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, Dr. Laura Jacobsen

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

Guests Present: None.

I. Call to Order and Approval of Minutes
   a. Dr. Owen called the meeting to order at 3:30 pm.
   b. The minutes from the April 15th meeting was approved.

II. Reports and Announcements
   a. 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 oneday 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
   a. 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.
b. The Motion to Address Accessibility Concerns on Campus was removed from the table and passed on a voice vote.
c. The Motion to Require Continuity Reports from Committee Chairs and Officers was removed from the table and passed on a voice vote.
d. 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.
e. 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**
   a. None

V. **Announcements**
   a. None.

VI. **Adjournment**
   a. The meeting was adjourned at 4:55 pm.
Faculty Senate Meeting Agenda
April 29th, 2010
3:30 PM
Heth Hall, Room 014

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, Dr. Joe Chase, Dr. Laura LaRue, Dr. Jerry Kopf, Dr. Laura Jacobsen

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

Guests Present: None.

I. Call to Order: 4:55pm

II. Reports

   a. None.

III. Old Business

   a. None.

IV. New Business

   a. Election of Senate Offices: The following officers were elected for the 2010-2011 Senate:

      1. President: Dr. Kay K. Jordan
      2. Vice President: Dr. Judy Niehaus
      3. Secretary: Dr. Rhett Herman
      4. At-Large (2): Patricia Easterling Vaccare, Dr. Erin Webster Garrett
      5. Parliamentarian: Dr. Joe I Wirgau
      6. Faculty Representative to the BOV (3): Dr. Steve Owen, Dr. Kay K. Jordan, Dr. Judy Niehaus

V. Announcements:

   a. None

VI. Adjournment: 5:10 pm
Members Present: Dr. Suzanne E. Ament, Dr. Mary W. Atwell, Mr. Timothy L. Channell, Dr. Joseph Chase, Mr. James E. Collier, Dr. Farrell D. Doss, Dr. Kim D. Gainer, Mr. Anthony R. Guest, Dr. Rhett B. Herman, Dr. Katherine R. Hilden, Dr. Pamela A. Jackson, Dr. Laura Jacobsen, Dr. Kay K. Jordan, Dr. Jerry M. Kopf, Dr. Mary B. LaLone, Dr. Laura E. LaRue, Dr. Douglas Mitchell, Dr. Garth N. Montgomery, Dr. Michael B. Moore, Dr. Judy Niehaus, Dr. Stephen S. Owen, Dr. Richard A. Roth, Dr. Helen M. Roybark, Dr. Basel Saleh, Dr. David N. Sallee, Dr. Susan L. Schoppelrey, Dr. Jim Gumaer, Dr. Kenneth Smith, Ms. Sarah Smith, Dr. Lauren Smith, Dr. Alex Orlov, Dr. Andrea J. Stanaland, Dr. Sylvester Thompson, Dr. Jonathan L. Tso, Dr. Edward Turner, Dr. Edward Udd, Dr. A. Craig Waggaman, Dr. Erin L. Webster Garrett, Ms. Monica M. Weinzapfel, Dr. Joseph I. Wirgau

Members Absent: Dr. Elise M. Fullmer, Mr. Blas Hernandez

I. Call to Order: 3:30pm

II. The minutes from the April 29, 2010 meeting of the 2009-2010 Senate were approved as corrected. The minutes from the April 29, 2010 meeting of the 2010-2011 Senate were approved as corrected.

III. Reports
   a. Dr. Kay Jordan delivered the Faculty Senate President’s report.
   b. Provost Joe Scartelli updated the Senate regarding a number of items. These items included the number of faculty searches for the coming year (37 planned), SACS reaccreditation, the ongoing assessment of the Core Curriculum, work on the IG documents and the 7:17 Plan, the reinstatement of the FPDLS&RS program, the planning for the new fitness center, and his address to the Board of Visitors (along with President Kyle and Richard Alvarez) on the 7-year budget projections.

IV. Dr. Joe Wirgau was elected as an at-large member of the Faculty Senate Executive Council.

V. Dr. Kay Jordan asked the senators to introduce themselves to the rest of the senate.

VI. Old Business
   a. None.

VII. New Business
   a. The motion to change of name from College of Business and Economics to the College of Business was introduced to the Senate by the FSEC and tabled.
VIII. Announcements
   a. None.

IX. Adjournment: 4:15pm
RADFORD UNIVERSITY

Financial Outlook

Presentation to:
RU Board of Visitors
September 16, 2010
Agenda

- Higher Education Funding Structure Review
- 2010-11 Tuition & Fees Comparison
- Funding Sources and Historical Trends
- Strategic Outlook using “What If” Scenarios
  - Educational & General (E&G)
  - Auxiliary Enterprises
  - Facilities/Capital
Higher Education Program Definitions

- **Educational & General (E&G):** Activities to provide instruction, public service, academic support (e.g., library, deans), student services (e.g., admissions, financial aid, registrar), and program support (e.g., administration, physical plant) services.

- **Auxiliary Enterprises:** Activities to provide essentially self-supporting goods or services to students, faculty, and staff (e.g., residence halls, dining services, bookstore, athletics, student activities).

- **Student Financial Assistance:** Activities to provide financial assistance to Virginia students.

- **Sponsored Programs:** Activities to provide additional resources for educational and general services through third-party grants, contracts, and research.
Summary of General Fund Reductions

- Radford University’s E&G program has received State General Fund reductions totaling $16.4 million (33.3%) since 2008 as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fiscal Year</th>
<th>Reductions (in $)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FY2008</td>
<td>$2,433,385</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY2009</td>
<td>2,496,321</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY2010</td>
<td>$5,052,434</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY2010*</td>
<td>$1,521,624 (continued in FY2011)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal FY2010</td>
<td>6,574,058</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY2012</td>
<td>4,889,346</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>$16,393,110</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Reduction Strategies Implemented

- Eliminated and restructured 98.5 FTE positions

- Reduced discretionary spending:
  - Eliminated and reduced maintenance contracts and contractual services
  - Extended equipment replacement cycle
  - Eliminated and reduced printed materials and postage expense
  - Reduced special projects and one-time purchases
  - Reduced operating travel, supplies and equipment

- New revenue sources to cover the gap, $3 million
Federal ARRA (Stimulus)

ARRA Allocations:

- FY2010 $3,761,002
- FY2011 $6,060,300

  Propose splitting allocation as follows:
  - FY2011: $2,560,300
  - FY2012: $3,500,000 (carry forward)
2010-11 Tuition & Fees
## 2010-11 Tuition & Mandatory E&G Fees (RU Technology Fee)
### In-State Undergraduate
#### Compared to Other State Institutions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>FY11</th>
<th>$ Change From FY10</th>
<th>% Change From FY10</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>University of Virginia</td>
<td>$8,780</td>
<td>$907</td>
<td>11.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Virginia Tech</td>
<td>$8,098*</td>
<td>$728</td>
<td>9.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>College of William &amp; Mary</td>
<td>$7,618</td>
<td>$1,135</td>
<td>17.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Virginia Commonwealth University</td>
<td>$6,953</td>
<td>$1,700</td>
<td>32.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>George Mason University</td>
<td>$6,320</td>
<td>$480</td>
<td>8.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Virginia Military Institute</td>
<td>$6,024</td>
<td>$524</td>
<td>9.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>University of Mary Washington</td>
<td>$5,500</td>
<td>$554</td>
<td>11.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Longwood University</td>
<td>$5,415</td>
<td>$690</td>
<td>14.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Christopher Newport University</td>
<td>$5,314</td>
<td>$900</td>
<td>20.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Radford University</td>
<td>$5,060</td>
<td>$664</td>
<td>15.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Old Dominion University</td>
<td>$4,722</td>
<td>$310</td>
<td>7.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>James Madison University</td>
<td>$4,182</td>
<td>$448</td>
<td>12.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>University of Virginia @ Wise</td>
<td>$4,020</td>
<td>$324</td>
<td>8.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Virginia State University</td>
<td>$3,886</td>
<td>$302</td>
<td>8.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Norfolk State University</td>
<td>$3,159</td>
<td>$207</td>
<td>7.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Average</strong></td>
<td><strong>$5,670</strong></td>
<td><strong>$658</strong></td>
<td><strong>13.1%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Rate is net of $130 Board-approved “mitigation grant” related to the ARRA
In-state, Undergraduate Tuition & Mandatory E&G Fees Comparison

Tuition and Mandatory E&G Fees Comparison, In-State Undergraduate
RU and Average 4-year Virginia Public Institutions of Higher Education

- Average
- RU
# 2010-11 Mandatory Comprehensive Fee Compared to Other State Institutions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>FY11</th>
<th>$ Change From FY10</th>
<th>% Change From FY10</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Virginia Military Institute</td>
<td>$6,304</td>
<td>$614</td>
<td>10.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>College of William &amp; Mary</td>
<td>$4,570</td>
<td>$253</td>
<td>5.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Longwood University</td>
<td>$4,440</td>
<td>$240</td>
<td>5.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Christopher Newport University</td>
<td>$3,936</td>
<td>$300</td>
<td>8.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>James Madison University</td>
<td>$3,678</td>
<td>$168</td>
<td>4.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>University of Virginia @ Wise</td>
<td>$3,174</td>
<td>$122</td>
<td>4.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Norfolk State University</td>
<td>$3,068</td>
<td>$148</td>
<td>5.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Old Dominion University</td>
<td>$2,986</td>
<td>$80</td>
<td>2.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Virginia State University</td>
<td>$2,684</td>
<td>$94</td>
<td>3.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Radford University</td>
<td><strong>$2,634</strong></td>
<td><strong>$126</strong></td>
<td><strong>5.0%</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>George Mason University</td>
<td>$2,364</td>
<td>$180</td>
<td>8.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>University of Mary Washington</td>
<td>$2,362</td>
<td>$196</td>
<td>9.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Virginia Commonwealth University</td>
<td>$1,864</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>University of Virginia</td>
<td>$1,848</td>
<td>$49</td>
<td>2.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Virginia Tech</td>
<td>$1,491</td>
<td>$126</td>
<td>9.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Average</strong></td>
<td><strong>$3,160</strong></td>
<td><strong>$180</strong></td>
<td><strong>6.0%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Comprehensive Fee Comparison

Comprehensive Fees Comparison
RU and 4-Year Virginia Public Institutions of Higher Education


$1,258 $1,321 $1,440 $1,570 $1,664 $1,788 $1,895 $2,018 $2,150 $2,349 $2,508 $2,634

$1,529 $1,600 $1,693 $1,804 $1,958 $2,092 $2,252 $2,430 $2,615 $2,822 $2,980 $3,160

RU
Average
2010-11 Tuition & “All” Mandatory Fees (E&G and Comprehensive) Compared to Other State Institutions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>FY11</th>
<th>$ Change From FY10</th>
<th>% Change From FY10</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Virginia Military Institute</td>
<td>$12,138</td>
<td>$1,138</td>
<td>10.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>College of William &amp; Mary</td>
<td>$12,188</td>
<td>$1,388</td>
<td>12.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>University of Virginia</td>
<td>$10,628</td>
<td>$956</td>
<td>9.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Longwood University</td>
<td>$9,855</td>
<td>$930</td>
<td>10.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Virginia Tech</td>
<td>$9,589*</td>
<td>$854</td>
<td>9.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Christopher Newport University</td>
<td>$9,250</td>
<td>$1,200</td>
<td>14.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Virginia Commonwealth University</td>
<td>$8,817</td>
<td>$1,700</td>
<td>23.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>George Mason University</td>
<td>$8,684</td>
<td>$660</td>
<td>8.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>University of Mary Washington</td>
<td>$7,862</td>
<td>$750</td>
<td>10.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>James Madison University</td>
<td>$7,860</td>
<td>$616</td>
<td>8.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Old Dominion University</td>
<td>$7,708</td>
<td>$390</td>
<td>5.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Radford University</td>
<td>$7,694</td>
<td>$790</td>
<td>11.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>University of Virginia @ Wise</td>
<td>$7,194</td>
<td>$446</td>
<td>6.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Virginia State University</td>
<td>$6,570</td>
<td>$396</td>
<td>6.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Norfolk State University</td>
<td>$6,227</td>
<td>$355</td>
<td>6.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Average</strong></td>
<td><strong>$8,830</strong></td>
<td><strong>$838</strong></td>
<td><strong>10.5%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Rate is net of $130 Board-approved “mitigation grant” related to the ARRA
## 2010-11 Average Room and Board Compared to Other State Institutions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>FY11</th>
<th>$ Change From FY10</th>
<th>% Change From FY10</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Christopher Newport University</td>
<td>$9,340</td>
<td>$300</td>
<td>3.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>College of William &amp; Mary</td>
<td>$8,684</td>
<td>$182</td>
<td>2.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>University of Virginia</td>
<td>$8,652</td>
<td>$362</td>
<td>4.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Virginia Commonwealth University</td>
<td>$8,526</td>
<td>$191</td>
<td>2.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>University of Virginia @ Wise</td>
<td>$8,351</td>
<td>$581</td>
<td>7.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Virginia State University</td>
<td>$8,152</td>
<td>$102</td>
<td>1.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Longwood University</td>
<td>$8,114</td>
<td>$518</td>
<td>6.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>James Madison University</td>
<td>$8,020</td>
<td>$330</td>
<td>4.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>University of Mary Washington</td>
<td>$8,012</td>
<td>$550</td>
<td>7.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>George Mason University</td>
<td>$7,940</td>
<td>$240</td>
<td>3.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Old Dominion University</td>
<td>$7,902</td>
<td>$376</td>
<td>5.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Norfolk State University</td>
<td>$7,622</td>
<td>$293</td>
<td>4.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td><strong>Radford University</strong></td>
<td><strong>$7,302</strong></td>
<td><strong>$232</strong></td>
<td><strong>3.3%</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Virginia Military Institute</td>
<td>$7,132</td>
<td>$340</td>
<td>5.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Virginia Tech</td>
<td>$6,290</td>
<td>$466</td>
<td>8.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Average</strong></td>
<td><strong>$8,003</strong></td>
<td><strong>$338</strong></td>
<td><strong>4.4%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Average Room & Board Fee Comparison

Room and Board Fees Comparison
RU and 4-Year Virginia Public Institutions of Higher Education

