for a truly visionary and competent provost to lead the academic life of the university. Mr. Kevin Tapp noted that many had asserted that this vote just boils down to whether one has confidence in the provost, but that to his constituents it is not nearly so simple. Dr. Ed Udd said that in his view the hard work is after the vote, whichever way it goes; that we must build effective internal governance and systems of communication vertically and horizontally. He said that he hopes we will put the same energy that brought the motion forward into building the future. Dr. Skip Thompson said that if we do not vote no confidence we are accepting the status quo, and that this consequence is more serious than any other potential negative consequences that have been discussed. Dr. Mary Hope Gibson spoke in favor of the amendment on behalf of the School of Nursing, saying that many of her constituents had communicated with her and expressed their conviction that this vote was necessary. Dr. Gwen Brown spoke again to

reiterate her view that, as the Ad Hoc Investigative Committee's report asserted, failure to address the problems will have serious consequences. A member moved to call the question. Dr. Mike Montgomery made a motion to table the motion, and this was defeated on a voice vote. The motion to call the question was then seconded and passed without objection. Dr. Sidney Smith introduced a motion for a secret ballot, and this was approved without objection. Voting commenced, and the tally of ballots was 29 "yes" and 16 "nay", carrying the motion. A motion was made to adjourn the meeting, and this passed without objection.

IV. New Business

1. None

V. Announcements

1. None.

VI. Adjournment

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

**Radford University Faculty Senate
Meeting Minutes
November 5, 2009**

Members Present: Dr. Mary Atwell, Dr. Moira Baker, Dr. Roann Barris, Dr. Gwen Brown, Dr. Farrell Doss, Dr. Patricia Easterling, Dr. I-Ping Fu, Dr. Kim Gainer, Dr. Mary Gibson, Mr. Anthony Guest, Dr. Judith Guinan, Dr. Katie Hilden, Dr. Kay K. Jordan, Ms. Deborah McLaughlin, Dr. Douglas Mitchell, Mr. James Monaghan, Dr. Garth N. Montgomery, Dr. Michael Moore, Dr. Judy Niehaus, Dr. Alexei Orlov, Dr. Richard Roth, Dr. Helen Roybark, Dr. Basel Saleh, Dr. David Sallee, Dr. Gary Schirr, Dr. Reginald Shareef, Dr. Lauren Smith (sub Waldren), Dr. Lauren Smith, Dr. Sid Smith, Dr. Laura Spielman, Dr. Paula Stanley, Dr. Jenessa Steele, Mr. Kevin Tapp, Dr. Skip Thompson, Dr. Edward Carter Turner, Dr. Richard Van Noy, Dr. Joe Wirgau, Dr. David Zuschin

Members Absent: Dr. Suzanne Ament (excused), Dr. Paula Brush, Dr. Iain Clelland, Dr. Elise Fullmer, Dr. Maung Htay, Dr. James McDonel, Dr. Stephen Owen (excused), Dr. Sharon Roger Hepburn, Mr. Kevin Tapp, Dr. Lynne Taylor, Dr. Edward Udd (excused)

Guests Present: None.

I. Call to Order and Approval of Minutes

1. Dr. Jordan called the meeting to order at 3:30 pm.
2. The minutes from the October 22nd meeting were approved with minor edits.

II. Reports and Announcements

1. Dr. Jordan noted an email circulated by Dr. Udd calling for a discussion of how to move forward from the senate's recent business. She observed that there are two motions before the senate, one on the IG Decision Matrix and one on an IG Faculty Task Force, that represent ways in which the senate is already moving forward. She also remarked that each senate committee has a set of objectives for the year, and called upon the secretary, Dr. Smith, to display these objectives as the committees made their reports. She also asked that the committees' spokespersons make as full a report as they were able.
2. Dr. Jordan reported that the Anthropology Program Revision and the course proposal for ANSC/ANTH 101 had been referred to the Faculty Senate Curriculum Committee.
3. Dr. Judy Guinan reported for the Campus Environment Committee that the results of the Faculty Senate Survey had been posted on the senate web site, and that the committee would soon have a draft of the new questionnaire for the senate's review.
4. Dr. Gwen Brown reported for the Curriculum Committee that the committee is reviewing the 7-17 plan with particular attention to the impact of the plan on

curriculum. She noted that they are hearing that there are questions about the viability and applicability of the plan, and wondered if they are wasting their time in this review if there are plans by the administration to revise the plan significantly. Dr. Smith noted that Dr. Owen had previously reported from the Board of Visitor's retreat that the BOV is persuaded that the plan needs significant revision. Dr. Brown replied that in that case they should perhaps put their current review on hold. She reported further that the committee is also concerned about the new program review procedures that call for an annual review in addition to the 5-year review. She wanted to know if faculty had or would have significant input into the formulation of this new procedure. Dr. Jordan responded that the Faculty Senate Executive Council had significant input during the summer. Dr. Niehaus noted that she was on the Academic Program Review Committee, and that there was a real effort to get away from the "numbers game" and focus on qualitative assessments. Dr. Brown emphasized that their concern was over the impact on curriculum of such frequent reporting. Dr. Baker noted that there seems to be no guarantee that the numbers won't still be used to threaten programs. Dr. Smith noted that every objection that was raised by the FSEC in the summer resulted in a change to the plan to accommodate faculty concerns. He added that the annual review is intended to be perfunctory, simply a matter of plugging in numbers to a form, and that the 5-year review then becomes a matter of aggregating those numbers and writing the usual narrative about the program. Dr. Jordan added that the composition of the Academic Program Review Committee should be revisited as part of IG revision, since currently the faculty members of the committee are selected by their deans.

5. Dr. Barris reported for the Faculty Issues Committee that they are working on their objectives for the year. In particular, they are working on finding out how different departments rank different elements of teaching, professional activity, and service in their annual faculty evaluations. They currently have material from ten departments, and they would like to have materials from more departments.
6. Dr. Judy Neihaus reported for the Governance Committee that they have completed their review of the proposed IG Decision Matrix, and, with revisions, have decided to present a motion on behalf of their committee that the senate approved the revised matrix. Specifically, they have added sentences in the preamble of the Rules portion of the document to note the paragraphs of the current IG Document which grant the authority described in the matrix to the various committees and administrators. This was done to eliminate any perception that the IG Document on its own was somehow unclear. In response to a question from Dr. Baker, Dr. Smith explained that the decision matrix came about on the insistence of the FSEC that the provost had not followed IG during the spring, and that they wanted him to commit to a better set of procedures for decision making within Academic Affairs. The provost submitted the original draft, the FSEC revised it, and there were negotiations and further revisions. All

parties to this process were committed to ensuring that the Decision Matrix closely mirrors what is set forth in the IG Document.

7. Dr. Joe Wirgau reported that the Resource Allocation Committee has been meeting with the University Planning and Budget Advisory Committee, the Vice President for Finance, Richard Alvarez, and the University President. Vice President Alvarez laid out some principles for dealing with the ongoing budget crisis. First was protecting instruction, second was to consider the affects on students and their families, and third to be prepared to move the university forward when the budget climate improves. Mr. Alvarez also reported that cuts in the teaching areas was 20% less than cuts in administrative areas. He and the president are also very concerned about enrollment and its affect on the budget. Dr. Wirgau noted that he was generally pleased with the answers that were provided to the committee members' questions, although he was less satisfied about answers regarding the growth in comprehensive fees. Dr. Jordan noted in response to a question about the Foundation that Foundation personnel are paid by the Foundation, but that University Advancement personnel are being paid out of the RU budget, and that this is standard practice. She also noted that the Foundation had funds in reserve that are permitting them to continue to fund scholarships. In response to a question, Dr. Wirgau said that they had been told that the growth in the Athletics budget had been comparable to growth in other areas of the budget. In response to a question from the secretary, Dr. Jordan and Dr. Wirgau promised to send supporting documents with their committee minutes to be posted on the Faculty Senate web site. Dr. Niehaus asked about the lab fees. Dr. Wirgau said that he would follow up on that issue. Dr. Jordan noted that once the Board of Visitors has approved the budget at it's meeting the following week, it might be appropriate for the senate to invite Mr. Alvarez to come to a meeting of the senate to answer senator's questions.

III. **Old Business**

1. None

IV. **New Business**

1. Dr. Niehaus, on behalf of the Governance Committee, introduced the motion to recommend adoption of the IG Decision Matrix. Dr. Smith noted for senators the location of the matrix on the senate web site. In response to a question from Dr. Brown, Dr. Smith noted that the IG Faculty Task Force isn't considering how to revise internal governance, but at a process to be followed by all university constituencies in considering how to revise internal governance. That this process, if adopted, may result in a new IG Document in two years time, but that in the meantime the university would be conducting business under the current IG Document, and the matrix is meant to facilitate that.
2. Dr. Smith, on behalf of the Faculty Senate Executive Council, introduced a motion to conduct the special Faculty Senate meeting on Sept. 10th as a Committee of the

Whole. Dr. Atwell, the parliamentarian, noted that the point of the committee of the whole is to allow discussion of matters that are not part of committee reports or formal motions. Dr. Smith added that the motivation for this motion was to try to ensure that senators get what they seem to want from the planned meeting, which is an exchange with the university president regarding the recent Vote of No Confidence in the provost. A motion was made to suspend the rules to debate the motion, and this passed on a voice vote. Dr. Brown asked if the President Kyle had been notified of the meeting and had she committed to attending. Dr. Jordan responded that President Kyle had told her that she is in town that day, that she had some questions about the meeting, but that she is open to the suggestion of holding this meeting. The motion was then carried without objection.

V. Announcements

1. None.

VI. Adjournment

1. The meeting was adjourned at 4:25 pm.

Radford University Faculty Senate
Meeting Minutes
November 19, 2009

Members Present: Dr. Mary Atwell, Dr. Moira Baker, Dr. Roann Barris, Dr. Kate Brennan, Dr. Gwen Brown, Dr. Paula Brush, Dr. Iain Clelland, Dr. Farrell Doss, Dr. Elise Fullmer, Dr. I-Ping Fu, Dr. Mary Gibson, Mr. Anthony Guest, Dr. Judith Guinan, Mr. Steven P. Helm (sub Tapp), Dr. Katie Hilden, Dr. Kay K. Jordan, Dr. James McDonel, Ms. Deborah McLaughlin, Dr. Douglas Mitchell, Mr. James Monaghan, Dr. Garth N. Montgomery, Dr. Michael Moore, Dr. Judy Niehaus, Dr. Alexei Orlov, Dr. Stephen Owen, Dr. Richard Roth, Dr. Helen Roybark, Dr. Basel Saleh, Dr. David Sallee, Dr. Gary Schirr, Dr. Sid Smith, Dr. Laura Spielman, Dr. Jenessa Steele, Mr. Kevin Tapp, Dr. Lynne Taylor, Dr. Skip Thompson, Dr. Edward Carter Turner, Dr. Edward Udd, Dr. Richard Van Noy, Dr. Joe Wirgau, Dr. David Zuschin

Members Absent: Dr. Suzanne Ament (excused), Dr. Patricia Easterling, Dr. Kim Gainer (excused), Dr. Mary Hope Gibson (excused), Dr. Sharon Roger Hepburn, Dr. Maung Htay, Dr. Reginald Shareef, Dr. Lauren Smith, Mr. Kevin Tapp (Excused)

Guests Present: None.

I. Call to Order and Approval of Minutes

1. Dr. Owen called the meeting to order at 3:35 pm.
2. The minutes from the November 5th meeting were approved.

II. Reports and Announcements

1. Dr. Owen reported that Mr. Alvarez, Vice President of Finance, will give a presentation on the fiscal year 2010 budget on December 8th at 3:30pm in the Bonnie Hurlburt auditorium. The forum will be open to all, and will reflect closely the presentation Mr. Alvarez just gave to the Board of Visitors at their recent meeting.
2. Dr. Owen reported on the Board of Visitors meetings. From the Academic Affairs meeting: There are two searches ongoing, one for a director of admissions and one for a registrar. The Master of Occupational Therapy program is up and running, but the other new graduate programs may be delayed by budgetary constraints. The budget dominated the business meeting of the BOV. There is an additional shortfall in funds anticipated. For further details on the budget Dr. Owen referred members to the BOV web page. In the Governance meeting there was a report on the Banner system, which is moving forward. Additional components will soon be coming online. The university's web page redesign project will soon be starting, with a discovery process to gather input from constituencies and stakeholders on what the new web site should include. Eventually there will be a set of templates that colleges and departments can use to move their own web presence to design parameters that are consistent with

the new design. In response to a question, Dr. Owen promised to obtain information regarding the cost of this project.