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Average Fee</th>
<th>RU Fee</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1999-00</td>
<td>$4,700</td>
<td>$4,737</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000-01</td>
<td>$4,770</td>
<td>$4,851</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001-02</td>
<td>$4,937</td>
<td>$5,031</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002-03</td>
<td>$5,233</td>
<td>$5,242</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003-04</td>
<td>$5,442</td>
<td>$5,425</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004-05</td>
<td>$5,660</td>
<td>$5,707</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005-06</td>
<td>$5,886</td>
<td>$5,927</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006-07</td>
<td>$6,120</td>
<td>$6,194</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007-08</td>
<td>$6,304</td>
<td>$6,566</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008-09</td>
<td>$7,070</td>
<td>$7,259</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009-10</td>
<td>$7,362</td>
<td>$7,658</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010-11</td>
<td>$8,003</td>
<td>$8,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1999-00 to 2010-11: Average Room & Board Fee Comparison for RU and 4-Year Virginia Public Institutions of Higher Education.
## 2010-11 TUITION, FEES, ROOM and BOARD Compared to Other State Institutions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>FY11</th>
<th>$ Change From FY10</th>
<th>% Change From FY10</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>College of William &amp; Mary</td>
<td>$20,872</td>
<td>$1,570</td>
<td>8.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Virginia Military Institute</td>
<td>$19,460</td>
<td>$1,478</td>
<td>8.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>University of Virginia</td>
<td>$19,280</td>
<td>$1,318</td>
<td>7.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Christopher Newport University</td>
<td>$18,590</td>
<td>$1,500</td>
<td>8.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Longwood University</td>
<td>$17,969</td>
<td>$1,448</td>
<td>8.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Virginia Commonwealth University</td>
<td>$17,343</td>
<td>$1,891</td>
<td>12.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>George Mason University</td>
<td>$16,624</td>
<td>$900</td>
<td>5.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>James Madison University</td>
<td>$15,880</td>
<td>$946</td>
<td>6.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Virginia Tech</td>
<td>$15,879*</td>
<td>$1,320</td>
<td>9.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>University of Mary Washington</td>
<td>$15,874</td>
<td>$1,300</td>
<td>8.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Old Dominion University</td>
<td>$15,610</td>
<td>$766</td>
<td>5.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>University of Virginia @ Wise</td>
<td>$15,545</td>
<td>$1,027</td>
<td>7.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td><strong>Radford University</strong></td>
<td><strong>$14,996</strong></td>
<td><strong>$1,022</strong></td>
<td><strong>7.3%</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Virginia State University</td>
<td>$14,722</td>
<td>$498</td>
<td>3.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Norfolk State University</td>
<td>$13,849</td>
<td>$648</td>
<td>4.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Average</strong></td>
<td><strong>$16,833</strong></td>
<td><strong>$1,175</strong></td>
<td><strong>7.5%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Rate is net of $130 Board-approved “mitigation grant” related to the ARRA
In-state, Undergraduate
Total Cost: Tuition, Fees, Room & Board Comparison

Total Cost: Tuition, Fees, Room & Board Comparison, In-State Undergraduate
RU and Average 4-year Virginia Public Institutions of Higher Education


# 2010-11 Total Cost
RU Compare to State Average

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>In-State, Undergraduate</th>
<th>FY11 State Average</th>
<th>FY11 RU</th>
<th>$ RU Below Average</th>
<th>% RU Below Average</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tuition &amp; Mandatory E&amp;G Fees</td>
<td>$5,670</td>
<td>$5,060</td>
<td>($610)</td>
<td>(10.8%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mandatory Comprehensive Fee</td>
<td>$3,160</td>
<td>$2,634</td>
<td>($526)</td>
<td>(16.6%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Room &amp; Board</td>
<td>$8,003</td>
<td>$7,302</td>
<td>($701)</td>
<td>(8.8%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>$16,833</strong></td>
<td><strong>$14,996</strong></td>
<td><strong>($1,837)</strong></td>
<td><strong>(10.9%)</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Out-of-State, Undergraduate</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tuition &amp; Mandatory E&amp;G Fees</td>
<td>$19,603</td>
<td>$15,794</td>
<td>($3,809)</td>
<td>(19.4%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mandatory Comprehensive Fee</td>
<td>$3,160</td>
<td>$2,634</td>
<td>($526)</td>
<td>(16.6%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Room &amp; Board</td>
<td>$8,003</td>
<td>$7,302</td>
<td>($701)</td>
<td>(8.8%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>$30,766</strong></td>
<td><strong>$25,730</strong></td>
<td><strong>($5,036)</strong></td>
<td><strong>(16.4%)</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
RU General Fund Trend – All Programs

General Fund Trend
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Enrollment Trend 2000-2011

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fall Headcount</td>
<td>8,837</td>
<td>9,142</td>
<td>9,242</td>
<td>9,219</td>
<td>9,329</td>
<td>9,552</td>
<td>9,220</td>
<td>9,122</td>
<td>9,157</td>
<td>8,878</td>
<td>9,006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annual FTE</td>
<td>8,273</td>
<td>8,630</td>
<td>8,659</td>
<td>8,766</td>
<td>8,933</td>
<td>9,373</td>
<td>8,881</td>
<td>8,810</td>
<td>8,875</td>
<td>8,558</td>
<td>8,691</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Strategic Outlook

- Operating
  - Academic Affairs/Instruction
  - Administration/Unavoidable Costs
  - Auxiliary Operations

- Facilities/Capital Projects
  - Academic and Administration
  - Auxiliary
Strategic Outlook
Academic Affairs/Instruction
## Objective(s) | Action Initiatives
---|---

1.A. Students

- Increase graduate stipends
- Retain students
- Assure learning
- Student Financial Assistance
### Objective(s) Action Initiatives

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1.B. Faculty</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>New faculty positions in critical programmatic areas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Correct salary parity inequities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maintain an average 80%/20% full-time, tenure-track/adjunct ratio</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improve stipends for faculty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improve stipends for Department Chairs/School Directors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty development support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional development leave</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty promotion &amp; tenure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Objective(s)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.C. Staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Academic Affairs What If Needs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Objective(s)</th>
<th>Action Initiatives</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.D. Learning Communities</td>
<td>Develop faculty/student/staff learning communities and outreach initiatives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Student learning communities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Enhance Honors programs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Objective(s)</td>
<td>Action Initiatives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.A. Interdisciplinary</td>
<td>Develop academic support functions and infrastructure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Develop and implement interdisciplinary approaches and research</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Objective(s) | Action Initiatives
---|---
2.B. Experiential

- Expand career services and internships
- Expand study abroad scholarships and opportunities
- Nurture faculty/student scholarly
- Develop applied and active service learning initiatives
## Objective(s) Action Initiatives

### 2.C. New Programs

- Develop and implement new doctoral programs
- Develop and implement new masters programs
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Objective(s)</th>
<th>Action Initiatives</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2.D. Accreditation &amp; Assessment</td>
<td>Maintain external accreditations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Attain accreditation for programs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Improve assessment support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Objective(s)</td>
<td>Action Initiatives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.E. Library</td>
<td>Enhance collections, electronic and in-print</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Staff positions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Increase contractual services budget</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Objective(s) | Action Initiatives
--- | ---
#### 3.A. Outreach
- Foster global connections
- Develop clinics, centers, and outreach
- Strengthen current partnerships
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Objective(s)</th>
<th>Action Initiatives</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3.B&amp;C. Scholarly &amp; Creative</td>
<td>Student outreach service to community</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engagement</td>
<td>Internal research grants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Enhance bridge and connecting programs</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# Academic Affairs What If Needs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Objective(s)</th>
<th>Action Initiatives</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4.A. Operating</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Budget</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Increase base operating budgets</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Enhance involvement of academic community with external</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>constituents</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Enhance academic and public reputation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Objective(s)</td>
<td>Action Initiatives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.B. Facilities</td>
<td>Support planning and design processes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ensure adequate space for current programs</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Strategic Outlook:
Administration
Unavoidable Costs
Equipment
## Summary of Top Priorities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action Initiatives</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Unavoidable cost increase (contracts, fringe benefit rates, utilities)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty salary parity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Critical faculty positions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student financial assistance (undergraduate &amp; graduate)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic programmatic needs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support staff positions</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
What If

- Enrollment
- Tuition and fee increases
- Retention efforts
What If Scenario 1: 7%, Enrollment Growth

Multi-Year Budget Projection – What If Scenario 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Proj Incremental Revenue</td>
<td>$2.2</td>
<td>$1.2</td>
<td>$6.2</td>
<td>$6.1</td>
<td>$6.3</td>
<td>$6.3</td>
<td>$6.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proj Incremental Expenditures</td>
<td>$4.5</td>
<td>$4.9</td>
<td>$6.6</td>
<td>$6.2</td>
<td>$6.6</td>
<td>$6.9</td>
<td>$7.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NF Proj Enrollment</td>
<td>1,915</td>
<td>1,990</td>
<td>2,065</td>
<td>2,140</td>
<td>2,215</td>
<td>2,215</td>
<td>2,215</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proj ISUG Tuition Increase</td>
<td>7.0%</td>
<td>7.0%</td>
<td>7.0%</td>
<td>7.0%</td>
<td>7.0%</td>
<td>7.0%</td>
<td>7.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
What If Scenario 2: 9.5%, Enrollment Growth

Multi-Year Budget Projection – What If Scenario 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Proj Incremental Revenue</td>
<td>$3.4</td>
<td>$2.1</td>
<td>$6.5</td>
<td>$6.3</td>
<td>$6.5</td>
<td>$6.5</td>
<td>$6.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proj Incremental Expenditures</td>
<td>$4.5</td>
<td>$4.9</td>
<td>$6.6</td>
<td>$6.2</td>
<td>$6.6</td>
<td>$6.9</td>
<td>$7.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NF Proj Enrollment</td>
<td>1,915</td>
<td>1,990</td>
<td>2,065</td>
<td>2,140</td>
<td>2,215</td>
<td>2,215</td>
<td>2,215</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proj ISUG Tuition Increase</td>
<td>9.5%</td>
<td>8.5%</td>
<td>7.0%</td>
<td>7.0%</td>
<td>7.0%</td>
<td>7.0%</td>
<td>7.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
What If Scenario 3: 12%, Enrollment Growth

Multi-Year Budget Projection – What If Scenario 3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Proj Incremental Revenue</td>
<td>$4.7</td>
<td>$2.7</td>
<td>$6.7</td>
<td>$6.5</td>
<td>$6.7</td>
<td>$6.7</td>
<td>$6.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proj Incremental Expenditures</td>
<td>$4.5</td>
<td>$4.9</td>
<td>$6.6</td>
<td>$6.2</td>
<td>$6.6</td>
<td>$6.9</td>
<td>$7.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NF Proj Enrollment</td>
<td>1,915</td>
<td>1,990</td>
<td>2,065</td>
<td>2,140</td>
<td>2,215</td>
<td>2,215</td>
<td>2,215</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proj ISUG Tuition Increase</td>
<td>12.0%</td>
<td>9.5%</td>
<td>7.0%</td>
<td>7.0%</td>
<td>7.0%</td>
<td>7.0%</td>
<td>7.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
What If Scenario 4:
To Fund All Needs, Enrollment Growth

Multi-Year Budget Projection – What If Scenario 4

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Proj Incremental Revenue</td>
<td>$4.7</td>
<td>$5.2</td>
<td>$6.9</td>
<td>$6.8</td>
<td>$7.0</td>
<td>$7.0</td>
<td>$7.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proj Incremental Expenditures</td>
<td>$4.5</td>
<td>$4.9</td>
<td>$6.6</td>
<td>$6.2</td>
<td>$6.6</td>
<td>$6.9</td>
<td>$7.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NF Proj Enrollment</td>
<td>1,915</td>
<td>1,990</td>
<td>2,065</td>
<td>2,140</td>
<td>2,215</td>
<td>2,215</td>
<td>2,215</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proj ISUG Tuition Increase</td>
<td>12.0%</td>
<td>14.0%</td>
<td>7.0%</td>
<td>7.0%</td>
<td>7.0%</td>
<td>7.0%</td>
<td>7.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
What If Scenario 5: 9.5%, No Enrollment Growth

Multi-Year Budget Projection – What If Scenario 5 Level Enrollment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Proj Incremental Revenue</td>
<td>$3.1</td>
<td>$1.8</td>
<td>$5.7</td>
<td>$5.2</td>
<td>$5.1</td>
<td>$5.3</td>
<td>$5.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proj Incremental Expenditures</td>
<td>$4.5</td>
<td>$4.9</td>
<td>$6.6</td>
<td>$6.2</td>
<td>$6.6</td>
<td>$6.9</td>
<td>$7.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NF Proj Enrollment</td>
<td>1,840</td>
<td>1,915</td>
<td>1,915</td>
<td>1,915</td>
<td>1,915</td>
<td>1,915</td>
<td>1,915</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proj ISUG Tuition Increase</td>
<td>9.5%</td>
<td>8.5%</td>
<td>7.0%</td>
<td>7.0%</td>
<td>7.0%</td>
<td>7.0%</td>
<td>7.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Members Present: Dr. Suzanne E. Ament, Dr. Lucy Hochstein (sub for Dr. Mary W. Atwell), Dr. Joseph Chase, Mr. James E. Collier, Dr. Farrell D. Doss, Dr. Kim D. Gainer, Mr. Anthony R. Guest, Dr. Rhett B. Herman, Dr. Katherine R. Clouse, Dr. Pamela A. Jackson, Dr. Laura Jacobsen, Dr. Kay K. Jordan, Dr. Jerry M. Kopf, Dr. Mary B. LaLone, Dr. Laura E. LaRue, Dr. Douglas Mitchell, Dr. Garth N. Montgomery, Dr. Michael B. Moore, Dr. Judy Niehaus, Dr. Stephen S. Owen, Dr. Helen M. Roybark, Dr. Basel Saleh, Dr. David N. Sallee, Dr. Susan L. Schoppelrey, Dr. Kenneth Smith, Ms. Sarah Smith, Dr. Lauren Smith, Dr. Alex Orlov, Dr. Andrea J. Stanaland, Dr. Sylvester Thompson, Dr. Jonathan L. Tso, Dr. Edward Turner, Dr. Edward Udd, Dr. A. Craig Waggaman, Dr. Erin L. Webster Garrett, Ms. Monica M. Weinzapfel, Dr. Joseph I. Wirgau

Members Absent: Mr. Timothy L. Channell, Dr. Elise M Fullmer, Mr. Blas Hernandez, Dr. Richard A. Roth, Dr. Jim Gumaer

I. Call to Order: 3:30

II. The minutes from the September 9, 2010 meeting of the 2010-2011 Faculty Senate were approved.

III. Reports

a. Dr. Kay Jordan delivered the Senate President’s Report. She said the senators were invited to the October 26 meeting of the Academic Affairs Leadership Team where SACS accreditation will be discussed. The location for the meeting is still to be determined. She reminded the Senate that Dr. Steve Owen was elected as faculty representative to the Faculty Appeals Committee. Dr. Lucy Hochstein is the at-large representative to the Faculty Grievance Committee.

b. Dr. Joe Scartelli delivered the Provost’s Report. Provost Scartelli reiterated that the Senate was invited to the October 26 meeting of the Academic Affairs Leadership Team, the Student Government Association and others for an orientation to the SACS accreditation process. The Quality Enhancement Plan will also be discussed included what it is, what RU did for the QEP in the past, and the academic theme for the next decade. The general timeline for the SACS process is as follows:

i. September 12, 2011—Certificate of Compliance due

ii. Movember 1-4, 2011—off-site review of the Certificate of Compliance is performed. This will likely be in Atlanta.

iii. February (exact date not known) 2012—QEP is due

iv. March 27-29, 2012—on-site review wherein the SACS team will be on the RU campus.

c. Committee Reports

i. Campus Environment—None.
ii. Curriculum—None.

iii. Faculty Issues—Dr. Kim Gainer said she will bring two motions from the Faculty Issues Committee to the floor of the Senate later in the meeting.

iv. Resource Allocation—Dr. Basel Saleh reported the Resource Allocation Committee was still gathering input for and discussing two issues. One is faculty workloads and compensation, and the other is the “133% pay rule” wherein a faculty member’s overall compensation “...shall not exceed 133% of the faculty member’s base academic year salary.” (secretary’s note” Faculty Handbook section 3.1)

IV. Old Business

a. The motion to change of name from College of Business and Economics to the College of Business was opened for debate. Dr. Kay Jordan reminded the senators that the function of the Senate at this stage of the process was “review and comment” on this motion. She asked Dr. Steve Owen to also take notes during this debate.

i. Dr. Judy Niehaus read the motion.

ii. Dr. Jordan asked Dr. Faye Gilbert, Dean of COBE to address the Senate regarding this motion. Dr. Jordan reminded the Senate that although the FSEC brought the motion to the Senate the FSEC neither approved or disapproved of the motion. Thus it was more appropriate for Dr. Gilbert to discuss the motion.

iii. Dr. Gilbert put forth the following reasons for supporting the motion:
   1. Faculty in COBE looked at the names of similar colleges at other universities
   2. College of Business (COB) was a shorter name than College of Business and Economics (COBE).
   3. Economics was contained within the overall COB name.
   4. 72% of the COBE faculty voted in favor of the name change in a vote in March 2010.
   5. The Business Advisory Council supported the name change.

iv. Dr. Craig Waggaman asked Dr. Gilbert if she asked the opinion of each COBE department. Dr. Gilbert indicated in the affirmative.

v. Dr. Helen Roybark stated that the vote of the COBE faculty was by secret ballot.

vi. Dr. Suzanne Ament asked what the faculty of the Department of Economics thought of the proposed name change.

vii. Dr. Prahlad Kasturi answered Dr. Ament’s question with the following points:
   1. The Dept. of Economics was not in favor of the motion. They voted unanimously against the motion on March 3, 2010.
   2. Dr. Kasturi mentioned that he had 26 years of experience at RU
   3. The process was flawed and did not receive the serious consideration this issue should have received. He said the economists were told there were two main reasons for the name change. One was that no business colleges “anywhere” has the word “economics” in their names. The other was that the proposed new name “College of Business” was shorter that the current COBE name.
   4. The Strategic management committee collected comments regarding advantages and disadvantages of a name change.
5. Dr. Kasturi said that there was no discussion in COBE meetings, but there was only a secret ballot “right before spring break.” He said that the final percentages of the “yes” and “no” votes were reported, not the total number of votes cast. He mentioned that having 28% of faculty voting “no” meant that at least some of the “business faculty” must have voted “no” also since the Economics faculty does not constitute 28% of the total of COBE faculty.