3. A representative from the Student Government Association reported on the increased printing costs for students this year, and implored faculty to consider the printing burden for many students.
4. Dr. Judy Guinan reported for the Campus Environment Committee that they will be introducing a motion to approve the new Faculty Senate Survey Questionnaire
5. Dr. Gwen Brown reported for the Curriculum Committee that the committee has issued a report on the 7-17 plan that includes a list of questions about the impact on curriculum that should be considered in any future iteration of the strategic plan, and noted that this report was posted on the senate web site.
6. Dr. Barris reported for the Faculty Issues Committee that they are continuing their fact-finding efforts on annual faculty evaluations.
7. Dr. Judy Neihaus reported for the Governance Committee that the proposed IG Decision Matrix is now before the senate.
8. Dr. Joe Wirgau reported for the Resource Allocation Committee that they are continuing to gather information on the budget from the administration.
9. Dr. Sid Smith reported for the IG Faculty Task Force that it had completed its mandate and would be presenting a resolution for the senate's consideration during new business.

III. **Old Business**

1. The motion to recommend adoption of the IG Decision Matrix was taken from the table. Dr. Niehaus briefly introduced the matrix, noting that the governance committee had spent considerable time considering whether there were better forms that the matrix could be put into, but decided in the end the form it is in now is the most useful for those who would actually have to use it. She also noted that there was much discussion about the timeline specified, and the committee revised the language of the matrix to ensure that constituencies have 20 class days to fulfill their authority. Dr. Baker stated that the order in which IG Committees were specified to fulfill their authority was not consistent with the forms currently in use, for instance by the Undergraduate Curriculum and Catalog Review Committee. Dr. Owen noted that it was acceptable to offer an amendment to repair any perceived deficiencies or errors. Dr. Baker suggested that there might be too many errors, and it should be tabled until it has been more carefully reviewed. Dr. Brown also suggested that it should be reviewed by people knowledgeable with the functioning of the IG Committees. Dr. Brush echoed this assertion. Dr. Udd moved that the motion be tabled, and this was passed on a voice vote.

IV. New Business

1. Dr. Smith introduced a motion on behalf of the IG Faculty Task Force to Recommend a Process for Revision of the Radford University Internal Governance System.
2. Dr. Guinan introduced a motion on behalf of the Campus Environment Committee to approve the new Faculty Satisfaction Survey Questionnaire.
3. Dr. Barris brought to the attention of the senate a letter that had been circulated in her college and which faculty members had been asked to sign, in support of Provost Stanton and in opposition to the Faculty Senate's recent vote of no confidence in his leadership. She voiced the concern that it might be inappropriate for department and college leaders to ask faculty members to sign such a letter. Dr. Brown said that she was familiar with the letter, and had gone so far as to write a rebuttal of what she believes are inaccuracies and distortions in the letter, and distributed to senators a copy of the letter with her interpolations. Dr. Baker wondered aloud if perhaps the Faculty Senate should adopt a resolution confirming its proper role as the voice of the faculty. Informal discussion ensued. Dr. Jordan introduced a motion to adopt a resolution stating that the Faculty Senate is the authoritative voice of the faculty. The motion was seconded. Dr. Jordan moved to suspend the rules for immediate consideration of her motion, but this motion failed on a voice vote.
4. Dr. Spielman brought to the attention of the senate that an email has been circulated stating that email could not be used to solicit donations for canned-food drives currently being undertaken by some student organization. Dr. Udd provided further information, noting that even if the solicitations technically violate some policy, the current focus on the issue is a waste of time. Dr. Owen said that he would try to find out the nature of the concern that anyone may have over the emails.

V. Announcements

1. None.

VI. Adjournment

1. The meeting was adjourned at 4:35 pm.

**Radford University Faculty Senate
Meeting Minutes
December 3, 2009**

Members Present: Dr. Mary Atwell, Dr. Moira Baker, Dr. Roann Barris, Dr. Kate Brennan, Dr. Gwen Brown, Dr. Paula Brush, Dr. Iain Clelland, Dr. Farrell Doss, Dr. Patricia Easterling, Dr. Elise Fullmer, Dr. I-Ping Fu, Dr. Kim Gainer, Dr. Mary Gibson, Mr. Anthony Guest, Dr. Judith Guinan, Mr. Steven P. Helm (sub Tapp), Dr. Katie Hilden, Dr. Maung Htay, Dr. Kay K. Jordan, Dr. James McDonel, Ms. Deborah McLaughlin, Dr. Douglas Mitchell, Mr. James Monaghan, Dr. Garth N. Montgomery, Dr. Michael Moore, Dr. Judy Niehaus, Dr. Alexei Orlov, Dr. Stephen Owen, Dr. Richard Roth, Dr. Helen Roybark, Dr. Basel Saleh, Dr. David Sallee, Dr. Gary Schirr, Dr. Reginald Shareef, Dr. Lauren Smith, Dr. Sid Smith, Dr. Laura Spielman, Dr. Jenessa Steele, Mr. Kevin Tapp, Dr. Lynne Taylor, Dr. Skip Thompson, Dr. Edward Carter Turner, Dr. Edward Udd, Dr. Richard Van Noy, Dr. Joe Wirgau, Dr. David Zuschin

Members Absent: Dr. Suzanne Ament (excused), Dr. Sharon Roger Hepburn, Mr. Kevin Tapp (excused)

Guests Present: None.

I. Call to Order and Approval of Minutes

1. Dr. Owen called the meeting to order at 3:34 pm.
2. The minutes from the November 19th meeting were approved.

II. Reports and Announcements

1. Dr. Owen reported on the web page redesign project and the contract that was awarded to Digital Wave. The cost of the contract is \$363,000, and will be paid out of stimulus funds. This choice was based in part on the responses to the questionnaire previously distributed to faculty asking about how the stimulus money should be spent. In response to a question, Dr. Owen noted that there were several state guidelines governing how the vendor was selected, and that the only local company from whom a bid was solicited failed to submit their bid on time.
2. Dr. Owen announced that there would be a budget forum on Tuesday, December 8th at 3:30 in the Bonnie Hurlburt auditorium.
3. Dr. Owen reported that he is continuing to solicit information concerning the email policies governing solicitation for charitable causes using official email.
4. Mr. Jeffrey Douglas, Executive Director of University Relations, gave a lengthy report on student printing fees, with the conclusion that under the new regime the cost of student printing is now almost exactly offset by the fee being charged to students.

5. Dr. Susan Van Patten reported that she would be making a full update on the Core Curriculum at the faculty senate meeting in January. She reported on the the current and projected number of sections of the CORE courses, and reported that she currently has more volunteers to teach the courses than she has slots to fill. She also reported on grants available to faculty members to help them develop their CORE courses.

III. Old Business

1. The motion to recommend adoption of the IG Decision Matrix was taken from the table. Dr. Smith reported on how and why the matrix was developed, and what its purpose is intended to be. After discussion, Dr. Gibson moved that the matrix be referred back to the governance committee. Dr. Udd moved an amendment to this motion that the governance committee report back by the fourth meeting of the faculty senate in the spring semester. This amendment was adopted by a voice vote, and the motion to refer the main motion back to the governance committee as amended was then carried on a voice vote.
2. The motion to recommend a process for revision of internal governance was taken from the table. Dr. Smith reported that the motion was the product of the IG Faculty Task Force, and remarked that the task force reached a consensus that the problems with the current IG system are many and deep. Without further discussion the motion was carried without objection.
3. The motion to approve the revised version of the Faculty Satisfaction Survey was taken from the table. Dr. Ian Clelland moved an amendment to change certain language in two of the questions in the survey, numbers 10 and 14, and to delete questions 2 and 39. Dr. Owen noted that there was only 5 minutes before mandatory adjournment absent a motion, and a motion was then offered to extend the time of the meeting, but this failed on a division of the house. A motion was then made to divide the question (on the motion to amend), and this passed on a voice vote. Dr. Guinan pointed out that the committee was hoping to get the questionnaire approved before break so as to get it out in a timely fashion in the spring semester. After discussion, it was agreed by a voice vote to strike the question, number 2, concerning loyalty from the questionnaire. After discussion it was agreed by a voice vote to retain the language of question 10. The motion was then automatically tabled owing to mandatory adjournment.

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 28, 2010**

Members Present: Dr. Suzanne Ament, Dr. Mary Atwell, Dr. Moira Baker, Dr. Roann Barris, Dr. Kate Brennan, Dr. Gwen Brown, Dr. Paula Brush, Dr. Iain Clelland, Dr. David Daugherty (sub Htay), Dr. Farrell Doss, Dr. Patricia Easterling, Dr. Elise Fullmer, Dr. I-Ping Fu, Dr. Kim Gainer, Dr. Juergen Gerlach (sub Spielman), Mr. Anthony Guest, Dr. Judith Guinan, Dr. Katie Hilden, Dr. Kay K. Jordan, Dr. Kim Lane (sub Wirgau), Ms. Deborah McLaughlin, Mr. James Monaghan, Dr. Garth N. Montgomery, Dr. Judy Niehaus, Dr. Stephen Owen, Dr. Richard Roth, Dr. Basel Saleh, Dr. David Sallee, Dr. Gary Schirr, Dr. Lauren Smith, Dr. Sid Smith, Dr. Laura Spielman, Dr. Jenessa Steele, Mr. Kevin Tapp, Dr. Lynne Taylor, Dr. Skip Thompson, Dr. Edward Carter Turner, Dr. Edward Udd, Dr. Erin Webster-Garret, Dr. David Zuschin

Members Absent: Dr. Maung Htay, Dr. Mary Gibson, Dr. James McDonel, Dr. Douglas Mitchell, Dr. Michael Moore, Dr. Alexei Orlov (excused), Dr. Helen Roybark, Dr. Reginald Shareef, Dr. Laura Spielman (excused), Dr. Joe Wirgau (excused)

Guests Present: None.

I. Call to Order and Approval of Minutes

1. Dr. Owen called the meeting to order at 3:32 pm.
2. The minutes from the December 3rd meeting were approved.

II. Reports and Announcements

1. Dr. Owen reported that the next Board of Visitors meeting will be on February 9th and 10th in Richmond, immediately preceding Higher Education Advocacy Day on the 11th.
2. Dr. Owen announced that he has communicated with Krista Terry about the replacement for WebCT, and we should see a new learning management system put in place soon.
3. Dr. Owen reported that President Kyle is supportive of the Faculty Senate's recommendation for a process of revision of Internal Governance, and is prepared to take the initial steps in that process.
4. Dr. Owen reported that total number of applications to the university has increased 18 percent since last year, which is a testament to the efforts of the admissions office.
5. Dr. Richard Alvarez, Vice President of Finance, reported that he and President Kyle have met with numerous delegates and senators in the state capital, and there seems to be a consensus among them that the budget situation remains dire. He reported that the state has reduced our general fund cut, but that this

has been offset by a decision to give the university fewer funds from the federal stimulus. It is clear that the university is still facing a 3 million dollar cut next year, at least. Also, the legislature has taken 18 million dollars in student fees from the state universities to add to the general fund. This has many people upset. Dr. Alvarez said he will be able to make professional travel funds available for travel between now and June 14th. Also, there will be another summer research grant program, with details to be announced. There is also money for one time investment in equipment. Mr. Alvarez also affirmed his commitment to see that the Core Curriculum is fully funded.