6. Dr. Kasturi said that the whole process occurred from February 23 to March 17, 2010 which was too short of a time for such a process to be a serious process.

7. Dr. Kasturi then detailed why the economists opposed the change:
   a. Economics started as a discipline at RU in 1964/65
   b. Economics achieved department status in 1969
   c. In 1972 Econ was placed in the School of Social Sciences
   d. In 1973 Econ was placed under Applied Arts and Sciences
   e. In 1974/75 Econ was placed in the Department of Business and Economics
   f. In 1978/79 Econ was renamed the Economics Department and placed in the School of Business and Professional Studies
   g. In 1979/1980 the School was renamed the School of Professional Studies
   h. Since 1985/86 the Economics Department has been in the College of Business and Economics. Thus there is a 25-year history of the Economics Department being in COBE.

8. Dr. Kasturi said the motion was based on a number of faulty premises including:
   a. There are actually 52 schools and colleges with “economics” in the name around the US and the world
   b. There are 17 named (i.e. with some person’s or corporation’s name attached) colleges with the specific name COBE around the country. Thus the current name of COBE would not turn off potential funding/donor sources.
   c. This was based on “imprecise information” and the “Top 20” arguments are not valid. While the “Top 20” schools don’t have “economics” in their titles they do have other words in their titles.
   d. “Branding”: RU has had a successful COBE with 10,000 total graduates. Economics is a social science and does not have a business perspective. Economics grads and business grads do not all have the same career options or career paths.

viii. Dr. Andrea Stanaland spoke in favor of the name change with the following points:
   1. COBE did go through the proper process regarding this proposed name change
   2. This was discussed in the Strategic Management Committee
   3. COBE did have several days prior to the vote being held
   4. This was vetted within COBE by the Dean, who sought opinions from sources such as graduates and outside constituencies
   5. 92% of the schools across the country do not single out one discipline as the current COBE name does
   6. RU needs to carve a name on the new building soon so this is a timely question to raise
   7. The name College of Business is actually more inclusive
ix. Dr. Craig Waggaman spoke against the name change with the following points:
   1. COBE alone should determine this [name change] “if you’re convinced the process is reasonable.”
   2. However with this issue having created such dissent within COBE seems to say that this is not a good idea.
   3. The other 4 departments within COBE are subsets of business but economics is not a subset of business. HE then added that his college of CHBS would be “happy to have the Economics Department.”

x. Dr. Jordan reminded the senators that the Senate only had the power of “review and comment” on this issue.

xi. Dr. Ed Udd spoke in favor of the name change with the following point:
   1. The COBE vote is the key, and the Faculty Senate should not micromanage this issue.

xii. Dr. Joe Chase spoke about the name change with the following points:
   1. The 92% of the AACSB [secretary’s note: Association to Advance Collegiate Schools of Business] schools do not have “economics” in the title.
   2. However he is from the College of Science and Technology. If the scientists in CSAT wanted to rename CSAT to the “College of Science” then IT would scream and protest.
   3. He said that “something about this just feels wrong.”

xiii. Dr. Jerry Kopf spoke about the name change with the following points:
   1. This issue has generated a lot of discussion
   2. Both sides are making good arguments here
   3. The bottom line is that this is a process issue
   4. Renaming to the College of Business would bring economics “more into the college.”
   5. COBE now offers a “Business Economics” degree for economics majors.
   6. The name alone is not a rational argument
   7. The secret ballot was used to make sure that those with class conflicts for a meeting did not miss the vote.
   8. Dr. Kopf asked the senators to “respect our own College’s decision just as you would want your own college’s vote” to be the deciding factor

xiv. Dr. Suzanne Ament called the question.
   1. Dr. Kay Jordan called for the vote required to cut off debate. There was not the required two-thirds vote of senators to end debate and thus the debate would continue.

xv. Dr. Kim Gainer posed the hypothetical question of whether a “College of Business” could be subsumed under a “College of Economics.”

xvi. Dr. Jerry Kopf responded that George Mason University had a “College of Business” under their School of Management, so yes, RU could possibly have a School of Economics.

xvii. Dr. Prahlad Kasturi replied with a number of points.
   1. The London School of Economics does have a College of Business within it.
2. He reiterated that he thought the process was flawed because this issue did not receive the attention it should have.
3. “The name does not reflect the current status” is not a good reason to change the name.
4. To change the name to increase enrollment is not valid because of a number of longitudinal studies. These were post-name change and these colleges did not experience enrollment increases.
5. To reflect a change in the future mission is not a valid reason. Three times RU has been accredited by the AACSB whereas only 25% of colleges nationwide even receive accreditation.
6. The name change would increase the prestige is not a valid reason.
7. To say that the Business Advisory Council support the name change only means that they “never say no.”
8. 39% of the majors did vote “no” on the name change. But since Economics majors make up only 4% of graduates then there is major dissent among non-economics majors.

xviii. Dr. Helen Roybark stated that 72% of the faculty in COBE voted to change the name. This vote should not be disregarded by the senators in their votes.

xix. Dr. Prahlad Kasturi stated that some other schools with a “College of Business” have dropped their Economics departments. They get “restructured” and they disappear from the college.

xx. Dr. Kim Gainer stated the economics had “historical primacy.” Subsuming Economics within a College of Business “almost reminds me of children eating their parents.”

xxi. Dr. Jerry Kopf stated that around our campus and at many off-campus meetings people called it the “College of Business” anyway. Thus the name change is just a formality for what is already occurring.

xxii. Dr. Andrea Stanaland stated the most Economics majors graduate with a Bachelor of Business Administration degree. She stated that she studies consumer psychology which is not something one would normally think of as “business.” There is a lot of social influence in what she studies. She supports the name change.

xxiii. Dr. Michael Moore asked where this measure went after the Senate voted on it.

xxiv. Dr. Kay Jordan replied that it was her belief that it would go to the Provost. Dr. Scartelli concurred.

xxv. Dr. Steve Owen made a motion for a secret ballot. Dr. Helen Roybark seconded that motion. Dr. Kay Jordan stated that this motion did not need a vote to pass, only a second and thus Dr. Jordan announced the vote would occur.

xxvi. The results of the vote: 11 votes for the motion, 26 votes against the motion. The number of abstentions was not announced.

V. New Business

a. Dr. Kim Gainer read a substitute motion from the Faculty Issues Committee regarding the School of Nursing’s to be authorized to administer student evaluations online in courses for the Doctorate in Nursing Practice. More than two-thirds of the
senators voted to suspend the rules and discuss the motion and vote on it in the current meeting. After debate the motion carried by voice vote.

b. Dr. Kim Gainer read the motion from the Faculty Issues Committee that the Student Evaluation of Faculty Committee (SEFC) be authorized to pilot a revised student evaluation instrument during Fall Semester, 2010. More than two-thirds of the senators voted to suspend the rules and discuss the motion and vote on it in the current meeting. After debate the motion carried by voice vote.

VI. Announcements
   a. None.

VII. Adjournment: 4:47pm
Faculty Senate Meeting  
October 21, 2010  
Heth Hall, Room 014

Members Present: Dr. Suzanne E. Ament, Dr. Mary W. Atwell, Dr. Joseph Chase, Mr. James E. Collier, Dr. Kim D. Gainer, Mr. Anthony R. Guest, Dr. Rhett B. Herman, Dr. Katherine R. Clouse, Dr. Pamela A. Jackson, Dr. Laura Jacobsen, Dr. Kay K. Jordan, Dr. Jerry M. Kopf, Dr. Mary B. LaLone, Dr. Douglas Mitchell, Dr. Garth N. Montgomery, Dr. Michael B. Moore, Dr. Judy Niehaus, Dr. Stephen S. Owen, Dr. Richard A. Roth, Dr. Helen M. Roybark, Dr. Basel Saleh, Dr. Susan L. Schoppelrey, Dr. Kenneth Smith, Ms. Jennifer Whicker (sub for Ms. Sarah Smith), Dr. Andrea J. Stanaland, Dr. Sylvester Thompson, Dr. Jonathan L. Tso, Dr. Edward Udd, Dr. Isaac Van Patten, Dr. A. Craig Waggaman, Dr. Erin L. Webster Garrett, Dr. Joseph I. Wirgau

Members Absent: Mr. Timothy L. Channell, Dr. Farrell D. Doss, Dr. Elise M Fullmer, Dr. Jim Gumaer, Mr. Blas Hernandez, Dr. Laura E. LaRue, Dr. David N. Sallee, Dr. Lauren Smith, Dr. Alex Orlov

I. Call to Order: 3:33pm

II. The minutes from the October 14, 2010 meeting of the 2010-2011 Faculty Senate were approved.

III. Reports

a. Dr. Kay Jordan delivered the Senate President’s Report. Dr. William Flora is the chair of the Faculty Grievance Committee, Dr. Christine Hermann is the chair of the Faculty Appeals Committee. Dr. Jordan reminded the Senate they are invited to the Tuesday October 26 meeting of the Academic Affairs Leadership Team wherein the Quality Enhancement Plan for RU’s SACS accreditation will be discussed. The Senate is also invited to a reception with the Board of Visitors at President Kyle’s house on Thursday November 11.

b. Mr. Steven Nape, Vice Provost for Enrollment Planning and Management reported the latest (as of September 16, 2010) enrollment numbers for RU. (Note: The numbers from the census date of September 16, 2010 are included at the end of these minutes.) He mentioned a number of new initiatives with his office. These include sharing some resources and information with New Student Programs, more recruiters on the road including more out-of-state recruiters, the Highlander Priority Application program, hiring a professional telemarketing group (in process at this writing), setting up a telemarketing center in Martin Hall including student staffers, offering more on-site admissions decisions at more high schools than before, and sending some Admissions funds to each College in the University for their own recruitment. When asked the amount to each College Mr. Nape said it was $8,000 per college. He also suggested that, when individual potential students contact each department regarding RU then the department could feel free to pass that person’s name along to Admissions so Admissions could follow up with mailings, etc.
c. Dr. Joe Scartelli delivered the Provost’s Report. He did not have anything specific but asked for questions from the senators.
   i. Dr. Erin Webster Garrett asked how department could get accurate information regarding adjunct budgets so the departments could plan their staffing. Dr. Scartelli responded this is a work in progress as he, Mr. Richard Alvarez and the Deans are working to construct a permanent budget within the University for adjuncts.
   ii. Dr. Kay Jordan suggested Provost Scartelli add to the Academic Affairs web site RU’s policies on adjunct faculty.
   iii. Dr. Judy Niehaus expressed concerns that RU needs more faculty for teaching the Core Curriculum classes and expressed concerns that some faculty are being asked to teach CORE classes instead of courses specific to their departments. Provost Scartelli responded that “existing faculty who do not wish to tech the Core do not have to teach the Core.” Dr. Jordan suggested that Provost Scartelli pass along the message to the Deans about the past promise of the former Provost that no one would be forced to teach the Core.
   iv. Dr. Basel Saleh raised concerns with class sizes. Provost Scartelli responded that the Board of Visitors raised tuition this past May to hire more faculty and lower class sizes.

IV. Old Business
   a. None.

V. New Business
   a. The Motion to allow the online evaluation of courses taught online during the 2010-2011 academic year was brought to the floor. A vote to suspend the rules and open debate on this motion passed. A friendly amendment was introduced to change the working from “The Faculty Senate recommends that classes taught online be authorized to administer student evaluations online during the 2010-2011 academic year.” to “The Faculty Senate recommends that classes taught online or by other distributed education methods be authorized to administer student evaluations online during the 2010-2011 academic year.” The Senate passed the motion as amended.
   b. The Motion to Declare Labor Day a Paid University Holiday was introduced by Dr. Basel Saleh. It was tabled until the next meeting.

VI. Announcements
   a. Dr. Helen Roybark suggested the Senate observe a moment of pause for Samuel Mason of Chesterfield, the RU student who passes away the previous Friday.

VII. Adjournment: 4:40pm
Radford University Enrollment Report

Final Census taken at 5:00 p.m. 09/16/2010

### Headcount Enrollment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>New Freshmen:</th>
<th>New Transfers:</th>
<th>Total New Students:</th>
<th>CU + RA:</th>
<th>Total Undergraduate:</th>
<th>Total Graduate:</th>
<th>Total GR and UG:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1,837</td>
<td>711</td>
<td>2,548</td>
<td>5,402</td>
<td>7,950</td>
<td>1057</td>
<td>9,007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average GPA</td>
<td>3.22</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average SAT Math</td>
<td>512</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average SAT Verbal</td>
<td>511</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average Math+Verbal</td>
<td>1023</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### New Freshmen Profile

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Average GPA:</th>
<th>Average SAT Math:</th>
<th>Average SAT Verbal:</th>
<th>Average Math+Verbal:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3.15</td>
<td>3.11</td>
<td>3.11</td>
<td>3.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>512</td>
<td>511</td>
<td>511</td>
<td>501</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>510</td>
<td>507</td>
<td>504</td>
<td>499</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1022</td>
<td>1018</td>
<td>1015</td>
<td>1000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
RULE 133%

Resource Allocation Committee
Report
Presented during Faculty Senate Meeting
November 4, 2010
3.1 OTHER RADFORD UNIVERSITY EMPLOYMENT

“The maximum earnings for full-time faculty from all Radford University employment, including other Radford University assignments, grants, overloads, and Radford University summer employment, shall not exceed 133% of the faculty member’s base academic year salary.”
History

- The Consolidated Salary Authorization for Faculty Positions in Institutions of Higher Education, 2001-2002
- Signed by Virginia Secretary of Education, Wilbert Bryant, on September 7, 2001
The Consolidated Salary Authorization states that:

“Unless authorized by the Secretary of Education, the average (mean) of salaries paid from public funds (excluding Eminent Scholar Payment) for teaching and research positions in any institution, shall be to the extent possible equal to the authorized salary.”
Salary Authorization-Summer Employment for Teaching and Research Positions

The 133% salary is derived from the a specific formula on page 7 of the CSA.

“faculty who are paid for summer employment should receive a salary which is proportionately equal to their academic year rate. Total pay for summer employment. Shall not exceed a percent of the full-time academic year salary of the individual staff member.”
133% Formula

The percent by which a faculty salary cannot be exceeded shall be determined by the following formula:

\[(52-N)/N\]

Where N equals the number of weeks in a faculty member’s academic year contract.

Our contracts are from Mid-August to Mid-May, that is exactly 39 weeks (T&R Handbook).
So, \( N = 39 \)

Prorated salary can’t exceed

\[
\frac{(52-39)}{39} = 33.34\% \text{ of one’s salary}
\]

Thus,

The 133\% salary cap rule

Rational: anything over 133\% is considered a raise or salary increase that is not authorized by the VA Department of Education.
On Thursday, October 28, 2010: Dr. Kay Jordan and Chair of RSA met with Dr. Joe Scartelli and Mr. Richard Alvarez about the 133% rule.

According to Mr. Alvarez, the CSA has not been rescinded and therefore still applies to our salaries.

The 133% rule is still in place.
Faculty are advised that they plan ahead if they anticipate their university grants or summer teaching might exceed the 133% rule.

Requesting that the grant money be used for procurement and not as a stipend can help a faculty not reach the 133% salary limit.
Faculty Senate Meeting
November 4, 2010
Heth Hall, Room 014

**Members Present:** Dr. Suzanne E. Ament, Dr. Mary W. Atwell, Mr. Timothy L. Channell, Dr. Joseph Chase, Mr. James E. Collier, Dr. Farrell D. Doss, Dr. Kim D. Gainer, Mr. Anthony R. Guest, Dr. Jim Gumaer, Dr. Rhett B. Herman, Mr. Blas Hernandez, Dr. Katherine Hilden, Dr. Pamela A. Jackson, Dr. Laura Jacobsen, Dr. Kay K. Jordan, Dr. Jerry M. Kopf, Dr. Laura E. LaRue, Dr. Douglas Mitchell, Dr. Garth N. Montgomery, Dr. Michael B. Moore, Dr. Judy Niehaus, Dr. Alex Orlov, Dr. Stephen S. Owen, Dr. Richard A. Roth, Dr. Helen M. Roybark, Dr. Basel Saleh, Dr. David N. Sallee, Dr. Susan L. Schoppelrey, Dr. Kenneth Smith, Sarah Smith, Dr. Lauren Smith, Dr. Andrea J. Stanaland, Dr. Sylvester Thompson, Dr. Jonathan L. Tso, Dr. Edward Turner, Dr. Edward Udd, Dr. Lori Elise (sub for Dr. Isaac Van Patten), Dr. A. Craig Waggaman, Dr. Erin L. Webster Garrett, Ms. Monica M. Weinzapfel, Dr. Joseph I. Wirgau

**Members Absent:** Dr. Elise M Fullmer, Dr. Mary B. LaLone

I. Call to Order: 3:34pm

II. The minutes from the October 21, 2010 meeting of the 2010-2011 Faculty Senate were approved.

III. Reports

a. Dr. Kay Jordan delivered the Senate President’s Report. Dr. Jordan reminded the senators to reply to the RSVP from President Kyle about the Thursday November 11 social event with the Board of Visitors at President Kyle’s house. Dr. Jordan reported that BOV Rector Steve Musselwhite met on Wednesday November 3 with the FSEC to get acquainted with the FSEC.

b. President Kyle delivered the RU President’s Report to the Senate. She mentioned a number of items and addressed previously-emailed and new questions including:
   i. President Kyle encouraged the senators to attend any public part of the upcoming November 11-12 BOV meeting on the RU campus.
   ii. With the national elections over there are good possibilities that things will bode well for RU. A potential candidate for the soon-to-be-vacant Virginia Assembly seat of Morgan Griffith has strong ties to southwestern Virginia and is supportive of RU.
   iii. RU cannot rely on the ARRA “stimulus funds” next year. As with all state agencies RU must give to Richmond by Friday November 5 plans for a 2%, 4% and 6% reduction in budget. That translates for RU into dollar amounts of $866k, $1.7 million and $2.6 million. However the Governor is looking at these reductions not to balance the budget but to create a pot of money to support needy state agencies. Thus these cuts to RU and higher education in general may not happen at all.
   iv. President Kyle reminded senators to come to her house on Thursday November 11 for the social with the board of Visitors.
v. President Kyle talked about the new initiatives of the BOV. These include adding the term “marketing” to the Business Affairs and Marketing Committee, as well as creating a new University Advancement and Alumni Relations Committee. The first will seek to broaden/improve RU’s image. The second will seek to actively raise funds by establishing strong alumni networks.

vi. The RU administration has had meetings to discuss the recent tragic death of RU student Sam Mason.

vii. Future construction projects include the underway COBE building. Next is the new fitness and wellness center which is hoped to have a construction start date of the summer of 2011. The exact location is still under discussion although a general location has been decided. The new CSAT building is in the planning stages and will be located in the parking lot on the north side of Curie Hall. It should be joined to Reed-Curie Halls when completed.

viii. Parking will only get worse. However RU and the city of Radford have partnered on a new transit system that should allow more students and faculty to park at e.g. Facilities Management and get to their buildings quickly. The new buses were obtained through a grant that, due to various regulations had to be spearheaded by Radford City.

ix. President Kyle has been going to department meetings in order to hear concerns from individual departments. Departments should request of her to attend a meeting to hear their concerns or issues.

x. President Kyle is keenly aware of the issue of faculty salary compression/inversion. She and Provost Scartelli are working on a new formula based on RU’s current peer group. Provost Scartelli added that he would like to quickly get everyone at RU up to at least the 10th percentile. The president said it would be a good idea to inform people she used the example of what they had done with staff and then they were able to get some money to actualize it. President Kyle stated that the Virginia Secretary of Education would not allow requests for faculty salary raises to go forward.

xi. While a parking garage is on the University’s Master Plan it is prohibitively expensive and, once built, would not be able to generate enough revenue to make it cost-effective.

xii. A question was asked about College autonomy—if a College decision is not related to curriculum should this decision go through the Faculty Senate? The creation of the “decision matrix” was addressed by Dr. Steve Owen. The matrix was put together in the summer of 2009 through conversations between the FSEC and the former Provost. The matrix was based on the existing Internal Governance documents. Dr. Kay K. Jordan mentioned the matrix elements were constructed by including every constituency that a decision might affect. Each constituency then had tasks such as “action,” “decision” or “review and comment.”

xiii. President Kyle emphasized that academic issues should go through the Provost’s office before coming to her.

xiv. The question was asked regarding how individual faculty members could find out if they were below the 10th percentile when compared to salaries at RU’s peer
institutions. Provost Scartelli said that he would respond to individual faculty requests if they wanted to know.

c. Dr. Joe Scartelli delivered the Provost’s Report. He reminded senators that Dr. Steve Lerch was working with the Quality Enhancement Plan and that there was an open forum on Tuesday November 16. This will be at 3:30pm in Heth 014.

d. Committee Reports:
   i. The Faculty Issues Committee is working on the follow up to the online student evaluations.
   ii. The Governance Committee is working on the Dean’s evaluations.
   iii. The Resource Allocation Committee researched the “133% rule” whereby faculty cannot receive more than 133% of their salary from state sources and federal grant funding. This limitation does not include private employment. Such private employment does, however need to be reported yearly through the “extra employment” forms available in department offices. Dr. Basel Saleh delivered a PowerPoint presentation on this “133% rule.” This will be posted on the Senate website.

IV. Old Business

a. The Motion to Declare Labor Day a Paid University Holiday was removed from the table by Dr. Basel Saleh. A motion was introduced to send this motion to the Faculty Issues Committee to consider in light of the 14- vs. 15-week semester. A friendly amendment was introduced to this committee motion to also send the original motion to the Staff Senate. The friendly amendment passed, and the motion to refer the original motion to the Faculty Issues Committee passed with the stipulation that the FIC should return a motion on this to the Senate by the end of the Spring 2011 semester.

b. During the debate on this issue the Senate had reached its time of mandatory adjournment. The Senate passed a motion to extend the meeting until 5:05pm.

V. New Business

a. None.

VI. Announcements

a. None

VII. Adjournment: 4:55pm
Members Present: Dr. Suzanne E. Ament, Dr. Mary W. Atwell, Dr. Kevin Ayers, Mr. Timothy L. Channell, Dr. Joseph Chase, Mr. James E. Collier, Dr. Farrell D. Doss, Dr. Kim D. Gainer, Mr. Anthony R. Guest, Dr. Jim Gumaer, Dr. Rhett B. Herman, Dr. Katherine Hilden, Dr. Janessa Steele (sub for Dr. Pamela A. Jackson), Dr. Laura Jacobsen, Dr. Kay K. Jordan, Dr. Jerry M. Kopf, Dr. Mary B. LaLone, Dr. Laura E. LaRue, Dr. Garth N. Montgomery, Dr. Michael B. Moore, Dr. Judy Niehaus, Dr. Alex Orlov, Dr. Stephen S. Owen, Dr. Richard A. Roth, Dr. Helen M. Roybark, Dr. David N. Sallee, Mr. Kenneth Smith, Ms. Sarah Smith, Dr. Lauren Smith, Dr. Sylvester Thompson, Dr. Jonathan L. Tso, Dr. Edward Turner, Dr. A. Craig Waggaman, Dr. Erin L. Webster Garrett, Ms. Monica M. Weinzapfel, Dr. Joseph I. Wirgau

Members Absent: Dr. Elise M Fullmer, Mr. Blas Hernandez, Dr. Douglas Mitchell, Dr. Basel Saleh, Dr. Andrea J. Stanaland, Dr. Edward Udd, Dr. Isaac Van Patten

I. Call to Order: 3:30pm

II. The minutes from the November 4, 2010 meeting of the 2010-2011 Faculty Senate were approved.

III. Reports

a. Dr. Kay Jordan delivered the Senate President’s Report. Dr. Jordan informed the senators that Dr. Mark Shanley, Vice President for Student Affairs will address the Senate during the December 2, 2010. Senators should send their questions for Dr. Shanley to Dr. Jordan. She will compile them and forward them to Dr. Shanley. Dr. Jordan reported briefly on her attendance at the recent Board of Visitors meeting held on the RU campus, November 11-12, 2010. She mentioned that the BOV is quite aware of the salary issues with RU faculty and that RU faculty are very poorly compensated as compared to the RU peer group (listed at https://orbit.radford.edu/ir/peer_institutions.php). Dr. Jordan will pdf her presentation to the Board and email that to the senators.

b. Ms. Randi-Lyn Randall, Student Government Association President, delivered the SGA Report to the Senate. She mentioned a number of items and answered questions including:

i. The SGA would like to focus on three main issues. These are RU’s culture, RU’s image and the General Education classes. The SGA considers RU culture and RU image being intertwined.

ii. She addressed the question of drinking at RU. She feels that the SGA’s perspective is that RU is perceived as a “drinking school” but that the SGA members themselves tend to not be of that group.

iii. Ms. Randall was asked about students’ opinions about the lack of yearly class offerings due to a shortage of RU faculty to teach these classes. She mentioned this is frustrating and seems to be worse in the spring than in the fall.
iv. When asked about RU’s strengths Ms. Randall replied that the technology in the classrooms is great, and that the academics at RU have improved over the course of at least the last 7 years.

v. One senator encouraged the SGA to develop some type of “mantra” for RU students along the lines of “show up, be prepared, be ready” for classes.

vi. Ms. Randall was asked about students’ response to the recent tragic death of student Sam Mason. Ms. Randall replied that “Something should have been said and done” by the administration, and that student leaders should have said more, too. Dr. Jordan mentioned that President Kyle attended Mr. Mason’s funeral to represent RU.

vii. Mr. Brian Massey, and off-campus SGA senator was recognized and mentioned that one problem he sees is that not all classes have an attendance policy. A discussion ensued regarding attendance policies of various senators in their classes. Ms. Randall discussed both faculty canceling classes as well as students skipping classes. She said that “student learn from their [professors]” and will skip classes is professors do the same.

c. Committee Reports:
   i. Campus Environment Committee—Dr. Laura Jacobsen gave a general update and said the committee was making progress on their list of charges.
   ii. Curriculum Committee—they have had meetings with the Core Coordinators and Ms. Bethany Bodo.
   iii. The Faculty Issues Committee has completed language for the Faculty handbook to replace the ad hoc implementation of the online student evaluations.
   iv. The Governance Committee is making progress on their charges.
   v. The Resource Allocation Committee had no report.

IV. Old Business
   a. None

V. New Business
   a. None.

VI. Announcements
   a. None

VII. Adjournment: 4:24pm
Faculty Senate Meeting
December 2, 2010
Heth Hall, Room 014

Members Present: Dr. Suzanne E. Ament, Dr. Mary W. Atwell, Dr. Kevin Ayers, Dr. Joseph Chase, Mr. James E. Collier, Dr. Kim D. Gainer, Mr. Anthony R. Guest, Dr. Rhett B. Herman, Mr. Blas Hernandez, Dr. Katherine Hilden, Dr. Pamela A. Jackson, Dr. Kay K. Jordan, Dr. Jerry M. Kopf, Dr. Mary B. LaLone, Dr. Laura E. LaRue, Dr. Douglas Mitchell, Dr. Garth N. Montgomery, Dr. Michael B. Moore, Dr. Judy Niehaus, Dr. Stephen S. Owen, Dr. Richard A. Roth, Dr. Basel Saleh, Dr. Kenneth Smith, Sarah Smith, Dr. Andrea J. Stanaland, Dr. Sylvester Thompson, Dr. Jonathan L. Tso, Dr. Edward Turner, Dr. Edward Udd, Dr. Isaac Van Patten, Dr. A. Craig Waggaman, Dr. Erin L. Webster Garrett, Dr. Joseph I. Wirgau

Members Absent: Mr. Timothy L. Channell, Dr. Farrell D. Doss, Dr. Elise M Fullmer, Dr. Jim Gumaer, Dr. Laura Jacobsen, Dr. Alex Orlov, Dr. Helen M. Roybark, Dr. David N. Sallee, Ms. Renee Walsh

I. Call to Order: 3:34pm

II. The minutes from the November 18, 2010 meeting of the 2010-2011 Faculty Senate were approved as amended.

III. Reports

senate.asp.radford.edu/current/reports/miscellaneous/101016_QEP_Forum.pdf
a. Senate President’s report: None.
b. Provost’s report: None
c. Dr. Steve Lerch, RU SACS Consultant addressed the Senate.
   i. Dr. Lerch gave an update on the November 16 SACS Quality Enhancement Program (QEP) workshop. His presentation from that workshop is posted on the Senate website at
      http://senate.asp.radford.edu/current/reports/miscellaneous/101016_QEP_Forum.pdf Dr. Lerch gave the senators a handout showing how the members of that workshop addressed the question of the “theme” of the QEP by answering the question, “RU can improve by improving ________,” with the workshop participants filling in the blank. He also gave a handout of 5 potential QEP themes that came out of that workshop.
   ii. Dr. Lerch said that the QEP is a 3-step process. First, the RU QEP team will attempt to “flesh out” the potential themes to show how each theme will benefit RU, its students and all groups affected by each theme. Second, the QEP team will bring those fleshed out themes back to the Senate which would act as a “committee of the whole” to consider these themes. The QEP team will also send these themes to the other campus Senates. Third, the Senate will be asked to rank the top 3 themes by March 1, 2011.
iii. Dr. Lerch was asked how the QEP fits into the SACS process. Dr. Lerch responded that the QEP is “arguably the most important part of the SACS process.” The theme will be “something that is already in place [at RU] but will be enhanced by this plan.”