6. The interim provost, Dr. Joe Scartelli, said that he looked forward to working with the senate and the executive council, and that he his committed to making this semester as productive as possible. He also expressed his gratitude to Mr. Alvarez for his work with the budget. Dr. Scartelli said that about 120 students plan to come to the rescheduled winter commencement, and that it will take place on Sunday February 6th at 2pm in Bondurant Auditorium. He and the Dean's Council are working on a new protocol for summer research grants, and invited faculty to begin thinking about ideas to take advantage of the opportunity. He added in response to a question that the deans are taking into account feedback they have received from faculty on the restrictions that were placed on the previous summer's grants. He expressed his belief that the increase in applications to the university reflect well on the departments and their recruiting efforts. He announced that there will be a search firm for the search for the new provost, and by using one of the firms already working with the state the search can begin about a month sooner than if there had to be a request for proposals to select the search firm. He mentioned that he will not be a candidate. Dr. Scartelli said that he his still formulating goals for the provost's office for this semester, but that a top priority will be SACS accreditation, which will be led by Dr. Rick Slavings.
7. Dr. Susan Van Patten reported on the Core Curriculum. She expressed her gratitude to many constituencies for their assistance in getting the program up and running. She reported that three emeritus faculty members will be helping as coordinators for the second-year Core courses. She said that their goal was to have as many full-time faculty as possible staffing those courses. Currently they are at about 50 percent. She asked that faculty be patient with the advising staff and registrar's office as they struggle to integrate the Core system with the new Banner software. In response to a question, Dr. Van Patten said that the committee is working to ensure that learning outcomes for assessment of general education courses work under both the old and new objectives. She noted that the Core Committee is working on ensuring that students who transfer from other institutions get appropriate credit for prior coursework. Regarding freshman matriculating with dual-enrollment credit, Dr. Van Patten said that dual-enrollment English is generally not the same as freshman comp or the Core 101, 102 courses. Advanced Placement credit, on the other hand transfers more straightforwardly.

III. Old Business

1. None.

IV. New Business

1. None.

V. Announcements

1. None.

VI. Adjournment

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

Radford University Faculty Senate
Meeting Minutes
February 11, 2010

Members Present: Dr. Suzanne Ament, Dr. Mary Atwell, Dr. Moira Baker, Dr. Gwen Brown, Dr. Paula Brush, Dr. Iain Clelland, Dr. Farrell Doss, Dr. Patricia Easterling, Dr. Kim Gainer, Dr. Mary Hope Gibson, Mr. Anthony Guest, Dr. Judith Guinan, Dr. Hash Hashemzadeh (sub Saleh), Dr. Katie Hilden, Dr. Kay K. Jordan, Ms. Deborah McLaughlin, Dr. Douglas Mitchell, Mr. James Monaghan, Dr. Garth N. Montgomery, Dr. Michael Moore, Dr. Judy Niehaus, Dr. Stephen Owen, Dr. Richard Roth, Dr. David Sallee, Dr. George Santopietro (sub Orlov), Dr. Gary Schirr, Dr. Reginald Shareef, Dr. Lauren Smith, Dr. Sid Smith, Dr. Laura Spielman, Dr. Jenessa Steele, Mr. Kevin Tapp, Dr. Skip Thompson, Dr. Edward Carter Turner, Dr. Edward Udd, Dr. Erin Webster-Garret, Dr. Joe Wirgau

Members Absent: Dr. Roann Barris, Dr. Elise Fullmer, Dr. I-Ping Fu, Dr. Maung Htay, Dr. James McDonel, Dr. Alexei Orlov (excused), Dr. Helen Roybark, Dr. Basel Saleh (excused), Dr. Lynne Taylor, Dr. David Zuschin

Guests Present: None.

I. Call to Order and Approval of Minutes

1. Dr. Owen called the meeting to order at 3:32 pm.
2. The minutes from the January 28th meeting were approved.

II. Reports and Announcements

1. Dr. Owen reported that today is advocacy day in Richmond, and that many students are in Richmond meeting with legislators to talk about RU.
2. Dr. Owen reported that the legislature's plan to reduce our non-general funds is part of Governor Kaine's budget, and is currently being considered as House Bill and Senate Bill 29 and 30.
3. Dr. Owen reported that all state employees, including faculty, must take a furlough day on the day before Labor Day. There are no furlough days planned for the next biennium.
4. Dr. Owen reported that there is a plan being considered by the legislature to require greater employee contributions to the Virginia Retirement System and the Optional Retirement Plan.
5. The Board of Visitors has met. There were no action items from the Academic Affairs Committee. The Board approved a motion to certify that the university is in compliance with its debt management strategy.

6. Provost Scartelli reported regarding the one-time purchases that he has instructed the deans to work with their leadership teams and their faculty to come up with a prioritized list of needs. Money spent should show a return on investment in terms of teaching and learning. All items and services must be paid for by mid-June. It is expected that there will be about \$1 million available.
7. Provost Scartelli reported that he has also asked the deans and their teams to begin strategizing 5 to 7 years out, so as to be prepared for the recovery when it comes. He wants to have something on paper by mid-summer that reflects this strategizing.
8. Provost Scartelli reported that the provost search is still in the planning stages.
9. Provost Scartelli reported that the request for applications for summer research grants will be forthcoming soon.
10. Provost Scartelli presented to the board the new schedule for the role-out of the Doctor of Nursing Practice program in the fall, and also informed them of the decision to put back for one year the start of the Doctor of Physical Therapy, which will now roll-out in the fall of 2011. Dr. Scartelli also gave the board a presentation on tenure which was well-received, and distributed to them copies of the AAUP Red Book.
11. In response to a question, Dr. Owen reported that the Board of Visitors is no longer working with Tim Sullivan.
12. Dr. Brown reported for the Curriculum Committee that the faculty in the English department had identified problems with the implications of the RU 7-17 Strategic Plan and the teaching of the Core 101 and 102 courses. Dr. Moira Baker distributed a report on this to the members and asked them to share it with their constituents. Dr. Brown also mentioned that the chairs of the departments of the College of Humanities and Behavior Sciences took a unanimous vote to replace the Core Curriculum be replaced by a revised General Education program, and that this would be coming to the senate as a motion.
13. Dr. Kim Gainer reported for the Faculty Issues Committee that there is concern about VHS players being phased out, causing problems for instructors who still need to use them to provide instructional content. She also reported that there is concern about confidentiality with the emailed PDF's of student evaluations. She reported on concerns about the loss of the Friday of final exam week and the impact on students. Dr. Gainer reported that there has been discussion about adjusting some of the language in an upcoming proposal to change the requirements for graduate faculty.
14. Dr. Atwell reported for the Governance Committee that they are working on the Decision Matrix that was referred back to them and invited members to communicate with members of the committee about the matrix.

III. Old Business

1. The Motion to Approve the Revised Version of the Faculty Satisfaction Survey was taken from the table. Dr. Smith noted that at the previous discussion of this motion an amendment was offered by Dr. Clelland. A motion to divide was then entered to consider the amendment in four parts. On voice votes Question 2 was stricken from the questionnaire and the language of Question 10 was retained. It remains to consider two similar questions. On further debate and voice votes, the language of Question 14 was retained and Question 39 was stricken. The motion to approve the Revised Version of the Faculty Satisfaction Survey was then carried on a voice vote.

IV. New Business

1. Dr. Judy Niehaus introduced a motion on behalf of the Executive Council to Separate the Departments of Chemistry and Biology. Dr. Judy Guinan moved to suspend the rules so that the senate could move to immediate debate. This motion carried on a voice vote. Without discussion the motion was carried on a voice vote.
2. Dr. Gwen Brown introduced on behalf of the Curriculum Committee the Motion to Recommend Adoption of the Anthropological Science Major and Minor. There was a motion to suspend the rules to permit immediate consideration of the motion. Dr. Rick Roth noted that there is a sense of urgency because of a need to get the catalog edited. Dr. Brown responded that the registrar has told them they have until March, so the matter is not that urgent. After brief discussion Dr. Jordan moved to table the motion, and this passed on a voice vote.
3. Dr. Gwen Brown introduced on behalf of the Curriculum Committee the Motion to Recommend Approval of ANSC 101 for Core Curriculum Credit if the companion motion for the program major and minor is approved. This motion was tabled in accordance with standard practice.
4. Dr. Gwen Brown introduced on behalf of the Curriculum Committee the Motion Requesting that the Core Curriculum Committee/General Education Curricular Advisory Committee hold two open meetings for the purpose of receiving feedback on the Core. Dr. Brown moved to suspend the rules, and this motion was seconded and passed on a division of the house. Dr. Jordan moved an amendment to permit the meetings to not be held at times that would interfere with senate business. This was accepted as a friendly amendment. Dr. Udd remarked that forums are useful, but asked what the expected outcome would be? What would be the focus of the meeting? Who would be reporting on that outcome? To whom would they report? Dr. Smith expressed concern about language in the rationale, and didn't see how a forum was an appropriate venue for determining an evaluation of a program. This was echoed by remarks by Mr. Tapp, and Dr. Hashemzadeh said he thought that a formal assessment would be more useful than a forum. Dr. Suzanne Ament said she felt the Core Curriculum

Committee/GECAC could benefit from hearing from faculty and students. After further discussion, the rationale was dropped from the language of the amendment. The language of the motion was then amended to specify that its purpose was to provide feedback to the Core Curriculum Committee/GECAC and that the Core Curriculum Committee/GECAC should report to the Faculty Senate on the forums. The question was called and the motion as amended passed on a voice vote.

V. Announcements

1. Dr. Smith announced that because this will be his last semester at the university it will be important for members to begin thinking about who can be recruited to take on the duty of secretary while there is still time for some cross training before he leaves campus around the first of May.

VI. Adjournment

1. The meeting was adjourned at 4:39 pm.

**Radford University Faculty Senate
Meeting Minutes
February 25, 2010**

Members Present: Dr. Suzanne Ament, Dr. Mary Atwell, Dr. Moira Baker, Dr. Roann Barris, Ms. Dana Bella (sub McLaughlin), Dr. Gwen Brown, Dr. Paula Brush, Dr. Iain Clelland, Dr. David Daugherty (sub Htay), Dr. Farrell Doss, Dr. Patricia Easterling, Dr. I-Ping Fu, Dr. Kim Gainer, Mr. Anthony Guest, Dr. Judith Guinan, Dr. Hash Hashemzadeh (sub Saleh), Dr. Katie Hilden, Dr. Kim Lane (sub Wirgau), Dr. Glen Martin (sub Jordan), Dr. Douglas Mitchell, Mr. James Monaghan, Dr. Garth N. Montgomery, Dr. Michael Moore, Dr. Judy Niehaus, Dr. Stephen Owen, Dr. Richard Roth, Dr. Helen Roybark, Dr. Basel Saleh, Dr. David Sallee, Dr. George Santopietro (sub Orlov), Dr. Gary Schirr, Dr. Reginald Shareef, Dr. Lauren Smith, Dr. Sid Smith, Dr. Laura Spielman, Dr. Jenessa Steele, Mr. Kevin Tapp, Dr. Lynne Taylor, Dr. Skip Thompson, Dr. Edward Udd, Dr. Erin Webster-Garret, Dr. Joe Wirgau, Dr. David Zuschin

Members Absent: Dr. Elise Fullmer, Dr. Mary Hope Gibson, Dr. Maung Htay, Dr. Kay K. Jordan (excused), Dr. James McDonel, Ms. Deborah McLaughlin (excused), Dr. Alexei Orlov (excused), Dr. Edward Carter Turner

Guests Present: None.

I. Call to Order and Approval of Minutes

1. Dr. Owen called the meeting to order at 3:32 pm.
2. The minutes from the February 11th meeting were approved with minor edits.

II. Reports and Announcements

1. Dr. Owen reported that President Kyle would like the names of two faculty members to serve on the search committee for the new Vice President of Student Affairs.
2. Dr. Owen reported that as part of the implementation of the Banner system faculty would soon be asked to verify their information (names, rank, etc.) in the database.
3. Dr. Owen reported that there is no plan to phase out video cassette recorders. Apparently VCR's could not be wired into Young Hall during the renovation for technical reasons. Any faculty who require a VCR should let the technology office know. Also, there are VCR's in the library and they can feed their signal to any classroom. Finally, the Center for Innovative Teaching and Learning can transfer material from VHS to DVD, and they can help you with that.
4. Dr. Owen reported that the open forums for feedback on the Core Curriculum will be held on Tuesday, March 2nd at 3:30 pm in Bonnie 250, and on Friday, March 5th at 11:00 am, also in Bonnie 250.