iv. Dr. Lerch was asked if there is any possibility for an extension since it appeared that RU may be behind schedule in the SACS process. Dr. Lerch responded that Dr. Rick Slavings had reported to him [Dr. Lerch] that RU was not behind in this process. Provost Scartelli also mentioned that RU is not behind in this process, and that he wants to make sure that the entire process is an open one.

v. Dr. Lerch mentioned that after the theme is determined then a QEP development team consisting mostly of faculty will work in the summer and fall of 2011 on the implementation plan of the QEP theme.

vi. Dr. Jordan mentioned that since most potential themes involved students then Student Affairs will be heavily involved. She also stated her opinion that faculty on the implementation team should have reassigned time and/or stipends, especially if they are working during the summer.

d. Dr. Mark Shanley, Vice President for Student Affairs addressed the Senate. Points mentioned included:

i. Dr. Shanley stated that “All things in Student Affairs complement academics.” He also stated that “Student Affairs is a component of a university but academics is the core.”

ii. Dr. Shanley stated that he is working on a 7-year overall plan for Student Affairs. He mentioned four goals: A diverse and distinct curriculum, student retention and success, a safe and inviting campus environment, and staff retention and success.

iii. Dr. Shanley mentioned that he was concerned about RU’s externally viewed perception and reputation regarding alcohol. He stated that it was his experience that if it takes the “top dog 6 to 7 years to lose its good reputation then it takes an up-and-comer 6 to 7 years to gain a good reputation.” He wants to work on a systematic environmental change of our student culture regarding alcohol and substance abuse. He is working on a comprehensive alcohol and substance abuse steering committee to affect systematic change.

iv. Dr. Jordan asked about a student drinking survey (a 2-hour survey and education activity) at places such as Ohio University, Miami of Ohio, RU and 360 institutions nationwide. Dr. Shanley said this was given pre-matriculation in the summer and during 6 weeks in the fall. He said that the “RU data was off the charts” vs. Miami of Ohio and that RU was “definitely different.” About 46% of RU incoming freshmen had engaged in high risk drinking within the prior 30 days (this was pre-college behavior). He said that “very high risk” was 10 or more drinks per sitting while “high risk” was 5 or more drinks per sitting. He then pointed out that this data held for all RU students (freshmen, sophomores, juniors, seniors) and not just incoming freshmen.

v. Dr. Ament mentioned that faculty could get involved with Student Affairs through the Conduct Board. Dr. Shanley mentioned individual faculty could get involved by advising clubs and organizations, and by “respectfully inquiring of red-eyed sleep-deprived students.”

vi. Dr. Joe Chase asked about what authority Student Affairs had regarding off campus Greek organizations that were “not helpful.” Dr. Shanely responded that his former school had organizations on campus. He mentioned there were too few faculty
advisors for these organizations. RU has a low-paying high-turnover Greek coordinator position. RU has no nationally-sanctioned fraternity houses [on campus] but such a thing would help RU. He mentioned that RU faculty need to get involved as advisors to these groups. He said that about 12% of RU students are involved in Greek life.

vii. Dr. Shanley was asked what numbers Student Affairs track regarding violence, especially violence to women. Dr. Shanely said that he was “alarmed” by incidents involved with alcohol and substance abuse.

e. Committee Reports:
   i. Campus Environment: None
   ii. Curriculum Committee: None
   iii. Faculty Issues Committee: None
   iv. Governance Committee: None
   v. Resource Allocation Committee: None

IV. Old Business

   a. None

V. New Business

   a. The Motion regarding the Core Curriculum website and RU course equivalencies for CORE classes (brought by the FSEC) was introduced and automatically tabled.
   b. The Motion to Oppose Tuition &Fees Increase at Radford University (brought by Basel Saleh) was introduced from the floor, seconded and automatically tabled.

VI. Announcements

   a. None

VII. Adjournment: 4:41pm
Faculty Senate Meeting
January 20, 2011
Heth Hall, Room 014

Members Present: Dr. Suzanne E. Ament, Dr. Mary W. Atwell, Dr. Kevin Ayers, Dr. Roann Barris, Mr. Timothy L. Channell, Dr. Joseph Chase, Mr. James E. Collier, Dr. Farrell D. Doss, Alice King Ingram (sub for Dr. Elise M Fullmer), Dr. Kim D. Gainer, Mr. Anthony R. Guest, Dr. Jim Gumaer, Dr. Rhett B. Herman, Dr. Pamela A. Jackson, Dr. Laura Jacobsen, Dr. Kay K. Jordan, Dr. Jerry M. Kopf, Dr. Mary B. LaLone, Dr. Garth N. Montgomery, Dr. Michael B. Moore, Dr. Judy Niehaus, Dr. Alex Orlov, Dr. Stephen S. Owen, Dr. Richard A. Roth, Dr. Helen M. Roybark, Dr. Basel Saleh, Dr. David N. Sallee, Dr. Susan L. Schoppelrey, Sarah Smith, Dr. Lauren Smith, Dr. Carol Bienstock (sub for Dr. Andrea J. Stanaland), Dr. Sylvester Thompson, Dr. Jonathan L. Tso, Dr. Edward Turner, Dr. Edward Udd, Dr. Isaac Van Patten, Dr. A. Craig Waggaman, Dr. Erin L. Webster Garrett, Ms. Renee Walsh, Dr. Monica M. Weinzapfel, Dr. Joseph I. Wirgau

Members Absent: Mr. Blas Hernandez, Dr. Laura E. LaRue, Dr. Douglas Mitchell

I. Call to Order: 3:32pm

II. The minutes from the December 02, 2010 meeting of the 2010-2011 Faculty Senate were approved.

III. Reports
   a. Senate President’s report: Dr. Kay K. Jordan discussed the progress of the Provost search. The original 65 applicants resulted in 7 candidates being brought to campus in December for interviews by the Provost Search Committee. Three of these were invited to campus in January 2011 as finalists. These are Dr. Paul K. Kreider of Western Illinois University, Dr. Sam Minner of Truman State University and Dr. Mary Flannery Radosh at the State University of New York at Geneseo. After these open-to-the-campus interviews the search committee will report to President Kyle on the strengths and weaknesses of each candidate. President Kyle will then make the final decision.
   b. Mr. Julio Stephens and Dr. Dennis Grady reported on their work on RU SustainABILITY (http://www.radford.edu/rugreen/). Mr. Stephens, the Sustainability Coordinator delivered a PowerPoint presentation on his work. This is posted in pdf format at http://senate.asp.radford.edu/current/reports/miscellaneous/110120_Faculty20Senate-Sustainability.pdf.
   c. Dr. James Lollar, President of the Faculty Senate of Virginia, addressed the Senate.
      i. Dr. Lollar explained that the Faculty Senate of Virginia both provides a forum to discuss faculty issues in Virginia as well as works to inform policymakers in Virginia about faculty issues.
      ii. Dr. Lollar addressed the proposal from Governor Bob McDonnell to no longer fund the 5% contribution to state employees’ retirement plans. This proposal actually originated with the previous administration of Gov. Tim Kaine. Gov. McDonnell also proposes to offset this by giving all state employees a 3% pay raise. However he also proposes to give only those state employees in the Virginia Retirement System (VRS) a
2% bonus, making this whole thing “a wash” in terms of net salary change. However those state employees in the Optional Retirement Plan (ORP) would not get that 2% bonus which would make for a net pay decrease of 1.9%.

iii. There are currently 17,111 faculty at Virginia public colleges and they have no political action committee. But the Faculty Senate of Virginia has partnered with 7 other state employees’ associations to work on this VRS/ORP issue. The bill form Gov. McDonnell has been filed with the legislature but it will be discussed in a legislative committee.

iv. This history of this 5% started in 1983. At that time Virginia state employees had not had pay raises in some time. Thus the state decided instead of a pay raise that it would pay employees’ 5% contribution to their retirement plans. In 2007 the system was actually 107% funded, although it is now 63% funded with a total of $57 billion in assets. This fund goes up and down with markets so the label of “underfunding is a ‘red herring.’”

v. Shortly after the beginning of the year the legislature has received over 1,000 emails on this issue. After 1,000 have been received on an issue the state starts to mark the rest of the emails “as spam.” Faculty should now send their comments directly to the Governor’s office.

vi. 87% of new faculty since the early 1990s are in the ORP. Thus 62% of all faculty in Virginia are in the ORP.

d. Committee Reports:
   i. Campus Environment: None
   ii. Curriculum Committee: Motions will be brought to the Senate soon.
   iii. Faculty Issues Committee: Motions will be brought to the Senate soon.
   iv. Governance Committee: None
   v. Resource Allocation Committee: None

IV. Old Business

a. The Motion regarding the Core Curriculum website and RU course equivalencies for CORE classes (brought by the FSEC) was brought off the table and discussed. Points included:
   i. Dr. Roann said this motion was really about undercutting the core Curriculum and was against it.
   ii. Dr. Susan Van Patten, Acting Core Curriculum Director gave a handout to the senators in response to this motion. Dr. Van Patten pointed out that the transfer equivalencies for CORE 201 and CORE 202 are for transfer students and not the general RU student population. The handout stated that “In order to make this change in DegreeWorks, it is necessary for an Advising Coordinator or the Registrar’s Office to make a manual exception...” She made the point that allowing native RU students to make these substitutions “would create additional workload and possible confusion during advising sessions.” She also said that the sequential nature of CORE 201 and CORE 202 students cannot substitute for only one and not the other.
   iii. Dr. Roybark asked if this transfer ability is available to everyone. Dr. Niehaus responded that students taking ENGL 101 at their “home” community college would transfer as CORE 101. Dr. Roybark stated that she opposed the motion as a transfer
policy across the board. Dr. Niehaus said that this was not a policy but rather that RU
is already doing this so this motion was for a “simple clarification” of current policy.
iv. Dr. Chase pointed out that DegreeWorks is programmable to some extent and thus
we need to tell DegreeWorks how to handle this matter.
v. Dr. Udd stated that he was against a menu of courses from which students would pick
and choose. If this is already a policy then it should be posted. The “menu option” is
the “old way” for general education.
vi. Dr. Van Patten stated that ENGL 111 and ENGL 112 are no longer offered at RU so this
[substitution] is not available to all RU students. PHIL 111 and COMM 114 require
individual academic petitions to substitute for CORE 201 and CORE 202.
vii. The question was asked about AP classes with ENGL 101 and if students would then
need to take CORE 102?
viii. Dr. Webster Garrett asked if there was a group of students who usually try to petition
for substitutions. Dr. Van Patten said this was most common with re-admitted
students.
ix. Dr. Chase asked if students who take PHIL 111 and COMM 114 at a community college
between freshman and sophomore years could substitute these for CORE 201 and
CORE 202?
x. The motion was placed back on the table for further discussion at a later date.
b. The Motion to Oppose Tuition & Fees Increase at Radford University (brought by Basel
Saleh) was removed from the table and then re-tabled.

V. New Business

a. The Motion of Support for the Partnership Agreement between VCCS and RU (brought by
the FSEC) was introduced and automatically tabled.

VI. Announcements

a. None

VII. Adjournment: 4:48 pm
Members Present: Dr. Suzanne E. Ament, Dr. Mary W. Atwell, Dr. Kevin Ayers, Dr. Roann Barris, Mr. Timothy L. Channell, Dr. Joseph Chase, Mr. James E. Collier, Dr. Farrell D. Doss, Dr. Kim D. Gainer, Mr. Anthony R. Guest, Dr. Jim Gumaer, Dr. Rhett B. Herman, Dr. Pamela A. Jackson, Dr. Laura Jacobsen, Dr. Jerry M. Kopf, Dr. Mary B. LaLone, Dr. Garth N. Montgomery, Dr. Michael B. Moore, Dr. Judy Niehaus, Dr. Alex Orlov, Dr. Stephen S. Owen, Dr. Richard A. Roth, Dr. Wayne Saubert (sub for Dr. Helen M. Roybark), Dr. David N. Sallee, Sarah Smith, Dr. Lauren Smith, Dr. Carol Bienstock (sub for Dr. Andrea J. Stanaland), Dr. Sylvester Thompson, Dr. Jonathan L. Tso, Dr. Edward Turner, Dr. Edward Udd, Dr. Isaac Van Patten, Dr. A. Craig Waggaman, Dr. Erin L. Webster Garrett, Dr. Inessa Plekhanova (sub for Dr. Monica M. Weinzapfel), Dr. Joseph I. Wirgau

Members Absent: Dr. Elise M Fullmer, Mr. Blas Hernandez, Dr. Laura E. LaRue, Dr. Douglas Mitchell, Dr. Susan L. Schoppelrey, Ms. Renee Walsh

I. Call to Order: 3:33pm

II. The minutes from the January 20, 2011 meeting of the 2010-2011 Faculty Senate were approved as amended.

III. Reports
   a. Senate President’s report: Dr. Judy Niehaus substituted for Dr. Kay Jordan as presiding officer.
      i. Dr. Niehaus discussed the format of the next Senate meeting on February 17, 2011. This would be a meeting of the Senate as a “committee of the whole.” This format would allow the discussion of a topic without the necessity of that topic being a motion under debate. The topic of this meeting will be the QEP (quality Enhancement Plan) topics to be discussed later in the current meeting. These QEP topics will form the theme for Radford University’s next decade under the SACS reaccreditation.
      ii. Senators should meet with their constituents before February 17 so they may vote on the 8 QEP topics to be presented in today’s meeting. The Senate will take this input and decide on February 17 on a top 3 list. This list will be passed to the SACS reaccreditation committee which will pick the final one. This committee will do its work over the summer of 2011. Other senates on campus will do the same.
      iii. Dr. Niehaus introduced the main topic of the meeting—the QEP report—which would be delivered by Dr. Steve Lerch.
   b. Dr. Steve Owen reported on the QEP process so far. He reported on a number of items including the following.
      i. The QEP is an essential piece of RU’s SACS reaccreditation process.
      ii. RU served as a pilot institution in 2000 for SACS. The theme chosen then of “Student Engagement” turned out to be too broad a topic. However that had no deleterious consequences since this was within the SACS pilot program.
iii. The QEP topic that we choose will be a 10-year focused effort, a campus-wide theme. This should be something that we are currently doing but that could be enhanced.

iv. The members of the QEP are Dr. Steve Owen, Dr. Erin Webster Garrett, Dr. Kay K. Jordan, Dr. Pat Shoemaker, Dr. Joe King, Dr. Joe Scartelli and Dr. Rick Slaving. This team is continually consulting with other campus constituencies about the QEP.

v. The QEP theme must take into account our resources, with reasonable expectations of funding available to implement this theme.

vi. February 1, 2012 is the final deadline for submission of this plan to SACS.

c. Dr. Steve Lerch gave a brief overview of the QEP topics. He reported that the basic question to be asked and answered by this theme is, “Why would ______ make a good QEP?” He then asked people to stand and give an explanation of each of the 8 topics and how each topic might answer that question. These people were not necessarily those who came up with these topics, or wrote the longer explanations of the topics.

i. On the Faculty Senate website there is a summary paragraph for each theme along with 8 longer documents explaining more about each theme.

d. Committee Reports: None were asked for or delivered today due to the QEP presentation occupying the bulk of the meeting time.

IV. Old Business

a. The Motion regarding the Core Curriculum website and RU course equivalencies for CORE classes (brought by the FSEC) was removed from the table and re-tabled.

b. The Motion to Oppose Tuition & Fees Increase at Radford University (brought by Basel Saleh) was removed from the table and then re-tabled.