5. Dr. Owen reported that he had received a number of questions about the role of the Faculty Senate and GECAC in decisions regarding the Core Curriculum. He said that he has spent time in the library going over the Board archives and other internal governance documents. In 1995 the Board of Visitors approved the Faculty Senate Constitution which gives the Faculty Senate approval authority over changes to general education. In 1996 the BOV approved a document that we have followed since that time that specifies that in order to accomplish a change in general education the president of the university is the final authority, with the exception of any instances in which the president and senate disagree. In those cases both sides present their argument to the BOV and presumably the Board is then the arbiter. The document specifies that the president is obligated to ensure that any recommendation to change general education went through the appropriate steps, which included a recommendation from GECAC, review and comment by the Faculty Senate and the Student Government Association, with such recommendations going to the Vice President for Academic Affairs (Provost). Thus, if the senate recommends a change, that recommendation goes to GECAC, and then upward ultimately to the president, who is the final authority. In response to a question, Dr. Owen noted that the senate does have final approval authority over courses and course recommendations for the general education system.
6. Provost Scartelli reported that the form of the Provost Search Committee has been approved and members are now being selected by their constituencies. It is hoped that the committee can be assembled before spring break.
7. Provost Scartelli reported that the deans met and thoroughly reviewed the lists of priorities for equipment purchases with stimulus money. (Dr. Scartelli's full report is on the senate web page under "current - reports - provost.")
8. In response to a question Dr. Susan van Patten reported that the new system does not presently allow separation of the students into special populations for the purpose of midterm grade reporting. In response to another question, Dr. Owen reported that Mr. Alvarez will be reporting on when some departments will have to move to make room for the new fitness center when he returns from Richmond.
9. Dr. Guinan reported for the Campus Environment Committee that the faculty satisfaction survey is ready to go out, and is planned to be sent out within two weeks of returning from spring break. The committee has obtained the results of the 2009 child care survey. The committee will promulgate a proposal for a university-wide task force on the issue for consideration by the full senate. Finally, the committee has been working on accessibility issues, and will have a report for the senate soon.
10. Dr. Brown reported for the Curriculum Committee that they are bringing three motions to the senate today.

11. Dr. Barris reported for the Faculty Issues Committee that the committee has addressed the compressed final exam schedule, the student evaluations, and the lack of uniformity in faculty evaluations across campus. The committee has been collecting data, meeting with principles such as Bethany Bodo and Matt Oyos, and is continuing to work on these issues.
12. Dr. Niehaus reported for the Governance Committee that the committee has reviewed the Decision Matrix and some alternatives, and will be meeting further on that issue on March 4th. They have also undertaken a review of the senate constitution and bylaws, and have begun the process of evaluating the forms for evaluation of department chairs. They are also working on getting the dean evaluations done soon.
13. Dr. Wirgau reported for the Resource Allocation Committee that the committee has worked with the administration on setting budgetary priorities. They are continuing to solicit information from the administration to allow them to analyze the budget more carefully. Dr. Wirgau noted that there is a budget structure document completed every year and he has already sent that link to senators. He noted that the committee is charged with reviewing and reporting on the Foundation account and this has been completed. Also, in response to questions, the committee has promulgated information on growth in the athletic budget. Dr. Wirgau noted that there is not a consistent policy on pay for faculty overloads, and currently when it is paid overloads are paid at the adjunct rate regardless of faculty rank.

III. **Old Business**

1. The motion to recommend approval of the revised Anthropological Sciences program was taken from the table. Dr. Brown noted that the Curriculum Committee supports the motion. Dr. Brush added that the Sociology Department supports the motion as well. In response to a question, a member of the department noted that there is no increased faculty resource requirement for the program because of a policy of rotation of the courses involved. The motion was carried on a voice vote.
2. The motion to recommend approval of ANSC 101 for Core Curriculum credit was taken from the table. Dr. Brush expressed her support for the motion. In response to a question Dr. Owen reported that the motion was sent to the senate by the General Education Curricular Advisory Committee. The motion was then carried on a voice vote.

IV. **New Business**

1. Dr. Brown introduced a motion on behalf of the Curriculum Committee to change the Interior Design and Fashion degree program to a Bachelor of Fine Arts, and noted that the motion needed to be amended to indicate that the change applies only to the Interior Design and Fashion concentrations. Dr. Brown moved to suspend the rules to consider the motion at the current meeting, and the motion

- to suspend the rules carried on a voice vote. Dr. Farrell Doss reported that the motion was unanimously supported by the Department of Interior Design and Fashion, and that the recommend change brings the department's program into alignment with the national norm for their discipline, and will enhance their graduates' employment prospects. The motion was carried on a voice vote.
2. Dr. Brown introduced on behalf of the Curriculum Committee a motion to revise the online syllabi for CORE 101 and 102. Dr. Baker reported that the changes in the revisions have already been made in practice, and that it is important that the online syllabi accurately reflect the actual syllabi. The motion was tabled until the next meeting.
 3. Dr. Brown deferred to Dr. Baker to introduce on behalf of the Curriculum Committee a motion to codesignate CORE 101 and 102 as CORE/ENGL 101 and 102. Dr. Baker noted that this change reflects the fact that the courses are taught exclusively by faculty in the English Department, and would bring in the departments curriculum committee in a role of oversight and approval for these courses. The motion was tabled until the next meeting.
 4. Dr. Barris introduced on behalf of the Faculty Issues Committee a motion to support new criteria for the assignment of graduate faculty status to members of the faculty. The motion was tabled until the next meeting.
 5. Dr. Paula Brush introduced a motion on behalf of the department chairs of the College of Humanities and Behavioral Sciences to replace the Core Curriculum with a revised general education curriculum beginning in the fall 2010 semester. The motion was tabled until the next meeting.
 6. Dr. Baker addressed the issue raised earlier about the system for submitting midterm grades and suggested a motion to clarify faculty obligations with respect to midterm grades in light of the sudden change in the system for grade reporting. Several options were discussed. With time running short, a motion was made to extend the time of the meeting, and this passed. After more discussion, Mr. Matthew Brunner, the interim registrar, arrived to address the concerns that were being discussed. Several senators left to attend to other commitments, and the secretary noted that the body had lost a quorum and moved to adjourn. This motion was carried on a voice vote.

V. Announcements

1. None.

VI. Adjournment

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

The Minutes of the Special Meeting of the Radford University Faculty Senate, March 4, 2010

President Steve Owen called the meeting to order at 3:30 p.m. He announced that this special meeting would have a single agenda item: the Motion that the 2009-2010 Core Curriculum be Replaced. Dr. Owen reminded senators to wait to be recognized before speaking. Additionally, he observed that if passed the motion would be forwarded as a recommendation to the General Education Curricular Advisory Committee/Core Curriculum Committee (GECAC). It was moved and seconded that the motion be removed from the table. The motion passed.

Dr. Judy Guinan presented a substitute motion that the Core Curriculum be replaced by a curriculum attached to the motion (refer to the motion posted on the Senate webpage). She stated that this curriculum had been unanimously supported by the chairs of both the College of Humanities and Behavioral Sciences and those of the College of Science and Technology. The CSAT faculty voted 39 to 1 in support of the proposed curriculum. The motion was seconded and a lively discussion ensued.

Dr Gary Schirr raised a point of order, inquiring whether Dr. Guinan's motion was, in fact, a motion to rescind the Motion to Replace the 2009-2010 Core Curriculum or a substitute motion. Dr. Owen ruled that the motion qualified as a substitute motion in that it recommends a particular program different from the curriculum which existed prior to adoption of the 2009-2010 Core Curriculum. Additionally, the substitute motion introduced new information.

Dr. Mary Atwell explained the background of the substitute motion. She stated that the chairs of CHBS and CSAT unanimously supported the restored and revised general education curriculum. All of the chairs were concerned about the current difficulty in recruiting persons to staff the second year of the core. They concurred that it would be easier to staff the proposed general education curriculum. She noted that the chairs supporting the proposed curriculum come from the two colleges that provide the bulk of general education.

Dr. Ed Udd objected to the motion in that it failed to use the proper procedure for changing general education. He noted that neither the other colleges nor the students had been consulted.

Dr. Paula Brush, chair of the Sociology Department, stated that the substitute motion was presented for the purpose of discussion and that the motion's sponsors were not asking for an immediate vote on it.

Dr. Laura Spielman explained that she was the lone dissenting vote on the proposed curriculum in CSAT. Her rationale was that the new core has been in place less than a year and that we should assess it. She emphasized the need to consult the students. She opposed the motion stating that we should not transform general education for the third time in three years without becoming better informed.

Dr. Gwen Brown suggested that the department chairs attending the meeting be allowed to speak to contribute to our understanding of the core. She noted that the fall 2010 schedule is available on the registrar's webpage and that more than half of the sections of Core 201 remain

unstaffed. On top of everything else, we are in the midst of a budget crunch. The original plan for the core included staffing it with specially trained regular faculty members rather than adjuncts.

Dr. Lynn Taylor affirmed the important role played by the two colleges that deliver the bulk of the general education program. But, she simultaneously pointed out that faculty from other colleges have a vested interest in the quality of education in the core.

Dr. Helen Roybark voiced her objection to both the original motion and the substitute motion because two meetings are insufficient to educate senators and faculty on the issues surrounding the debate over the core. She also noted that the core has yet to be assessed.

Dr. Elise Fullmer raised several questions: Why are we throwing out a curriculum that has been approved by the Faculty Senate? Why are we returning to a curriculum many considered flawed? Shouldn't we be trying to identify the problems with the core and fix them? She noted that one of the strengths of the core is that more colleges could be involved in it. She declared that our first and foremost responsibility is to our students. She supports fixing the core curriculum.

Library senator Kevin Tapp suggested that the senate seek input from other university constituencies. He asked if the information gathered at the GECAC forums would be made available to senators. Dr. Owen replied that this information would be made available.

Dr. Rosemary Guruswamy, chair of the English department, stated that the general education program in place prior to fall 2009 was replaced before it had been assessed because the Board of Visitors demanded that we adopt a new program. She expressed concern about funding for the core curriculum given that the stimulus money will expire in two years. Some of the technologies included in the original plan failed and it was extremely difficult to train instructors for the curriculum. English professors do not want to teach Core 101 and Core 102 or mentor instructors. Her department has replaced adjuncts with graduate teaching fellows who are less well prepared to teach.

Dr. I Ping Fu expressed concern about the problems with training persons to teach the core. She also noted that the core places a high demand on university resources. She affirmed the importance of acting in the best interest of our students.

Dr. Moira Baker explained that the purpose of the motion before us is not to bring back the old general education program. Instead, this motion addresses the lack of qualified instructors for the core curriculum and of an infrastructure to support them. At one time, Radford University had a thriving Writing Across the Curriculum (WAC) program and subsequently an Oral Communication Across the Curriculum (OAC) program. We no longer have these programs. When the core curriculum was proposed the administration promised that the Core 201 and Core 202 courses would be taught by full time faculty rather than adjuncts. Now, we don't even have enough adjuncts to teach these courses. She noted that raising the number of students per section would make it impossible for teachers to require the number of projects included in the syllabi and provide the necessary feedback for students.

Dr. Kim Gainer focused her comments on the issue of resources. She noted that when she arrived in August 1998, RU had a thriving Writing Across the Curriculum program. This program which required a budget of \$100,000 fell victim to budget cuts. She stated that the core curriculum courses which include instruction in information technology literacy and critical thinking require an infrastructure similar to the one which previously supported WAC. Given the current and future budget situation at RU, it is doubtful that we can provide such an infrastructure. Accepting that all colleges across campus have in the core, Dr. Gainer wonders why faculty from COBE and WCHS have not volunteered to teach these courses. She challenged chairpersons in these colleges to recruit faculty members to teach the second year of the core.

Dr. Mary Atwell, chair of the Department of Criminal Justice, also addressed the resource issue. As a result of the budget crisis, her department has several vacancies and fewer adjuncts than in the past. Hence, she is having a hard time staffing the CRJU courses let alone releasing faculty to teach the core. She asked, Who will teach our regular courses if our best teachers staff the core? She also noted that administrators have already stated that the RU budget will “fall off a cliff” when the stimulus money disappears in 2012. She estimated that either backfilling regular faculty positions or hiring adjuncts to teach the core costs \$3,000 per course.