V. New Business

a. The Motion to Amend the Handbook to Address (1) Administration of Student Evaluations in Non-Traditional Settings and (2) Administration of Student Evaluations in Courses Not Housed in Departments (brought by the Faculty Issues Committee) was introduced and automatically tabled.

b. The Motion to Refer to the Calendar Committee without Recommendation the Proposal that Labor Day Be a University-wide Holiday (brought by the Faculty Issues Committee) was introduced and automatically tabled.

c. The Motion to recommend the approval of a revised Faculty Satisfaction Survey (brought by the Campus Environment Committee) was introduced and automatically tabled.

VI. Announcements

a. Dr. Rhett Herman announced that there were a number of items posted on the Senate website including legislative alerts related to the Virginia Retirement System and a number of reports prepared by the RU Administration for the upcoming Board of Visitors meeting.
VII. Adjournment: 4:47pm
Faculty Senate Meeting  
February 17, 2011  
Heth Hall, Room 014

**Members Present:** Dr. Kevin Ayers, Dr. Roann Barris, Dr. Joseph Chase, Mr. James E. Collier, Dr. Farrell D. Doss, Dr. Kim D. Gainer, Mr. Anthony R. Guest, Dr. Rhett B. Herman, Katherine Hilden, Dr. Pamela A. Jackson, Dr. Laura Jacobsen, Dr. Kay K. Jordan, Dr. Jerry M. Kopf, Dr. Mary B. LaLone, Dr. Laura E. LaRue, Dr. Douglas Mitchell, Dr. Michael B. Moore, Dr. Judy Niehaus, Dr. Alex Orlov, Dr. Stephen S. Owen, Dr. Richard A. Roth, Dr. Helen M. Roybark, Dr. David N. Sallee, Dr. Basel Saleh, Dr. Susan L. Schoppelrey, Sarah Smith, Dr. Lauren Smith, Dr. Carol Bienstock (sub for Dr. Andrea J. Stanaland), Dr. Sylvester Thompson, Dr. Jonathan L. Tso, Dr. Edward Udd, Dr. Isaac Van Patten, Dr. A. Craig Waggaman, Dr. Erin L. Webster Garrett, Ms. Renee Walsh, Dr. Monica M. Weinzapfel, Dr. Joseph I. Wirgau

**Members Absent:** Dr. Mary W. Atwell, Mr. Timothy L. Channell, Dr. Elise M Fullmer, Dr. Jim Gumaer, Mr. Blas Hernandez, Dr. Edward Turner

I. Call to Order: 3:32pm

II. The minutes from the February 3, 2011 meeting of the 2010-2011 Faculty Senate were approved as amended.

III. Reports
   a. Senate President’s report: Dr. Kay K. Jordan reported on her time spent with the BOV and RU students in Richmond this past week lobbying on RU’s behalf. She reiterated specifically to the BOV members that RU faculty are paid well below our benchmark institutions. She reiterated to the BOV members that a day care center on the RU campus is still a high priority for faculty members.
   b. Provost’s Report: Dr. Joe Scartelli reported on a number of items regarding RU’s SACS reaccreditation work including:
      i. He handed out a copy of the SACS reaffirmation calendar including the following dates:
         1. June 7, 2010: Leadership Team Orientation in Atlanta
         2. September 12, 2011: Certification of compliance due to SACS
         3. November 1-4, 2011: Off-site review
         4. February 1, 2012: Focused report on QEP due to SACS
         5. March 27-29, 2012: On-site review
         6. August 29, 2012: Follow-up report due to SACS
         7. December 2012: Reaffirmation decision at SACS annual meeting
      ii. The “certification of compliance” is the verification of RU faculty credentials in teaching all classes for the previous two semesters. This is almost complete, which is quite good. Wayne Marker from Hollins University is RU’s “outside reader” and he is very impressed with RU’s progress.
      iii. Another large task is “institutional effectiveness” and the goal is to be done with this by the end of the current semester.
iv. The rest of the reaffirmation process is the QEP (Quality Enhancement Plan).
c. Dr. Jordan announced that there will be an extra Senate meeting next week (February 24) instead of committee meetings. Senators should consult with their constituents about the current long list of motions in case someone might suggest suspensions of rules next week to vote on these motions.
d. Committee Reports: None were asked for or delivered today.

IV. Old Business

a. A Motion to Meet as a Committee of the Whole to Discuss the Quality Enhancement Plan for the SACS Reaccreditation brought by the FSEC was approved.

V. New Business

a. A motion was made from the floor to withhold the results of the Senate vote for the QEP #1, #2 and #2 themes until after the other involved campus constituencies had determined their rankings. A friendly amendment was proposed to release the Faculty Senate vote on March 3. Both of these failed. The results of the secret ballots were #1: Wellness, #2: Citizen Scholars, #3: Critical Reading.
b. A motion was made from the floor to continue all motions under Old and New Business until the next Senate meeting. This motion passed by voice vote.
c. A motion was made from the floor to continue the meeting until 10 minutes after the mandatory adjournment time so the QEP theme votes could be counted and the results announced. This motion passed by voice vote.

VI. Announcements

a. None.

VII. Adjournment: 5:00pm
Faculty Senate Meeting  
February 24, 2011  
Heth Hall, Room 014

Members Present: Dr. Suzanne Ament, Dr. Mary W. Atwell, Dr. Kevin Ayers, Dr. Roann Barris, Mr. Timothy L. Channell, Dr. Joseph Chase, Dr. Farrell D. Doss, Dr. Kim D. Gainer, Mr. Anthony R. Guest, Dr. Jim Gumaer, Dr. Rhett B. Herman, Katherine Hilden, Dr. Pamela A. Jackson, Dr. Laura Jacobsen, Dr. Kay K. Jordan, Dr. Jerry M. Kopf, Dr. Laura E. LaRue, Dr. Douglas Mitchell, Dr. Garth N. Montgomery, Dr. Michael B. Moore, Dr. Judy Niehaus, Dr. Alex Orlov, Dr. Bernd Kunnecke (sub for Dr. Richard A. Roth), Dr. Basel Saleh, Dr. Susan L. Schoppelrey, Sarah Smith, Dr. Laura E. LaRue, Dr. Carol Bienstock (sub for Dr. Andrea J. Stanaland), Dr. Sylvester Thompson, Dr. Jonathan L. Tso, Dr. Edward Turner, Dr. Edward Udd, Dr. Isaac Van Patten, Dr. A. Craig Waggaman, Dr. Erin L. Webster Garrett, Ms. Renee Walsh, Dr. Monica M. Weinzapfel, Dr. Joseph I. Wirgau

Members Absent: Mr. James E. Collier, Dr. Elise M Fullmer, Mr. Blas Hernandez, Dr. Mary B. LaLone, Dr. Helen M. Roybark, Dr. David N. Sallee,

I. Call to Order: 3:33pm

II. The minutes from the February 17, 2011 meeting of the 2010-2011 Faculty Senate were approved.

III. Reports
   a. Senate President’s report: Dr. Kay K. Jordan reported that Provost Scartelli could not be present today. However he has read every one of the files for faculty promotion and tenure.
   b. Committee Reports: None were asked for or delivered today.

IV. Old Business
   a. The Motion to recommend the approval of a revised Faculty Satisfaction Survey was taken off the table and debated. This motion passed by voice vote.
   b. The Motion to Amend the Handbook to Address (1) Administration of Student Evaluations in Non-Traditional Settings and (2) Administration of Student Evaluations in Courses Not Housed in Departments was brought off the table and debated. Relevant points addressed included:
      i. The question was asked about e.g. COBE courses but not department courses. Who sees those evaluations, and upon which criteria are the evaluations based?
      ii. There was a general discussion concerning who is responsible for the evaluations. Are the evaluations based on the faculty member or on the course/discipline?
      iii. This motion passed by voice vote (division called, hands counted).
   c. The Motion to Refer to the Calendar Committee without Recommendation the Proposal that Labor Day Be a University-wide Holiday was taken off the table and discussed. The case was made against this motion based on the idea that passing this to committee
without comment would imply that Labor Day could be a University holiday. This motion was defeated by voice vote.

d. The Motion to Oppose Tuition & Fees Increase at Radford University was brought off the table and re-tabled without debate.

V. New Business

a. The Motion regarding Conducting Paper Dean’s Evaluations brought by the Governance Committee was introduced. The Senate voted to suspend the rules and debate the motion today. Relevant points addressed included:
   i. A number of people were concerned about electronic Dean’s evaluations and who had charge of, or access to the electronic information.
   ii. Some expressed concerns about the anonymity of electronic submissions. Dr. Joe Chase stated that he was confident in the anonymity of the electronic submissions. The comments would be incredibly unlikely to be traceable.
   iii. The question was called and the motion failed by voice vote.

b. The Motion to Revise the Instructions for the Administration of the Faculty Morale Survey and the Mode of Reporting the Comments brought by the Faculty Senate Executive Council was introduced. The Senate voted to suspend the rules and debate the motion today. Relevant points addressed included:
   i. The Campus Environment Committee in years past had been summarizing university quantitative results in tables.
   ii. The question was raised about blatantly libelous comments being submitted and then posted publicly on the Senate website. Who might be held legally liable for any potential libel lawsuits?
   iii. Dr. Jordan remarked that in the 2009-2010 Senate Dr. Sid Smith (Senate Secretary) refused to post the comments related to the Vote of No Confidence and Senate President Dr. Steve Owen would not direct Dr. Smith to post them. This was because of the threat of liability.
   iv. A number of comments and questions were raised about who was responsible for the potential liability for publicly posting any libelous comments, even if the poster were not the author of the comments.
   v. The motion was tabled for further research into the matter.

c. The Motion regarding the Dean’s Search Committee Composition was introduced. In the introduction it was stated that this motion would among other things make the committee representative of all of the constituencies of the University. It was automatically tabled.

d. The Motion regarding Faculty Appeal and Faculty Grievance Information brought by the Governance Committee was introduced and automatically tabled.

e. The Motion regarding At-Large Alternative to Faculty Appeals and Faculty Grievance Committees brought by the Governance Committee was introduced and automatically tabled.

f. The Motion regarding Selection of College Assistant and Associate Deans brought by the Governance Committee was introduced and automatically tabled.
g. Motion regarding Qualifications of Assistant and Associate Deans brought by the Governance Committee was introduced and automatically tabled.

h. The Motion to Insert Language into the Teaching and Research Faculty Handbook a Statement Directing Faculty to the Personnel Information Handbook brought by the Faculty Issues Committee was introduced and automatically tabled.

VI. Announcements

a. None.

VII. Adjournment: 4:51pm
Members Present: Dr. Suzanne Ament, Dr. Kevin Ayers, Dr. Roann Barris, Dr. Joseph Chase, Mr. James E. Collier, Dr. Kim D. Gainer, Dr. Rhett B. Herman, Dr. Blas Hernandez, Katherine Hilden, Dr. Pamela A. Jackson, Dr. Laura Jacobsen, Dr. Kay K. Jordan, Dr. Jerry M. Kopf, Dr. Mary B. LaLone, Dr. Laura E. LaRue, Dr. Garth N. Montgomery, Dr. Michael B. Moore, Dr. Judy Niehaus, Dr. Alex Orlov, Dr. Steve Owen, Dr. David N. Sallee, Dr. Basel Saleh, Dr. Susan L. Schoppelrey, Sarah Smith, Dr. Lauren Smith, Dr. Carol Bienstock (sub for Dr. Andrea J. Stanaland), Dr. Sylvester Thompson, Dr. Jonathan L. Tso, Dr. Edward Turner, Dr. Edward Udd, Dr. Isaac Van Patten, Dr. A. Craig Waggaman, Dr. Erin L. Webster Garrett, Ms. Renee Walsh, Dr. Monica M. Weinzapfel, Dr. Joseph I. Wirgau

Members Absent: Dr. Mary W. Atwell, Mr. Timothy L. Channell, Dr. Farrell D. Doss, Dr. Elise M Fullmer, Mr. Anthony R. Guest, Dr. Jim Gumaer, Dr. Douglas Mitchell, Dr. Richard A. Roth, Dr. Helen M. Roybark

I. Call to Order: 3:34pm

II. Motion to amend today’s agenda to include the Motion to Revise the Instructions for the Administration of the Faculty Morale Survey and the Mode of Reporting the Comments. The motion passed. The amended agenda was re-posted with the note about this floor motion.

III. The minutes from the February 24, 2011 meeting of the 2010-2011 Faculty Senate were approved.

IV. Reports
   a. Senate President’s report: Dr. Kay K. Jordan welcomed Provost Joe Scartelli and President Penelope Kyle to the Senate meeting.
   b. The Provost’s report was delivered by Dr. Joe Scartelli. Dr. Scartelli mentioned a number of items including,
      i. Revenue sharing: When David Burdette was Vice President for Business Affairs off-campus programs worked under a “profit split” between the university and the program. Once an off-campus class was established then the “profit” from that offering was hard-budgeted into the program’s base budget. The first state budget cuts of 15% approximately 5 years ago forced this program to be cut (to save other things at the University). There was a second 15% state cut 2 years ago and thus this program has not been reinstated.
      ii. Dr. Jerry Kopf commented that the College of Business and Economics has experienced a significant effect from this [cut profit sharing programs] situation due to its class offerings in Roanoke.
      iii. Dr. Ed Udd mentioned that it does cost programs to operate off-campus and the removal of this [profit sharing] decreases the incentive to teach off campus. Dr.
Scartelli mentioned that we “just need to survive the next 2 years” and then he hopes this situation will be revisited.

iv. President Kyle mentioned that each part of the University offered up what they wanted to cut first due to the budget crises.

v. It was asked if this [profit sharing] was in the 7-year budget plan? Dr. Scartelli said “I don’t think it is...” but that RU would continue to look at it every year.

vi. Dr. Joe Chase mentioned that it would be good to have a clear statement to know if these [profit sharing] programs are important.

vii. President Kyle mentioned that the current “hot button” issue is online program. She mentioned that the Governor would support such offerings with funding.

viii. Dr. Jordan mentioned that Faculty Professional Development and Leave seem to be emphasizing research. But what about reassigned time for course and program development? She stated that this was more of a statement for the Provost and the President rather than a question. Dr. Scartelli did respond that perhaps RU might think about “peeling off” some research money for program development.

ix. Dr. Scartelli discussed the New College Institute (NCI) in Martinsville. He mentioned

1. The Governor wants to make NCI a satellite of 4 year schools. RU is one of 5 schools vying to fulfill that role. Those schools are RU, VCU, GMU, Longwood and ODU.

2. A team from RU will meet with the NCI board and Harvest Foundation soon to make RU’s case. The Harvest Foundation has pledged $50 million for the NCI and the state will match that $50 million.

3. Whoever gets this will be someone who partners best with Patrick henry Community College.

4. The full proposals for this are due April 15, 2011 and the decision will be made in the summer of 2011.

5. President Kyle mentioned that the faculty at the NCI would be in residence in Martinsville or Patrick County, not “borrowed” from other schools. Dr. Scartelli said that these faculty would be new hires and the NCI would eventually be a standalone institution a la UVa-Wise. Steven Nape and Ellen Taylor are currently working hard on this effort [to have RU be the one involved with the NCI].

x. President Kyle stated that RU has a “surprisingly good” year at the Legislature. The Governor was pushing his “Top Jobs” legislation. She said that two budget amendments especially relevant to RU had good resolutions.

1. RU was allotted $2.2 million to renovate the Roanoke Doctorate of Physical Therapy (DPT) space not just for one year but for several years going forward. This will assist STEM and healthcare projects that RU designates.

2. RU received $500 thousand for the Masters in high school math education, a program helped along in great part by Laura Jacobsen. This program will happen within VCU’s designated space in Richmond. President Kyle said she also proposed to extent this to places at George Mason University and ODU but no decision was to be made on that idea.