Dr. Elise Fulmer, Director of the School of Social Work, noted that her program is interdisciplinary and all students must complete the general education before going into the major. She expressed concern that the only solution for problems with the core recommended by the motion under discussion was a return to an older program. She expressed a willingness to release faculty under her supervision to teach the core.

Dr. Helen Roybark stated that some faculty from the College of Business and Economics were teaching the core.

In response to the issues raised by Dr. Elise Fulmer, Dr. Gwen Brown elaborated the concerns of faculty supporting the motion to replace the core. She stated that the problem is not only finding faculty to teach the core but also finding the resources to provide stipends for them to undergo training when RU is adjusting to a shrinking budget. Dr. Brown suggested that the members of the university advising staff who attended the GECAC forum on Tuesday seemed to calm down when they realized that the proposal to replace the Core Curriculum was actually a return to a familiar program. Dr. Brown argued on behalf of the substitute motion because it includes provisions for meeting the university’s obligation to students who entered under the 2009-2010 catalog.

Dr. Brown discussed the history of the core, noting that in fall 2007 the Faculty Senate rejected the initial core curriculum proposal developed by an ad hoc committee appointed by the provost. During the 2007-2008 semester break, GECAC hastily put together the plan which formed the basis for the core curriculum subsequently approved by the Faculty Senate. In summer 2008, Dr. Brown served on the committee tasked with developing the current core curriculum. This committee felt compelled to cram too many learning objectives into 12 semester hours and was denied permission to “pilot” the curriculum. She emphatically stated

that the English faculty believe this curriculum to be unteachable and chairpersons believe we cannot afford to staff it.

Dr. Ed Udd suggested that someone should do a cost comparison between keeping the core curriculum or returning to the older general education program. He suggested that the Senate should allow GECAC to propose solutions to the problems with the core.

Provost Joe Scartelli presented the administration's view of the core curriculum. He stated that according to CFO Richard Alvarez, the university is absolutely committed to financially support the Core Curriculum in the 2010-2011 academic year. He acknowledged that the university has lost a lot of faculty through the Workforce Transition program. He noted that two years ago we had about 420 faculty and now we have around 365. But, this reduction would affect any general education program. Dr. Scartelli guaranteed that he would support any faculty member who wishes to teach the core, including backfilling any positions. He stated that the 2012 budgetary cliff mentioned by several senators would impact any general education program. He affirmed that at present, there is an unfair reliance on part-time faculty to staff the core and that until the economy turns around this will be the case. Acknowledging that these numbers need more analysis, Dr. Scartelli stated that the cost of paying adjuncts to teach Core 101 and Core 102 was \$90,000 less than the cost of staffing ENG 101 and 102 the previous year. He also stated that we had fewer students in the current academic year than the prior year. Dr. Scartelli expressed a willingness to implement appropriate changes to the core after the assessment committee comprised of Carol Geller, Sam Zeakes, and Lee Stewart submits its report.

Dr. Brown asked if the provost's cost analysis included the cost of training teachers for the core? Dr. Scartelli said it did not. He wished that we had the funds to provide the kind of infrastructure that supported the Writing Across the Curriculum program. For the upcoming academic year, we will be able to use stimulus money to support the core's training expenses. Dr. Baker noted that the training for the 2009-2010 had been inadequate and asked how extensive the training would be. Dr. Scartelli responded that we did the best we could. Dr. Susan van Patten, Acting Core Curriculum Director, said that coordinators were hired and training was provided for the current academic year; that which was promised occurred.

Dr. Kim Gainer, who attended the week-long training sessions, complained that too many skill sets were presented in a short time. She called the sessions "drive by training" and asserted that faculty were more confused at the end than they were at the beginning of the process. She suggested that serious training involves a significant commitment of time, money, and personnel. Dr. Scartelli responded positively suggesting that better training might be provided in the future and that trainees could become trainers.

Dr. Erin Webster-Garrett observed that she found it difficult to teach Core 101 and 102. Additionally, she had a hard time mentoring teachers assigned to her and evaluating their performance. Dr. Scartelli suggested that some faculty might be given a course release to undergo training. Dr. Baker observed that she had received a one course released time to prepare a writing intensive course as part of WAC.

Dr. Judy Niehaus was not surprised that the first year of the core had been cheap. She noted that ENG 101 and ENG 102, the writing courses in the previous general education program, had a class size of 20-25 and Core 101 and 102 also had a class size of 20-25. But, implementing Core 201 and 202 involves reassigning faculty who have typically taught general education courses with 45 students to teaching classes of 20 students. Presently, we do not have sufficient instructors for the number of sections of 201 and 202 that must be taught in the 2010-2011 academic year. She said, "This is a train wreck about to happen." This is especially true for those programs that require completion of general education requirements before admitting students.

Gary Schirr was uncertain regarding the costs and benefits of the core curriculum versus the old general education program. He asked: "Is it better to have 45 students enrolled in a philosophy course or 20 students in a section of the core curriculum?"

Katie Hildren stated that the advising offices were concerned about a return to the old general education program given that they had spent the past year "selling" the new core to community college advising offices.

Speaking as a member of GECAC for the past two years, Dr. Roann Barris stated that development of the core curriculum program was based on a review of many curriculums.

Dr. Gwen Brown moved to table the substitute motion.

The meeting was adjourned at 3:45.

Respectfully submitted,
Kay K. Jordan
Substituting for Senate Secretary B. Sidney Smith

Radford University Faculty Senate
Meeting Minutes
March 18, 2010

Members Present: Dr. Suzanne Ament, Dr. Mary Atwell, Dr. Moira Baker, Dr. Roann Barris, Dr. Gwen Brown, Dr. Paula Brush, Dr. Kenneth Cox (sub Fullmer), Dr. Patricia Easterling, Dr. I-Ping Fu, Dr. Kim Gainer, Mr. Anthony Guest, Dr. Judith Guinan, Dr. Katie Hilden, Dr. Maung Htay, Dr. Kim Lane (sub Wirgau), Ms. Deborah McLaughlin, Mr. James Monaghan, Dr. Garth N. Montgomery, Dr. Michael Moore, Dr. Judy Niehaus, Dr. Stephen Owen, Dr. Richard Roth, Dr. Helen Roybark, Dr. Basel Saleh, Dr. David Sallee, Dr. Gary Schirr, Dr. Reginald Shareef, Dr. Lauren Smith, Dr. Sid Smith, Dr. Laura Spielman, Dr. Sumati Srinivas, Dr. Jenessa Steele, Mr. Kevin Tapp, Dr. Lynne Taylor, Dr. Skip Thompson, Dr. Edward Udd, Dr. Erin Webster-Garret, Dr. Joe Wirgau, Dr. David Zuschin

Members Absent: Dr. Iain Clelland, Dr. Farrell Doss, Dr. Elise Fullmer (excused), Dr. Mary Hope Gibson, Dr. Kay K. Jordan (excused), Dr. James McDonel, Dr. Douglas Mitchell

Guests Present: None.

I. Call to Order and Approval of Minutes

1. Dr. Owen called the meeting to order at 3:32 pm.
2. The approval of the minutes of the previous two meetings was deferred.

II. Reports and Announcements

1. President Kyle addressed the senate, and reported on the budget situation following the recent legislative session. Her remarks to the senate were published to the entire RU community, and are appended below these minutes.
2. Dr. Owen reported that on Friday, March 19th, the grand opening of the new faculty lounge would be held from 4pm.
3. Dr. Owen reported that the Charter Day Celebration would be held on Wednesday the 24th of March, and invited senators to inform their constituents.
4. Dr. Owen reminded senators that it is time to fill positions on the Internal Governance Revision Steering Committee, and asked them to seek out constituents willing to be nominated at the next senate meeting, at which time elections will be held.
5. Provost Scartelli reaffirmed that up to ten new positions may be authorized in the coming year, in addition to filling all those lines being vacated by resignations or retirements beyond those associated with the WTO this year. He reminded senators that the one-time funds for new equipment must be spent by the middle of June. Also, the unused money that was provided for professional travel will be added to the fund for summer research grants.

6. Dr. Owen reported that the search committee for the new provost has been constituted and will be meeting soon.
7. Dr. Roann Barris summarized the feedback received from the Core Curriculum Forums. She noted that the report that is published on the senate web site is simply a direct compilation of the remarks that were received at the forums. She then provided a summary, which is reproduced below in the appendix to these minutes.
8. Dr. Atwell reported for the Governance Committee that they are still working on the Decision Matrix/Curriculum Path Document, and hope to report back soon.

III. **Old Business**

1. At the request of Dr. Gwen Brown, without objection the agenda was altered to bring the motion to replace the Core Curriculum to the first place in old business. A motion to bring this motion off the table was carried on a voice vote, and debate ensued. Dr. Smith then read a statement from the advising center in regards to the motion. This statement is included in the appendix to these minutes. Dr. Udd then expressed his concern that the motion would not permit time for changes to be made in an appropriate manner, and that it would be more advisable for the senate to task the General Education Curricular Advisory Committee to examine the concerns that have been raised about the Core Curriculum, and to make a recommendation. He noted that many felt that taking two years to change the general education program was too hasty, yet here we are proposing to change it in two weeks. Moreover, the forums revealed that the concerns that have been raised may not be supported by the facts. He also asked that when the matter comes to a vote it be by secret ballot, but that it would be better if the motion was simply withdrawn, since we have important business to attend to and there is no way to implement this motion in the time we have. Dr. Mary Atwell noted that there was nothing hasty or casual in the deliberations of the chairs of the department in the College of Science and Technology and the College of Humanities and Behavioral Science in voting unanimously to bring this motion forward, and that to characterize it as hasty is not fair. She added that their ultimate concern is the quality of the education that students are getting, and that this concern should take precedence over concerns about difficulties with advising, registration, and so on. Dr. Gwen Brown then read a statement: "For several reasons, I favor this substitute motion. First, it was presented with the unanimous support of the CHBS Chairs and CSAT Chairs. I believe that no one is in a better position to know the possibilities and the problems with the Core Curriculum than the chairs of the two colleges who shoulder by far the heaviest load for teaching that Core Curriculum. If they say they don't have the faculty to teach these classes, we should listen to them. Second, the English faculty report that they are having major problems teaching Core 101 and 102 (and they have 100% of the responsibility for those courses). They argue that too much is being asked of them for which they are unprepared. Teaching composition is no problem, but teaching public speaking skills, critical thinking/logic skills, and information/technology literacy is

not something they feel prepared to do well. And the chair of the English department, Dr. Guruswamy, told the Senate that she is having great difficulty recruiting faculty to teach in the Core program and her graduate student teacher mentors are reporting a number of problems. We should, I think, listen to our colleagues in English and respect their views on the “teachability” of these courses. Moreover, faculty already are concerned about students receiving adequate preparation in writing skills; the English faculty are rightly concerned that they are even more limited in what they can do to teach writing if they have to teach public speaking, critical thinking, and information/technology literacy as well. Third, as of today, the Registrar’s web site shows that there are a total of 55 non-honors sections of CORE 201 and 202, and of those 55, only 21 are staffed for the fall semester; that is, only 38.2% of the sections are staffed. Three-fifths of the CORE 201 and 202 sections have not been staffed and registration is about to begin. And since department chairs have already set the fall schedule and committed faculty to teaching schedules, we can only fill those 201 and 202 sections in one of two ways. We can either hire adjuncts to teach those sections (a prospect the Senate was assured by the administration would never be allowed to occur) or adjuncts could be hired to teach majors in departments and other gen ed courses, thus freeing up faculty to teach 201 and 202 who might have otherwise taught those majors or other gen ed classes. Dr. Scartelli assured the Senate on Thursday before spring break that funding would be available to hire those adjuncts. He could not assure us, though, that funds for training full-time faculty (another promise made to the Senate when the Core was approved) would be available. Additionally, even if funding for hiring adjuncts (so that full-time faculty are freed up to teach in the Core) were available, we can never be sure that enough appropriately-trained adjuncts could be found to pick up classes in a major in order to free up other faculty to teach 201 and 202. Where, for example, do you find an adjunct with expertise about James Joyce to teach Dr. Jolanta Wawrzycka’s class so that she can be freed up to teach Core 201 or 202? Where do you find an adjunct Geologist with Dr. Skip Watts’ expertise in order to free him up to teach 201 or 202? And do we really want to come to depend upon finding adjuncts to teach junior- and senior-level course work to majors? Fourth, CORE 101, 102, 201, and 202 were designed to be small-enrollment classes; teaching writing intensive courses or performance-based communication courses cannot be done in large-enrollment classes. CORE 101 and 102 essentially take the place of ENGL 101 and 102; but with CORE 201 and 202, we have essentially added another layer of small-enrollment classes to our teaching obligation at RU and yet we’ve not added the faculty positions to compensate for that extra layer. Because there will need to be as many 201 and 202 courses as there are 101 and 102 classes, we will, in essence, need the equivalent of another English department’s worth of faculty to teach 201 and 202 if we are to teach the CORE and continue the same level of offerings in our majors. We don’t have those faculty numbers. In fact, the Chairs were recently told that RU is down approximately 40 faculty positions from what SCHEV believes is an appropriate number of faculty for the size of the institution and with the responsibilities of the institution (and this was likely SCHEV’s estimate before we began teaching the CORE A classes this year). If we can’t staff 201 and 202 for next fall, what will happen in the spring when we then have a backlog of students? And already the promise of keeping these classes small