3. RU also received $2 million for equipment in the new COBE building.

4. The State House left the Optional Retirement Plan members as they were with regards to the Governor’s original proposal for them to fund part of their
retirement. However the VCS members will have to pay 5% of their retirement funding but they will be given a 5% pay raise to offset that.

5. President Kyle discussed the idea of Virginia becoming a “system state” in which universities would be more closely tied together but that’s only being bantered around for now.

6. She pointed out that while RU did not get the most dollar-wise compared to other schools, RU certainly did well on a student headcount basis.

7. President Kyle discussed a possible new advisory group that may be created between RU and SCHEV. This group would consist of 1 private college president, 1 community college president, 2 research institution presidents, and 2 comprehensive institutions presidents. Other members would be the Secretary of Education, Secretary of Finance, Secretary of Planning and Budget, the head of SCHEV, one member of the House Appropriations Committee and one member of the Senate Finance Committee.

xi. It was asked if Virginia were considering going to a year-round calendar. President Kyle said just that the Governor would like to see more graduations in 3 years, and that UVa is working on a 4th year to get a Masters degree.

xii. President Kyle said that the state does not have the funds to provide any additional help to universities for when the Federal stimulus funds run out. RU does, however have permission to spend some of the stimulus funds given to us into the first quarter of the coming 2011-2012 academic year.

xiii. The comment was made that the “133% Rule” is blocking innovations that might occur due to people doing extra teaching. Dr. Scartelli said that this rule was standard across academic institutions in Virginia but he wasn't sure if it originated at the state level.

xiv. Dr. Jordan reminded everyone that 146 faculty were below the 10th percentile of our peers, 199 were below the 20th percentile and 181 RU faculty suffered still from compression and/or inversion. President Kyle asked the legislature for funds to give RU faculty a raise, and specifically asked to correct that 10th percentile group. But the legislature did not give a positive answer.

c. Committee Reports: None were asked for or delivered today.

V. Old Business

a. The Motion to Revise the Instructions for the Administration of the Faculty Morale Survey and the Mode of Reporting the Comments brought by the Faculty Senate Executive Council was taken off the table and debated. This motion was tabled.

b. The Motion regarding the Dean’s Search Committee Composition was taken off the table and debated. Dr. Owen pointed out that the main rationale for this motion was to provide complete department representation on this committee. The motion passed by voice vote.

c. All other Old Business motions were continued to the next meeting.

VI. New Business
a. The Motion to Recommend that the Faculty Senate Curriculum Committee be granted the review and approval authority of curriculum proposals for the University Core A as in the manner of a College Curriculum Committee was introduced and automatically tabled.
b. The Motion to Recommend that GECAC/CCAC act with regards to the University Core A Curriculum in the manner of a Department Personnel Committee was introduced and automatically tabled.
c. The Motion to Recommend that the Vice Provost for Academic Affairs act with regards to the Core Curriculum in the manner of a College Dean was introduced and automatically tabled.
d. The Motion Regarding the path for proposing changes to Core A was introduced and automatically tabled.

VII. Announcements

a. None.

VIII. Adjournment: 4:46pm
Faculty Senate Meeting  
March 17, 2011  
Heth Hall, Room 014

Members Present: Dr. Suzanne Ament, Dr. Mary W. Atwell, Dr. Kevin Ayers, Dr. Roann Barris, Dr. Joseph Chase, Mr. James E. Collier, Dr. Farrell D. Doss, Dr. Kim D. Gainer, Mr. Anthony R. Guest, Dr. Rhett B. Herman, Dr. Blas Hernandez, Dr. Pamela A. Jackson, Dr. Laura Jacobsen, Dr. Kay K. Jordan, Dr. Jerry M. Kopf, Dr. Laura E. LaRue, Dr. Garth N. Montgomery, Dr. Michael B. Moore, Dr. Judy Niehaus, Dr. Alex Orlov, Dr. Steve Owen, Dr. David N. Sallee, Dr. Richard A. Roth, Dr. Helen M. Roybark, Dr. Basel Saleh, Dr. Susan L. Schoppelrey, Sarah Smith, Dr. Carol Bienstock (sub for Dr. Andrea J. Stanaland), Dr. Sylvester Thompson, Dr. Jonathan L. Tso, Dr. Edward Turner, Dr. A. Craig Waggaman, Dr. Erin L. Webster Garrett, Ms. Renee Walsh, Dr. Monica M. Weinzapfel, Dr. Joseph I. Wirgau

Members Absent: Mr. Timothy L. Channell, Dr. Elise M Fullmer, Dr. Jim Gumaer, Katherine Hilden, Dr. Mary B. LaLone, Dr. Douglas Mitchell, Dr. David N. Sallee, Dr. Lauren Smith, Dr. Edward Udd, Dr. Isaac Van Patten

I. Call to Order: 3:35pm

II. The minutes from the March 03, 2011 meeting of the 2010-2011 Faculty Senate were approved.

III. Reports
   a. The Provost’s report was delivered by Dr. Joe Scartelli. Dr. Scartelli mentioned a number of items including,
      i. On March 15, 2011 a 12-member team from RU went to the New College Institute (NCI). They met with the Boards of the NCI and the Harvest Foundation, the City manager and others from the city of Martinsville. Dr. Scartelli reported that this area sees education as their way out of hard times.
      ii. The Harvest Foundation has up to $46 million to match whatever funding for the NCI that comes from the state.
      iii. This venture (to be the main partner institution working with NCI) will not cost RU anything. This venture will emphasize education in STEM fields along with healthcare/nursing and IT. All proposal will have been submitted (to become this partner) by April 15, 2011.
   b. Senate President’s report: Dr. Kay K. Jordan welcomed Provost Joe Scartelli and President Penelope Kyle to the Senate meeting.
      i. The FSEC has conversed with the RU Administration about the need for job descriptions. The FSEC passed a jobs motion which called for public release of job descriptions and job vacancies.
      ii. RU has a Compliance Officer in the Sponsored Programs and Grants Management Office. RU needs and updated research misconduct policy.
iii. Dr. Jordan reminded Senators that there were only 3 more meetings and thus they should anticipate that with any motions they may be planning.

c. A motion was made from the Senate floor to amend today’s agenda to include the University Motion Regarding the University Core A Assessment Plan. The motion passed. The amended agenda was re-posted with the note about this floor motion.

d. Committee Reports: None were asked for or delivered today.
   i. Campus Environment Committee: Motions will be forthcoming
   ii. Curriculum Committee: Motions will be forthcoming
   iii. Faculty Issues Committee: Motions will be forthcoming
   iv. Governance Committee: Motions will be forthcoming
   v. Resource Allocations Committee: Motions will be forthcoming

IV. Old Business

a. The Motion to Revise the Instructions for the Administration of the Faculty Morale Survey and the Mode of Reporting the Comments brought by the Faculty Senate Executive Council was taken off the table and debated. This motion was taken off the table and re-tabled.

b. The Motion regarding Faculty Appeal and Faculty Grievance Information brought by the Governance Committee was removed from the table and debated. The motion passed.

c. The Motion regarding At-Large Alternative to Faculty Appeals and Faculty Grievance Committees brought by the Governance Committee was removed from the table and debated. The motion passed.

d. The Motion regarding Selection of College Assistant and Associate Deans brought by the Governance Committee was removed from the table and debated. Points in the discussion included
   i. Dr. Owen mentioned that “no one could define what ‘Assistant’ or ‘Associate’ Dean was.” These titles may be College-specific.
   ii. An amendment was made from the floor to replace the word “unranked” with “ranked” so that the selection committees would submit a ranked list of names acceptable for these positions to the Dean for final choice.
      1. Dr. Chase said that sending ranked names to the Deans then set up a potential source of conflict with the administration. If the list is unranked then the selection committees would only be sending a list of acceptable candidates to the Deans. A list of strengths and weaknesses would go up the administration chain with the candidates, along with (often) a minority report about the candidates.
      2. Dr. Barris asked if there must be 3 names sent to the Deans.
      3. Dr. Niehaus said that it would not be a good idea to submit only 1 name since that would force the administration’s hand [in hiring that one person].
      4. The motion to amend the original motion to substitute the word “ranked” for “unranked” failed.
   iii. An amendment was made from the floor to replace the word “unranked” with “up to 3 unranked [names]" so that the selection committees would submit a ranked list of names acceptable for these positions to the Dean for final choice.
      1. Dr. Roybark said this was inconsistent with other search processes.
2. Dr. Atwell said that if there were not 3 qualified individuals then forcing a list to have 3 people was not a good idea.
3. The motion to amend the original motion to replace the word “unranked” with “up to 3 unranked [names]” passed.

iv. The Senate returned to debating the main motion.
1. Dr. Chase said that there seemed to be a problem with the search committee writing the job description only in consultation with the Dean.
2. Dr. Jacobsen made the motion to amend the original motion to state that the Dean shall write the job description in consultation with the search committee. This amendment passed.

v. The Senate returned to debating the main motion. It passed as amended (the Dean shall write the job description in consultation with the search committee).

e. The Motion regarding Qualifications of Assistant and Associate Deans brought by the Governance Committee was removed from the table and debated. Points in the discussion included
i. Dr. Chase asked about potential problems with a College that consisted of only one department?
ii. Dr. Turner asked if forcing Assistant and Associate Deans to be from a separate department from the Deans would be too restrictive?
iii. The motion failed.

f. The Motion to Insert Language into the Teaching and Research Faculty Handbook a Statement Directing Faculty to the Personnel Information Handbook brought by the Faculty Issues Committee was removed from the table. The motion passed.

g. The Motion to Recommend that the Faculty Senate Curriculum Committee be granted the review and approval authority of curriculum proposals for the University Core A as in the manner of a College Curriculum Committee was removed from the table and re-tabled.

h. The Motion to Recommend that GECAC/CCAC act with regards to the University Core A Curriculum in the manner of a Department Personnel Committee was removed from the table and re-tabled.

i. The Motion to Recommend that the Vice Provost for Academic Affairs act with regards to the Core Curriculum in the manner of a College Dean was removed from the table and re-tabled.

j. The Motion Regarding the path for proposing changes to Core A was removed from the table and re-tabled.

k. The Motion to Oppose Tuition &Fees Increase at Radford University, brought by Dr. Basel Saleh did not have a motion to remove it from the table. The motion does not continue.

V. New Business

a. The Motion to approve a certificate in Sustainability and Environmental Science from the FSEC was introduced and automatically tabled.

b. The Motion Regarding Research Leave for Assistant and Associate Deans from the Governance Committee was introduced and automatically tabled.

c. The Motion to Support the CSAT Proposal Regarding Program Names and Coordinator Titles from the FSEC was introduced and automatically tabled.
d. The Motion Regarding University Core A Assessment Plan from the FSEC was introduced and automatically tabled.

VI. Announcements

a. Dr. Jordan announced that the 2010-2011 Senate would meet on April 28 until 4:50pm. The 2011-2012 Senate will convene at 5:00 even if the 2010-2011 Senate ends early on that day.

b. A moment of silence was observed for student Patrick M. Dovell, a first year Art major who passed away the previous week.

VII. Adjournment: 4:43pm
Faculty Senate Meeting
March 31, 2011
Heth Hall, Room 014

Members Present: Dr. Mary W. Atwell, Dr. Kevin Ayers, Dr. Roann Barris, Dr. Joseph Chase, Dr. Farrell D. Doss, Dr. Kim D. Gainer, Mr. Anthony R. Guest, Dr. Jim Gumaer, Dr. Rhett B. Herman, Dr. Katherine Hilden, Dr. Pamela A. Jackson, Dr. Laura Jacobsen, Dr. Kay K. Jordan, Dr. Jerry M. Kopf, Dr. Michael B. Moore, Dr. Judy Niehaus, Dr. Alex Orlov, Dr. Steve Owen, Dr. Richard Roth, Dr. Helen M. Roybark, Dr. Basel Saleh, Dr. David N. Sallee, Dr. Susan L. Schoppelrey, Dr. Lauren Smith, Ms. Sarah Smith, Andrea J. Stanaland, Dr. Sylvester Thompson, Dr. Jonathan L. Tso, Dr. Edward Turner, Dr. A. Craig Waggaman, Dr. Erin L. Webster Garrett, Ms. Renee Walsh, Dr. Monica M. Weinzapfel, Dr. Joseph I. Wirgau

Members Absent: Mr. Timothy L. Channell, Mr. James E. Collier, Dr. Elise M Fullmer, Dr. Blas Hernandez, Dr. Mary B. LaLone, Dr. Douglas Mitchell, Dr. Isaac Van Patten

I. Call to Order: 3:33pm

II. The minutes from the March 17, 2011 meeting of the 2010-2011 Faculty Senate were approved.

III. A motion was made from the floor by Dr. Niehaus to amend today’s agenda to add the Motion to Revise the Instructions for the Administration of the Faculty Morale Survey and the Mode of Reporting the Comments to the bottom of today’s Old Business. The motion passed.

IV. Reports
   a. Senate President’s report: Dr. Kay K. Jordan’s comments included:
      i. Dr. Jordan and Dr. Jacobsen asked President Kyle to forward questions regarding the Faculty satisfaction survey to the Virginia Attorney General’s (AG) office. Ron Forehand of the AG’s office said informally that the Faculty Senate was a BOV-approved body at RU and was thus covered by government immunity as well as state liability. This is true so long as the Faculty Senate does not violate policy or state law. He said that all universities have privacy policies to protect their faculty. These comments were included in a non-confidential email from March 30, 2011 that Dr. Jordan shared with the Senate.
      ii. Dr. Jordan asked Mr. Forehand about the faculty satisfaction survey, specifically regarding the numerical and the written comments sections. He again informally remarked that the Senate should conduct the survey. However, the written comments cannot be distributed when the subject of those comments can be identified. Phrases such as “My Dean is ...” are OK since those types of questions are for all deans in general. But questions referring to a dean of a particular college, or the Provost or the President are not OK to distribute.
      iii. Dr. Jordan said that she will try to arrange a conference call with Mr. Forehand and will include Dr. Jacobsen and others involved with the survey.
      iv. Dr. Jordan reiterated that she could not discuss exact parts of Mr. Forehand’s memo in an open Senate meeting.
b. The Provost’s report was delivered by Dr. Joe Scartelli. Dr. Scartelli mentioned a number of items including,
   i. The work on the proposal for RU to become the principal partner in the New College Institute (NCI) is ongoing.
   ii. Enrollments at RU are up. The numbers in all categories are up from last year. New freshmen who have paid deposits were 617 at this point in 2010, but are 719 currently. Out of state students make up about 12% of these students.
   iii. The upcoming academic year (2011-2012) will be the worst of all budget-wise.
   iv. The QEP theme was chosen and it is “Citizen Scholars.”
   v. The percentage of our overall student body that is out of state remains steady at about 9%.
   vi. The question was asked from the floor if the administration is looking to provide new faculty lines. Dr. Scartelli responded that the target for new freshmen enrollment is 1,900. If that number is reached then maybe some adjunct help will be provided. However he stated that he knew this would only be a temporary fix.

c. Committee Reports:
   i. Campus Environment Committee: None.
   ii. Curriculum Committee: None.
   iii. Faculty Issues Committee: Motions will be introduced today.
   iv. Governance Committee: Dean’s evaluations will be distributed next week.
   v. Resource Allocations Committee: Dr. Saleh mentioned that RAC had prepared an extensive report on working conditions of adjunct faculty. That report is posted on the Senate site at [http://senate.asp.radford.edu/current/reports/resourceallocation/110329_RAC_WorkingConditionsofAdjunctFacultyatRadford.pdf](http://senate.asp.radford.edu/current/reports/resourceallocation/110329_RAC_WorkingConditionsofAdjunctFacultyatRadford.pdf)