is eroding; Dr. Susan Van Patten, who is the acting Director of the Core, has already suggested that one way to handle the problem of staffing the courses is to enlarge the sections and teach fewer of them. If this occurs, it will be yet another promise broken since we were repeatedly told that the administration understood that the classes had to be limited if objectives were to be met. Fifth, we were told that deposits are up for freshmen next year and the projections are for larger freshman classes over the next few years. This is good news. The bad news is that we are not going to be hiring many new faculty. Will parents be thrilled with having their sons and daughters at RU when they start to report that there aren't enough sections of required courses for them to take? This is a management and PR problem that RU doesn't need when we've had recent problems with attracting students. Finally, the CORE program (101, 102, 201, and 202) add costs that we cannot afford at this point with the current budget crisis. We were just told that RU has been cut \$16.4 million or 33% in state appropriations over the past couple of years. And President Kyle has just said that by 2012 we and other state institutions will be cut a further \$10 million and the stimulus money will be gone in that same year. It is, I believe, irresponsible to attempt to continue an already troubled program that has such high costs (hiring adjuncts, paying faculty to be trained to teach 101, 102, 201, and 202). We are so strapped financially that the Budget VP uses the expression "we are going over a cliff." At a point when we are about to go "over a cliff," we shouldn't be pedaling harder and faster. Adopting the CHBS/CSAT Chairs' plan would substantially drop the cost of supplying general education. The administration has been reporting its efforts to tighten the belt; faculty need to take appropriate steps to tighten the belt as well. For all of these reasons, I urge support of the Joint CHBS and CSAT Chairs Substitute motion. To disregard the concerns and appeals of our colleagues and the problems they bring to us and to say that we need to give a lengthier trial to what the chairs and the faculty most intimately involved in the entire CORE say is problematic and impossible for them to deliver—this is an abrogation of our duty as colleagues, as good stewards of the resources we have, and as trustees of our students' best interests." Dr. Baker seconded Dr. Brown's statement and added that the concern about having three general education systems in place at one time can be alleviated by making a change in academic policies to allow a blanket petition to give those who have already taken CORE courses to receive equivalencies in the new general education system. She said that any public relations fallout can be handled by saying that we are under a new set of fiscal constraints that makes teaching the Core Curriculum as envisioned impossible, so as good stewards we are making necessary changes. She said she believed that all concerns can be met, and that under the Core Curriculum as written the courses are not giving students what they need. After making this change, she said the faculty could then start over with a new, deliberative approach to rewriting general education. Dr. Susanne Ament spoke in favor of the motion, and noted that because of the faculty drain into teaching the Core courses, many of our courses such as beginning French will be taught not by the permanent faculty hired to teach those subjects, but by adjuncts. Dr. Barris said that she was inclined to agree with many of the arguments in favor of the motion, but that she believe too many issues were being addressed by this motion, and that more time was needed to

consider each issue on its own merits. Dr. Smith seconded Dr. Barris's point. He also said that Dr. Brown brought up many issues of fact, but that most of us haven't had the opportunity to gather data and look at it. He said that Dr. Baker has suggested that we'll just have to let the Academic Policies and Procedures Committee know what changes they will have to approve to do our will. Both of these points speak to the glaring problem with the motion; if shared governance means anything, it means ensuring that every stakeholder have the opportunity to think things through, and having thought things through, to then provide feedback on the basis of bonafide information and lengthy dialogue. He said that if we make this decision today then we are simply not permitting those things to happen. He noted that when the Core Curriculum was created people were brought into the process, that there were forums and discussions, that it was a shared governance process. He said that this motion is anything but that, but is instead a panic to a decision with enormous implications, and he could not in conscience support such an act. Having reached the mandatory adjournment time, a motion was made to extend the meeting to continue debate, but this failed on a voice vote.

IV. New Business

1. None.

V. Announcements

1. None.

VI. Adjournment

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

APPENDIX:

PRESIDENT KYLE'S REPORT:

Last Sunday evening the 2010 Session of the General Assembly adjourned after adopting the biennial budget (FY 2011 and FY 2012) for the Commonwealth. The following is a review of the provisions of the biennial budget that affect our institution. Overall the budget that was adopted by the General Assembly was very similar to the budget presented by outgoing Governor Timothy Kaine last December. The overall reduction in the University's E&G operating budget remains at \$16.4 million which is a 33% reduction in general fund dollars since FY2008.

- Operating Budget Reductions – The General Assembly recommends no further institutional reduction beyond the current reduction of 33% (\$16.4 million) through FY 2012; however, the budget does include a \$10 million reduction in higher education funding in FY 2012. The distribution of this additional reduction has not been allocated

among institutions. Distribution will likely occur during the 2011 General Assembly Session. We are working with staff in Richmond to learn more details about this additional proposed reduction.

- Faculty and Staff Salaries – subject to available funds, a salary bonus of up to 3% would be provided in December 2010 based on a state revenue calculation set forth in the budget. FY 2012 salaries were not addressed.
- Furlough Day – The budget as passed by the General Assembly requires that all state employees take a single furlough day prior to June 30, 2010; however, institutions of higher education may achieve the necessary savings “through alternative means”. At this time our interpretation of this language will allow us to use E&G funding to contribute to the state any funds that would have been produced by our employees if they had taken a furlough day in fiscal year 2010.
- Retirement and Other Benefits – The General Assembly eliminated Governor Kaine’s proposal that current state employees contribute 1% in FY 2011 and 2% in FY 2012 to the Virginia Retirement System and optional retirement plans. The General Assembly also fully restores funding for the cash match retirement program by FY 2012.
- New employees, those hired after July 1, 2010, will be required to pay a 5% employee contribution toward their retirement. Additionally, the contribution rate for the optional retirement program is also projected to change for new employees, but the specific rate is unknown at this time.
- Federal Stimulus Funds (ARRA) – The one-time allocation of stimulus funds (\$6.1 million) for FY 2011 remains the same as that provided in Governor Kaine’s budget proposal. Language in the budget bill states, “This funding is intended to moderate the general fund reductions to the institutions, as well as moderate the need for tuition and fee increases and increase student access.”
- Tuition and Fee Policy – The General Assembly placed no limits on the authority of the Board of Visitors to set tuition and fees. The General Assembly proposed an increase to the capital fee charged to out-of-state students of an additional \$5 per credit hour to partially support the state’s debt service on academic facilities.
- Student Financial Aid — The General Assembly recommends no institution level reductions in student financial aid.
- Auxiliary Fund Balances – The General Assembly rejected Governor’s Kaine’s recommendation to transfer 5% of each institution’s auxiliary enterprise fund balance to the state general fund.
- Interest Earnings – The University will not be allowed to retain any interest earnings on our auxiliary reserve balances in FY 2011 and FY 2012.

- Percentage of In-State/Out-of-State Undergraduates - No recommended changes to existing policy.
- Capital Projects – Construction approval for the College of Science and Technology building remained in the biennial budget; however, funding for this project remains subject to the state’s available debt capacity. Our maintenance reserve allocation is also subject to available debt capacity.

The budget as passed by the General Assembly now goes to the Governor for review and approval. The General Assembly will consider amendments requested by the Governor at the “veto session” on April 21, 2010.

All in all, we survived the 2010 session of the legislature in as good or better shape than we had thought possible last fall. This outcome is due mainly to the efforts of the elected members of the General Assembly and their staff who felt that higher education had already absorbed its share of budget reductions. We all need to thank Lisa Ridpath, Budget Director, Evelyn Wilson, Associate Vice President for Finance and Administration, and Richard Alvarez, Vice President for Finance and Administration, for the time and effort that they expended during the session in tracking and analyzing the vast numbers of bills that were introduced that would affect Radford University and the other institutions of higher education.

Our next challenge is to think and plan strategically so that we are prepared for 2012, when the stimulus funding has expired, and the years beyond. Efforts toward this strategic thinking and planning have already begun to occur in several areas of our University, but we all must commit ourselves to preparing Radford University for an even more successful next 100 years.

DR. BARRIS' SUMMARY:

The stated purpose of these meetings was to provide feedback on problems and issues related to the implementation of the core curriculum at this point. The discussion was not intended to propose solutions so much as to solicit without censoring or direction any and all feedback that was available at this time. Several speakers did refer to the proposed new core, but in most cases, it was referred to in terms of changing cores, as opposed to specifically implementing the new proposal. In preparing this summary, I tried to identify comments or ideas expressed more than once. The content of both meetings was quite similar.

1 – At both meetings, a great deal of the feedback related to implementation problems with core 101 and 102. Most of these issues were raised by more than one person:

- the lack of an adequate amount of time to work with GTAs prior to the beginning implementation leaving them ill-prepared from a pedagogical viewpoint
- the structure of the classes which involved too many objectives and skills to allow for meaningful teaching and/or reinforcement of essential skills in the time frame of the course
- the highly structured nature of the official syllabi (more structured than most)

- the lack of an adequate number of mentors for next year, given that some of this year's mentors do not want to do it again
- questions about whether these courses were as effective in teaching writing skills as English 101 and 102
- transfer equivalencies for transfer students and for students who were applying to graduate school and needed to demonstrate that they had taken the equivalent of courses in composition or English

2 – The second major area of concern was core 201/202. Since these courses have only been implemented on a small scale this year, the feedback had less to do with actual teaching problems than with anticipated problems for next year. The focus here was the lack of tenured or tenure-track fulltime faculty currently agreeing to or free to teach these sections. Some concerns were raised about content, asking if the courses could truly be called interdisciplinary when they were focused on skills, and also asking if faculty from any discipline would be adequately prepared to teach ethics, writing, and other skills associated with 201 and 202.

3 – Both meetings contained debate over the pros and cons of sticking with something that many people did not think was working versus changing to a new core so quickly. Advising problems were raised at both meetings with respect to having three different cores in the catalogues and “image” problems were also raised. These referred to perceptions of Radford by parents, community colleges, and students.

4 – Some speakers commented on the belief that the old core curriculum had not been fully assessed before replacing it, and that the new core had not been developed in an atmosphere of free choice. Several people raised the question of what value would lie in discarding the work that had been currently done as opposed to trying to revise and correct without throwing it away. Some people asked about the degree to which adjuncts were being exploited and would continue to be exploited by making new changes.

ADVISOR'S LETTER:

As professional advisors in the University Academic Advising Centers, we work closely with students concerning their academic progress towards graduation. We would like to formally state our analysis of advising implications as they relate to changes of our Core Curriculum.

Along with faculty, professional advisors have worked over the past year to assist with the implementation strategies for the current 2009-2010 Core Curriculum. Our experience extends beyond the replacement of the general education program to the numerous curriculum changes which were processed as a result of the implementation of the new Core Curriculum. Perhaps a leading advising challenge we have already experienced is the short amount of time to not only

implement strategies but communicate changes to prospective students in high schools and Virginia community colleges.

We request our faculty to consider and set forth an appropriate timeline for any changes in the existing Core Curriculum. For many of our students, advising begins long before their arrival to campus as an RU student. We have already met with numerous prospective students and discussed transfer equivalencies, core curriculum requirements as well as major requirements. As we have seen in the past year, many of our prospective transfer students base their course enrollments at their respective community colleges on information as it relates to our recommendations and curriculum requirements. We feel it is imperative to disseminate accurate and specific information in a timely manner to our advising colleagues in the Virginia Community College System.

In addition, faculty advisors and professional advisors face a considerable challenge by advising for three different curriculum programs simultaneously. Faculty advisors and professional advisors know that mistakes in advising can be costly and cause undue stress for our students. It is important that faculty advisors, professional advisors and our students are not only familiar with but understand any changes in the curriculum and how they may affect progress towards graduation. Even now, one year after creating the Core Curriculum, we are still trying to update materials and websites to inform our campus community and others of these changes.

Any extensive changes made for the upcoming academic year, 2010-2011, could greatly influence aspects of our advising currently in progress and registration for summer and fall. Our fall 2010 schedule and class enrollments have already been determined based on the needs of our previous general education program and new core curriculum. Students will begin enrolling in these classes on March 29th, leaving very little time for departments to make adjustments to classes if necessary due to additional changes. Moreover, extensive changes must be in place prior to the start of our new student orientation programs again leaving very little time for departments to consider the impact of changes on curriculum and make appropriate modifications if necessary.

Professional advisors value the same desirable learning outcomes as faculty: Writing, Communication, Critical Thinking, Ethical Reasoning, and Technology/Information Literacy. We know our faculty considers changes in curriculum with great seriousness and thoughtfulness.

Radford University Faculty Senate
Meeting Minutes
April 1, 2010

Members Present: Dr. Suzanne Ament, Dr. Mary Atwell, Dr. Moira Baker, Dr. Roann Barris, Dr. Maggie Bassett (sub Gibson), Dr. Gwen Brown, Dr. Paula Brush, Dr. Iain Clelland, Dr. Farrell Doss, Dr. Patricia Easterling, Dr. I-Ping Fu, Dr. Kim Gainer, Mr. Anthony Guest, Dr. Judith Guinan, Dr. Hash Hashemzadeh (sub Saleh), Dr. Katie Hilden, Dr. Kay K. Jordan, Ms. Deborah McLaughlin, Dr. Douglas Mitchell, Mr. James Monaghan, Dr. Garth N. Montgomery, Dr. Michael Moore, Dr. Judy Niehaus, Dr. Stephen Owen, Dr. Richard Roth, Dr. Helen Roybark, Dr. Basel Saleh, Dr. David Sallee, Dr. George Santopietro (sub Orlov), Dr. Gary Schirr, Dr. Lauren Smith, Dr. Sid Smith, Dr. Laura Spielman, Dr. Jenessa Steele, Mr. Kevin Tapp, Dr. Lynne Taylor, Dr. Skip Thompson, Dr. Edward Udd, Dr. Erin Webster-Garret, Dr. Joe Wirgau, Dr. David Zuschin

Members Absent: Dr. Elise Fullmer, Dr. Mary Hope Gibson (excused), Dr. Maung Htay, Dr. James McDonel (excused), Dr. Alexei Orlov (excused), Dr. Reginald Shareef, Dr. Basel Saleh, Dr. Edward Carter Turner

Guests Present: None.

I. Call to Order and Approval of Minutes

1. Dr. Owen called the meeting to order at 3:32 pm.
2. The minutes from the February 25th, March 4th, and March 18th meetings were approved.

II. Reports and Announcements

1. Dr. Owen pointed out that any new items of business, to be acted on this semester, must be introduced at the penultimate meeting of this year's senate on the 15th of April.
2. Dr. Nape reported that as of April 1st the university had 6,981 applications, of which 92% were complete. About 5,100 had been admitted, and deposits had been received from 632 applicants. This is a tremendous improvement over the previous three years. All the indicators point towards a good incoming freshman class.
3. Provost Scartelli announced that the old cycle of announcing budgets early and sweeping accounts late is now being ended. The following year will start with \$500,000 for travel and \$500,000 for research. There will not be summer research after this year. He invited faculty to be thinking about what kind of research they would like to do next year. Requests for proposals would be coming in September. This will be the pattern henceforth, so faculty can also begin thinking about research they might like to do in the following year. Dr.

Scartelli noted that he has already authorized all positions being vacated this spring to be advertised. Most of those will be full-time temporary. In addition to those 6 or 8 positions, there will be authorization to begin looking at the top ten priorities for new positions, for which will be assigned and authorized up to ten new positions. In all, there may be up to 30 positions, old and new, to be advertised for fall, or to be advertised in the fall for the following year. Dr. Scartelli passed out a schematic of a renovation of the apartment building on Downing Street near the Covington Center to be completed over the summer. There will be more than 60 offices, and these will be for those departments being displaced by the new fitness center, including Criminal Justice, Communication, Philosophy and Religious Studies, and (some) Psychology. Once the new building for the College of Business and Economics is completed, then Whitt hall will be renovated for use by these departments. In response to a question, Dr. Scartelli said it has been explained to him that the renovation planned for Whitt hall will take care of the existing mold problem in the building. Dr. Scartelli finally noted that he is now sweeping the unused travel money, so as to add it to this summer's research budget. He also encouraged all departments to finish spending their current budgets.

4. Dr. Smith reported that apportionment for the upcoming senate elections for the coming year had been completed, and there there was no change in the total number of seats apportioned to each college.

III. **Old Business**

1. The motion to replace the Core Curriculum, having been under discussion when the previous meeting was adjourned, was again taken up. Dr. Smith noted that the motion was holding up a great deal of business, and moved to call the previous question (on the substitute motion currently being debated). This was carried on a voice vote, and voting proceeded on the substitute motion by secret ballot. The motion was adopted by 25 to 15. Dr. Gainer then moved that the substitute motion now under discussion be referred to the General Education Curricular Advisory Committee. After some discussion of what this might mean, Dr. Owen explained that the motion to refer would result in the substitute motion being sent to GECAC without a recommendation from the senate. Dr. Udd spoke against the subsidiary motion to refer, complaining that if this was to go to GECAC, this should have been done one and a half months ago and not wasted so much of the senate's time. He then moved to call the question on the motion to commit. This was seconded and carried on a voice vote. Voting then proceeded by secret ballot on Dr. Gainer's motion to refer the main motion to GECAC. The vote was 21 yes, 19 no, so the motion passed and the main motion was referred to GECAC.
2. The motion to recommend adoption of the graduate faculty criteria was taken from the table. Dr. Owen explained that the motion reduces the number of graduate faculty categories and streamlines the process for approving faculty for graduate status. The motion was then carried on a voice vote.

3. The motion to recommend revision of online syllabi for Core 101 and 102 was taken from the table. Dr. Baker spoke in favor of the motion, referring to a report on the courses she had previously distributed to senators. The main concern is that the courses have already been revised, and it is important for the online syllabi to reflect these changes. Dr. Gary Schirr asked for a summary of the changes. Dr. Baker responded that the changes were needed to make the courses more pedagogically appropriate for instruction in formal writing. Also, the current syllabi refer to the use of technology that is not yet available, for example for electronic portfolios. The primary concern is concordance between the online syllabi and the actual conduct of the courses. Dr. Susan Van Patten noted that Dr. Guruswamy had forwarded to GECAC the desired changes, and so the revisions called for in the motion are going to be made regardless. The question was then called and the motion carried on a voice vote.
4. Following a motion to extend the time of the meeting, Dr. Owen asked that the remaining old business on the agenda be deferred to the next meeting so that new motions could be introduced and tabled. This was consented to by the members.

IV. New Business

1. Elections were held for the three faculty representatives for the Internal Governance Faculty Task Force that is to convene this spring and serve through 2012. Dr. Steve Owen, Dr. Ed Udd, and Dr. Kim Gainer were elected by a Borda count ballot.
2. The motion to recommend approval of the change of CIP code for the Nutrition and Dietics program was taken from the table. There was no discussion, and the motion was carried on a voice vote.
3. A motion to reaffirm Radford University's non-discrimination policy was introduced by Dr. Moira Baker on behalf of herself and her co-sponsors.
4. A motion to approve RELN 203 for general education credit was introduced on behalf of GECAC.
5. A motion to recommend approval of transfer equivalencies for Core 101 and 102 was introduced on behalf of GECAC.
6. A motion to recommend approval of transfer equivalencies for Core 201 and 202 was introduced on behalf of GECAC.
7. A motion to recommend approval of the Geospatial Science program was introduced on behalf of the School of Physical and Environmental Sciences.

V. Announcements

1. None.

VI. Adjournment

1. The meeting was adjourned on a motion to adjourn at 4:55 pm.

**Radford University Faculty Senate
Meeting Minutes
April 15, 2010**

Members Present: Dr. Suzanne Ament, Dr. Isaac van Patten (sub for Dr. Atwell), Dr. Moira Baker, Dr. Roann Barris, Dr. Gwen Brown, Dr. Carole Seyfrit, Dr. Farrell D. Doss, Dr. Patricia Easterling, Dr. Elise Fullmer, Dr. Kim Gainer, Mr. Anthony R. Guest, Dr. Judith A. Guinan, Dr. Katie Hildren, Dr. Maung M. Htay, Dr. Kay K. Jordan, Ms. danah bella (sub McLaughlin), Dr. Douglas Mitchell, Mr. James Monaghan, Dr. Garth Montgomery, Dr. Michael B. Moore, Dr. Judy Niehaus, Dr. Stephen S. Owen, Dr. Richard A. Roth, Dr. Basel Saleh, Dr. Gary R. Schirr, Dr. David Sallee, Dr. Margaret Hrezo (sub Shareef), Dr. Laura J. Spielman, Dr. Sumati Srinivas, Dr. Jenessa C. Steele, Mr. Kevin M. Tapp, Dr. Lynne Taylor, Dr. Sylvester Thompson, Dr. Edward Udd, Dr. Erin Webster-Garrett, Dr. Joseph Wirgau, Dr. David A. Zuschin.
Excused: Dr. Carter Turner, Dr. B. Sidney Smith

I. Call to Order and Approval of Minutes

1. The meeting was called to order at 3:30 p.m. by Senate President Dr. Steve Owen.
2. Approval of the minutes of the April 1, 2010 senate meeting was deferred.
3. Dr. Owen announced that faculty members would soon receive a Carbon Footprint Survey to measure our green house gas emissions. He hoped that senators would encourage their constituents to participate in this survey. He reminded senators that the April 29 senate meeting will be the last meeting for the 2009-2010 senate. Immediately after the close of this meeting, the 2010-2011 senate will hold its first meeting and elect officers. He suggested that senators who will not be serving in next year's senate should remind their successors to attend that meeting.

II. Reports and Announcements

1. Provost Scartelli announced that the SACS assessment workshop is now fully subscribed. Forty-two faculty members have now signed up for this symposium that will take place from May 19 through the May 21, 2010. Well known assessment scholar Dr. Joseph Hoy, formerly at Georgia Tech and now at Savannah School of Design, will be one of the guest speakers at the symposium. Dr. Scartelli expressed appreciation to the faculty who will be involved in this workshop which is designed to prepare them for participation in Radford University SACS reaffirmation.

2. Steven Nape, Vice-Provost for enrollment management, explained our recruitment strategy. He said that we are following a process aimed at helping students identify the type of college that will best suit them. We want to take our role as admissions counselors seriously. Through this process we will find those students best suited to Radford University. This is not a hard sell approach but rather an effort to help students.

We are marketing RU by emphasizing academics and the close connection between faculty and students at RU. In addition to academics, we are emphasizing the larger co-curricular and social environment at RU. We have been using the tag line "Radford University is big enough to offer the world, but small enough to help you find your place in it." We are trying to recruit the individual student versus mass marketing. Each application is individually reviewed and we are trying to identify the best predictors for student success at RU.

Dr. Nape provided statistical information to document the success of our student recruitment efforts. This academic year we have received over 7,000 applications from potential new freshmen. By the end of the summer we expect to receive enough applications to make this year's new freshmen applicant pool the second largest in school history. Each of the applications we receive costs the student \$50. The willingness of prospective students to pay this fee is an indication of their serious interest in Radford University. Approximately 93% of these applications are now complete. Right now we have admitted 5,136 students in comparison to 4,229 at this time last year and 5,555 the year before. As of yesterday, 880 new freshmen had paid their deposits for fall 2010. On this same date last year we had 629, on the same date in 2008 we had 795, and 777 in 2007. Hence we are significantly ahead of the last three years. In fall 2009, we came up short in new freshmen. The next two weeks are very important for recruiting students for this fall. Last year we saw 413 new freshmen at Highlander Days and this year we may see as many as 730 students. Campus visits have been up in every month except January. Another strong indicator of student interest is that the number of students sending in financial aid applications has also increased.

In response to questions from senators, Dr. Nape stated that we have denied a significant number of applications and we have 1,000 potential students on a waiting list. He also said that we participate in a national clearinghouse that provides information on student's final college selections. When some of our applicants select other colleges instead of RU, we will be able to track their

preferences. He also stated that the quality of students admitted for fall 2010 is comparable to those admitted in fall 2009

3. Dr. Judy Guinan reported for the Campus Environment Committee that it will bring forward two motions under New Business. At our next senate meeting, the CEC will present some of the results of the Faculty Satisfaction Survey.
4. Dr. Gwen Brown reported for the Curriculum Committee that it has prepared a six question survey to gather faculty feedback about teaching in Young Hall. The survey includes questions on both the rooms and equipment.
5. Dr. Roann Barris reported for the Faculty Issues Committee that it had reviewed a new survey for Student Evaluation of the Faculty submitted by an IG committee chaired by Dr. Matt Oyos. Faculty Issues has also begun reviewing policies related to maternity leave.
6. Dr. Judy Niehausl reported for the Governance Committee and reminded senators to encourage their constituents to complete the online dean's evaluation. The committee will also present two motions under New Business.

III. Old Business

1. The Motion to Recommend the Approval of the Geospatial Science Program was taken from the table. Dr. Rick Roth explained the background of the motion. He noted that the Geography program proposed to adopt the name Geospatial Science. The new program represents a restructuring which will better link it to the other disciplines in the School of Environmental and Physical Sciences. The SEPS Curriculum Committee and also the College of Science and Technology Curriculum Committee have already approved the revised program which was developed in consultation with Dr. Debra Templeton and the State Council of Higher Education. Given that the proposal involves a CIP code change, one senator asked about the impact of the proposal on the old CIP code. Dr. Roth replied that the old CIP code would no longer be valid after the new one was approved. The motion carried on a voice vote.
2. The Motion to Approve RELN 203 for Core Curriculum Credit was removed from the table. Dr. Kay K. Jordan explained that in the past the Philosophy and Religious Studies Department had offered the Survey of the Old Testament and Survey of the New Testament for general education credit. In consultation with GECAC, the

department decided to create a broader scriptures course for Humanities credit in the new Core Curriculum. The proposed course will include selections from the Old Testament, the New Testament, and the Qur'an. Some discussion occurred regarding the course title "Sacred Texts of the West" given that it includes the Qur'an. The motion carried by a voice vote.

3. The Motion to Recommend Transfer Equivalencies for Core 101 and Core 102 was removed from the table. Dr. Roann Barris, who is currently the chairperson of GECAC, explained the motion. The motion allows transfer students who have completed courses equivalent to ENGL 101 (Introductory Expository Writing) and ENGL 102 (Reading, Writing, and Research Skills) to waive the requirement to take Core 101 and Core 102. In answer to a question regarding whether or not other institutions would grant transfer credit for Core 101 and 102 as equivalent to freshman English, Dr. Susan van Patten, Director of the Core Curriculum stated that we have no control over the manner in which other institutions grant transfer credit.
4. The Motion to Recommend Transfer Equivalencies for Core 201 and Core 202 was removed from the table. Dr. Roann Barris explained that the motion allows transfer students who have completed courses equivalent to either COMS 114 (Public Speaking) or COMS 240 (Teamwork and Communication) and courses equivalent to one of the following: PHIL 111 (Introduction: Knowledge and Reality and the Human Condition), PHIL 112 (Introduction: Ethics and Society), or PHIL 113 (Introduction: Reasoning and Argument) to waive the requirement to take Core 201 and 202. In response to a query by Dr. Joe Wirgau, Dr. Barris stated that after three years, the Faculty Senate would have an opportunity to review these transfer equivalencies. Core Director Susan van Patten also stated that these transfer equivalencies would apply for students admitted to Radford University during the current academic year as well as students admitted during the next three years.
5. The Motion to Reaffirm Radford University's Non-Discrimination Policy was removed from the table. Dr. Moira Baker explained that Virginia Attorney General Ken Cuccinelli had directed Virginia public colleges and universities to remove provisions from their non-discrimination policies which protect persons from discrimination on the basis of their sexual orientation on March 4, 2010. Although on March 10 Governor Robert McDonnell's issued an Executive Directive affirming guarantees of non-discrimination to all citizens on the basis of the Equal Protection clause of the United States Constitution, Cuccinelli's directive remains problematic. Dr.

Baker proudly noted that Radford University was the first Virginia university to include sexual orientation in our non-discrimination policy. She observed that the University of Mary Washington's Board of Visitors has already reaffirmed its current non-discrimination policy. Additionally, the RU 7-17 Strategic plan includes diversity and freedom of expression among our core values. Deleting sexual orientation from our non-discrimination policy may discourage faculty from applying or accepting positions at Radford University. Dr. Baker also cited a letter to the RU community dated March 12 in which President Penelope W. Kyle reaffirmed current non-discrimination policy in support of the motion. The motion carried by a voice vote.

6. The Motion to Co-designate CORE 101 and 102 was removed from the table. Curriculum Committee Chair, Dr. Gwen Brown deferred to Dr. Moira Baker to introduce the motion. (A revised rationale for the motion was distributed to senators.) Dr. Baker then explained that Core 101 and 102 are taught by faculty hired and trained by the English Department, and co-designating these courses as CORE/ENGL would clarify the process for revising them. She noted that the English Department has already been given considerable control over these courses. Dr. Baker asserted that this motion would designate the English Department Curriculum Committee as the proper authority to oversee the syllabi for these courses. She stated that the English Department Curriculum Committee would work with the Core Curriculum Director and the Core Coordinators to define the objectives and methods appropriate for these courses. Senate President Owen observed that if this motion passes it would go to GECAC. If affirmed by GECAC, the motion would again come before the Faculty Senate. A lively discussion ensued.

Dr. Isaac van Patten asked about the process the Core Director would need to follow to add a learning outcome. Dr. Owen stated this would probably come to GECAC and then subsequently come to the Faculty Senate. Such a proposal might originate in a number of different ways. Dr. Isaac van Patten then asked if the English Department Curriculum Committee could veto such an objective. Dr. Baker opined that our governance documents do not allow any single constituency to veto a proposed change in these courses or the structure of general education. Dr. Kim Gainer noted that we had to create a structure that had not previously existed in order to implement the Core. She noted that this ad hoc structure had not functioned smoothly and that, in her opinion, the people who teach the courses are in the best position to take responsibility for them. Dr. Suzanne Ament suggested that co-designating these courses might solve some of the problems with transfer credit both to and

from RU. Dr. Erin Webster-Garrett said that many of the problems with implementing the Core that occurred in the fall could have been solved if the English Department had been empowered to modify the courses. Dr. Gary Schirr asked about the views of the Core Director and Core A Coordinators regarding the motion? Dr. Baker stated they had not yet been asked their opinion. Dr. Ed Udd observed that the Core belongs to everyone and not just the English department. Dr. Gwen Brown spoke in support of the motion stating that the School of Communication has a strong positive relationship with the English Department and trusts its curriculum committee. Dr. Joe Wirgau noted that there are pragmatic problems that the motion does not answer. For example, can the same section simultaneously be CORE and ENGL? Dr. Baker stated that co-designation is not the same thing as co-listing a course in two different departments. Dr. Farrell Doss suggested that if CORE 101 and ENGL 101 are identical then why don't we simply call the courses ENGL? Dr. Baker stated that this is not what we are doing.

Dr. Kay K. Jordan moved to table the motion. The motion to table carried 19 to 16.

IV. New Business

1. Dr. Judy Niehaus introduced the Motion to Recommend Adoption of a Curriculum Pathways Document on behalf of the Governance Committee.
2. Dr. Judy Guinan introduced a Motion to Establish a Representative Task Force to Make Recommendations Regarding Childcare at Radford University on behalf of the Campus Environment Committee.
3. Dr. Judy Guinan introduced a Motion to Address Accessibility Concerns on Campus from the Campus Environment Committee.
4. Dr. Kay K. Jordan introduced a Motion to Require Continuity Reports from Committee Chairs and Officers on behalf of the Faculty Senate Executive Council.
5. Dr. Kay K. Jordan introduced a Motion to Amend the Faculty Senate Bylaws to Permit Limited Debate of a Motion to Extend Meetings on behalf of the Faculty Senate Executive Council.

The meeting was adjourned at 4:50 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Dr. Kay K. Jordan
Vice-President
Radford University Faculty Senate

Radford University Faculty Senate
Meeting Minutes
April 29, 2010

Members Present: Dr. Suzanne Ament, Dr. Mary Atwell, Dr. Moira Baker, Dr. Roann Barris, Dr. Gwen Brown, Dr. Iain Clelland, Dr. Farrell Doss, Dr. Patricia Easterling, Dr. I-Ping Fu, Dr. Elise Fullmer, Dr. Kim Gainer, Dr. Mary Hope Gibson, Mr. Anthony Guest, Dr. Judith Guinan, Dr. Katie Hilden, Dr. Kay K. Jordan, Ms. Deborah McLaughlin, Mr. James Monaghan, Dr. Garth N. Montgomery, Dr. Michael Moore, Dr. Judy Niehaus, Dr. Stephen Owen, Dr. Basel Saleh, Dr. David Sallee, Dr. Carole Seyfrit, Dr. Gary Schirr, Dr. Lauren Smith, Dr. Sid Smith, Dr. Sumati Srinivas, Dr. Jenessa Steele, Mr. Kevin Tapp, Dr. Lynne Taylor, Dr. Skip Thompson, Dr. Edward Carter Turner, Dr. Edward Udd, Dr. Erin Webster-Garret, Dr. Joe Wirgau, Dr. David Zuschin

Members Absent: Dr. Maung Htay, Dr. James McDonel, Dr. Douglas Mitchell, Dr. Richard Roth, Dr. Helen Roybark, Dr. William Scott, Dr. Reginald Shareef, Dr. Laura Spielman

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 from the April 15th meeting was approved.

II. Reports and Announcements

1. Mr. Richard Alvarez reported on the budget. He noted that RU has sustained a total of \$16.3 million in cuts, of which about \$3 million will have to be covered by increased enrollment or higher tuition. RU employees will not be taking the one-day furlough in the governor's budget. New employees coming in after June 30 will have to pay 5% into their retirement funds. He reported that traditionally RU has budgeted from year to year, but that it would be well to be looking ahead 5 to 7 years to plan for when increased budgets become available. He also noted that 10 new faculty positions had been opened for the coming year. He reported that in future money would not be "swept" to support summer research; instead summer money will be planned in advance. A replacement for WebCT is being planned and budgeted for. He reported that RU is trying to get a 10% increase in need-based financial aid. Also, increasing costs of utilities and health care have been budgeted. In response to a question, Provost Scartelli said that many of the new positions would be filled by temporary hires for the coming year, so that proper and timely searches can be made for permanent hires to fill these positions.

III. Old Business

1. The Motion to Establish a Representative Task Force to Make Recommendations Regarding Childcare at Radford University was removed from the table, and passed on a voice vote.
2. The Motion to Address Accessibility Concerns on Campus was removed from the table and passed on a voice vote.
3. The Motion to Require Continuity Reports from Committee Chairs and Officers was removed from the table and passed on a voice vote.
4. The Motion to Amend the Faculty Senate Bylaws to Permit Limited Debate of a Motion to Extend Meetings was removed from the table and passed on a voice vote.
5. The Motion to Recommend Adoption of a Curriculum Pathways Document was taken from the table, debated at length, and passed on a division of the house.

IV. New Business

1. None

V. Announcements

1. None.

VI. Adjournment

1. The meeting was adjourned at 4:55 pm.