V. Old Business

a. Motion to Recommend that the Faculty Senate Curriculum Committee be granted the review and approval authority of curriculum proposals for the University Core A as in the manner of a College Curriculum Committee was removed from the table and debated. Points in the discussion included
   i. Dr. Webster Garrett commented that one of the “casualties” with the speed of implementation of the Core Curriculum included the lack of faculty oversight of the Core.
   ii. Dr. Raybark asked how this current motion relates to GECAC. Dr. Waggaman responded that the path of proposals would be GECAC followed by the Faculty Senate Curriculum Committee, which would act like a College curriculum committee with regards to the Core.
   iii. Dr. Susan Van Patten was recognized by Dr. Jordan. Dr. Van Patten commented that the correct path is from a College, to GECAC, and then to the Faculty Senate Curriculum committee. She remarked that she would like to expand this idea to other university-wide programs such as UNIV 100. Dr. Webster Garrett responded that the current proposal is only for the Core.
   iv. Dr. Jordan said that the Faculty Senate currently only has Review and Comment authority, not Decision authority. Now things go from the Faculty Senate to UGCCC,
and then to the Provost’s office for final approval. Dr. Scartelli remarked that he agreed with this.

v. A number of general questions were raised about the exact path of curriculum proposals. Dr. Jackson remarked that the 4th proposal in this series of 4 from the Senate Curriculum Committee would define that path.

vi. Dr. Kopf commented that colleges and departments seem to have no role in this path yet they would be the ones staffing the Core.

vii. A motion was made from the floor to table this motion. The motion to table passed.

b. The Motion to Recommend that GECAC/CCAC act with regards to the University Core A Curriculum in the manner of a Department Personnel Committee was removed from the table.

i. Dr. Webster Garrett announced a substitute motion. This substitute motion would like this motion to CORE 201 and CORE 202 only. The motion to make this substitute motion passed.

ii. This substitute motion was tabled.

c. The Motion to Recommend that the Vice Provost for Academic Affairs act with regards to the Core Curriculum in the manner of a College Dean was removed from the table. Points in the discussion included

i. Dr. Kopf asked if the previous motion was for Core as opposed to department adjunct appointments. Dr. Webster Garrett responded that this motion does not talk about the future, but only about the current structure of the Core.

ii. Dr. Susan Van Patten was recognized and asked to whom does this motion apply? Dr. Webster Garrett responded that this will not stop a department from rehiring someone to teach a department course even if they are rejected from teaching the Core.

iii. Dr. Jackson said that this motion is really to provide some relief to the Core Director.

iv. Dr. Susan Van Patten was recognized and stated that the Core [faculty] evaluations go back to the department chair. If the department won’t hire the adjunct then the department personnel committee would not have to evaluate that adjunct.

v. Dr. Kopf stated that to him, it sounded like the adjuncts must be a part of “something” and wondered if we were perhaps talking of making something like a “Core Department.”

vi. Dr. Gumaer asked who hires the Core adjuncts. Dr. Susan Van Patten was recognized and responded that she conducts the interviews and checks their CVs. She then asks a department if that department is willing to add that person to the department’s adjunct database.

vii. Dr. Niehaus asked about someone perhaps having an engineering degree who wanted to teach in the Core. She stated that this would be hard since RU does not have an engineering department to hire them. Dr. Scartelli mentioned that such a scenario would have SACS implications.

viii. Dr. Roybark called the question. The call to question failed (did not achieve the necessary two-thirds vote of the Senators present). The vote was 19 to end debate, 13 to continue; 32 Senators were present.

ix. It was mentioned that the Acting Core Director is currently T&R faculty. If the new Core Director is A/P faculty then this person would not need to be evaluated by a personal committee since A/P faculty report to their immediate supervisor.
x. Dr. Owen mentioned we should not specify an evaluation process until we specify whether this position is A/P or T/R faculty.

xi. A motion was made to table the current motion. The motion to table passed.

d. The Motion Regarding the path for proposing changes to Core A was removed from the table. Points in the discussion included
   i. Dr. Kopf made the motion to amend this motion to include the specific path for these changes in the motion. Dr. Webster Garrett responded that she would be in favor of this amendment.
   ii. Dr. Kopf called the question and the Senate voted to end debate.
   iii. The amended motion then passed.

e. The Motion to approve a certificate in Sustainability and Environmental Studies was removed from the table. Points in the discussion included
   i. Dr. Roth noted that the agenda had erroneously listed the word “Science” in the motion rather than the correct word “Studies.”
   ii. Dr. Saleh asked if there was a capstone class in this certificate. Dr. Roth answered in the affirmative.
   iii. Dr. Schoppelry asked about the difference between a “certificate” and a “minor.” Dr. Roth said that a “certificate” does not require SCHEV approval.
   iv. The question was called and the motion passed.

f. The Motion Regarding Research Leave for Assistant and Associate Deans was removed from the table.
   i. After it was read the motion was passed.

g. The Motion to Support the CSAT Proposal Regarding Program Names and Coordinator Titles was removed from the table.
   i. After it was read the motion was passed.

h. A motion was made from the floor to continue the Senate meeting after the mandatory adjournment time. This motion did not pass
   i. A motion was made from the floor to remove from the table and then retable all remaining Old Business. This motion passed.

VI. New Business

a. A motion was made from the floor to have all New Business counted as “introduced” and tabled. This motion passed.

VII. Announcements

a. Dr. Jordan asked that all Senators read all upcoming motions for the next meeting.

VIII. Adjournment: 4:51pm
Members Present: Dr. Suzanne E. Ament, Dr. Mary W. Atwell, Dr. Roann Barris, Mr. Timothy L. Channell, Dr. Joseph Chase, Dr. Farrell D. Doss, Dr. Kim D. Gainer, Mr. Anthony R. Guest, Dr. Jim Gumaer, Dr. Rhett B. Herman, Dr. Blas Hernandez, Dr. Katherine Hilden, Dr. Pamela A. Jackson, Dr. Laura Jacobsen, Dr. Kay K. Jordan, Dr. Jerry M. Kopf, Dr. Mary B. LaLone, Dr. Garth N. Montgomery, Dr. Michael B. Moore, Dr. Judy Niehaus, Dr. Alex Orlov, Dr. Steve Owen, Dr. Richard Roth, Dr. Helen M. Roybark, Dr. Basel Saleh, Dr. David N. Sallee, Dr. Susan L. Schoppelrey, Dr. Lauren Smith, Ms. Sarah Smith, Andrea J. Stanaland, Dr. Sylvester Thompson, Dr. Edward Turner, Dr. Ed Udd, Dr. A. Craig Waggaman, Dr. Isaac Van Patten, Dr. Erin L. Webster Garrett, Dr. Monica M. Weinzapfel, Dr. Joseph I. Wirgau

Members Absent: Dr. Kevin Ayers, Mr. James E. Collier, Dr. Elise M Fullmer, Dr. Laura Larue, Dr. Douglas Mitchell, Dr. Jonathan L. Tso, Ms. Renee Walsh

I. Call to Order: 3:32pm

II. The minutes from the March 31, 2011 meeting of the 2010-2011 Faculty Senate were approved as amended.

III. Reports
   a. Senate President’s report: Dr. Kay K. Jordan announced that she will be on academic leave in the fall of 2011.
   b. The Provost’s report was delivered by Dr. Joe Scartelli. Dr. Scartelli mentioned a number of items including,
      i. The incoming student numbers were so good that he felt he had to share them with the Senate. As of today RU was 310 paid deposits over last year on this date; this is an RU record. He said this was a direct result of the work done by Steven Nape and James Pennix.
      ii. The job description for the Core Director is almost finished. As things stand now it looks like this will be A/P faculty, someone tenured, but this person does not have to be a full professor. He will send the job description out to the faculty. Dr. Jordan commented that the search committee should have one faculty member from each College. Dr. Scartelli said that he hopes to be able to name the Core Director by the upcoming Commencement.
      iii. Dr. Ament asked about the decision of A/P vs. T/R faculty. Dr. Jordan mentioned that there is not plan to ever hire tenure-track faculty for the Core so this (A/P) keeps things “cleaner” with regards to evaluations [of the Core Director].
      iv. Dr. Webster Garrett asked if the job being an A/P faculty member is decided yet. Dr. Scartelli replied that this [Core Director being A/P] isn’t set yet and he’s willing to accept input.
   c. Committee Reports:
      i. Campus Environment Committee: Dr. Jacobsen gave a summary of the status of the CEC with regards to the objectives given to the CEC by the FSEC at the start of this year.
She suggested that next year the FSEC should try to get some to come to the Senate to update the Senate on the Campus Master Plan.

ii. Curriculum Committee: Dr. Webster Garrett gave a short summery of the current number of adjuncts teaching the Core.

iii. Faculty Issues Committee: Motions will be introduced today.

iv. Governance Committee: None.

v. Resource Allocations Committee: Motions will be introduced today.

IV. Old Business

a. Motion to amend the Faculty Senate Constitution granting faculty approval/disapproval authority over general education brought by the FSEC. Points in the discussion included
   i. Dr. Chase asked where the first “approval” was in the path of the proposals. Dr. Owen said it was “maybe” GECAC/CCAC. Dr. Webster Garret remarked that the path for such changes as passed at last week’s Senate meeting and is online.
   ii. The debate ended and the motion passed.

b. Motion to Revise the Instructions for the Administration of the Faculty Morale Survey and the Mode of Reporting the Comments brought by the FSEC. Points in the discussion included
   i. Dr. Jacobsen made a motion to introduce a substitute motion for the original motion. She said this substitute motion was created after a phone conversation with the Attorney General’s office, and this substitute motion is OK with the AG’s office. She pointed out that the substitute motion would have the CEC and the FSEC see all the written comments.
   ii. Dr. Ament asked if this meant that the general faculty could not see the comments. Dr. Jordan responded in the affirmative.
   iii. The debate on the question of the substitute motion ended and replacing the original motion with the substitute motion passed.
   iv. Dr. Joe Chase (now debating the substitute motion) asked about what would happen if the data got out? Is such a leak “actionable”? Dr. Jordan responded in the affirmative if the leaker of the data could be identified. It is her understanding that when an individual writes a comment then that is a private matter. But when a body publishes such comments on a website then it becomes a public matter.
   v. Dr. Waggaman remarked that the substitute motion seems to be doing more good by keeping things private in this manner. He thinks that only the people with the power to make changes will now see everything.
   vi. Dr. Kopf remarked that for the first time ever the Board of Visitors will see all the comments verbatim.
   vii. Dr. Roybark remarked that she supports the motion because it follows the spirit of the law.
   viii. Dr. Turner remarked that one purpose of the survey is to get faculty opinions to the BOV. This should empower faculty knowing that now all the comments will be read.
   ix. Dr. Jordan remarked that all the numerical data will be published on the Senate site.
   x. The debate ended and the motion (substitute) passed.

c. Motion to Recommend that the Faculty Senate Curriculum Committee be granted the review and approval authority of curriculum proposals for the University Core A as in the
manner of a College Curriculum Committee was removed from the table and debated. Points in the discussion included

i. Dr. Webster Garrett asked that this motion be withdrawn. The motion to withdraw passed.

d. Motion to Recommend that GECAC/CCAC act with regards to the University Core A Curriculum in the manner of a Department Personnel Committee was removed from the table and debated. Points in the discussion included

i. Dr. Webster Garrett asked that this motion be re-tabled. The motion to re-table was passed.

e. Motion to Recommend that the Vice Provost for Academic Affairs act with regards to the Core Curriculum in the manner of a College Dean was removed from the table and debated. Points in the discussion included

i. Dr. Webster Garrett asked that this motion be re-tabled. The motion to re-table was passed.

f. Motion to Change the Timeline for Submission of Faculty Annual Reports to Department Chairs was removed from the table and debated. Points in the discussion included

i. Dr. Atwell remarked that this motion was to give chairs and directors more time to review Faculty Annual Reports (FARs) and write thoughtful reviews.

ii. Dr. Jordan pointed out that the faculty “contract year” says that faculty must be available 2 weeks before the start, and 2 weeks after the end of the school year if meetings are called.

iii. Dr. Hilden stated that she was not in favor of this and asked if chairs'/directors’ deadlines could be later. Dr. Scartelli said pushing those deadlines later would cause a domino effect” since a number of things must happen after the chairs'/directors’ reviews are completed.

iv. Dr. Roybark asked if both ends of these deadlines could be moved as a compromise.

v. Dr. Gumaer asked if the FARs could be submitted at the end of the spring. Dr. Gainer mentioned that this had been discussed in committee but that would require a lot of adjustments to other deadlines.

vi. Dr. Ament said that spring is already a time when faculty are stressed and crunched for time so the spring would not be a good time for FAR submission.

vii. Dr. Hilden said that the proposed August 15 deadline would require faculty to work in the summer when they are not required to work.

viii. Dr. Atwell recognized that this is not a perfect solution but it’s better than the current policy.

ix. Dr. Chase asked if the Faculty Issues Committee would accept a friendly amendment to change the deadline in the motion to August 22. Dr. Gainer asked around and the members of the FIC said this friendly amendment was acceptable to them.

x. Dr. Barris asked if individual departments would be able to vary their own dates. Dr. Scartelli said this would be OK in-house (within departments) so long as the chair/director still makes the required deadline.

xi. Dr. Owen said that a spring deadline would not be good for appeals and grievances because members of those committees are not around during the summers. He supports the August deadline.
xii. Dr. LaLone asked if a deadline of the first day of fall classes would be better. Dr. Atwell responded that this would not be good for chairs since that is an extremely busy time for them.

xiii. The debate ended, and the main motion (with the friendly amendment of the August 22 deadline) passed.

g. The Motion regarding the University Core A Assessment Plan was removed from the table and debated. Points in the discussion included
   i. Ms. Bethany Bodo was recognized by the Senate President and stated that she supported this plan. The plan is to start a pilot in the summer of 2011 and that will help RU with SACS accreditation.
   ii. The discussion ended and the motion passed.

h. The Motion regarding the Core Curriculum 5-year Assessment Plan was removed from the table and debated. Points in the discussion included
   i. Ms. Bethany Bodo was recognized by the Senate President and stated that she supported this plan. The plan includes areas of the Core beyond just University Core A.
   ii. The discussion ended and the motion passed.

i. The Motion the Strengthen Academic Freedom was removed from the table and debated. Points in the discussion included
   i. Dr. Jordan introduced the motion and a substitute motion from the FSEC.
   ii. The Senate voted to accept the substitute motion.
   iii. Dr. Shoppelrey suggested that the word “suggest” in the last sentence of the substitute motion seemed to be “setting a pretty low bar” for the potential misconduct.
   iv. The discussion ended and the main motion (which was now the substitute motion) passed.

j. The Motion on Faculty Members Running for or Holding Political Office was removed from the table. Points in the discussion included
   i. Dr. Roth asked what constitutes a “public cause.” He gave the possible scenario of him giving a talk that promotes sustainability. He offered a friendly amendment to strike the phrase “or who promote a public cause” in the 4th point under Section 2.12. The motion incorporating the friendly amendment passed.
   ii. Dr. Hilden said that this motion actually seemed to dissuade people from running for office. She asked why it was worded for faculty to first notify the RU President.
   iii. Dr. Roybark asked as to the origins of this policy. Dr. Jordan responded that there is currently no consistent policy.
   iv. Dr. Udd moved to re-table the motion. The motion to re-table passed.

k. The Motion to Revise Section 1.8.4 of the Teaching and Research Faculty Handbook Regarding Faculty Appeals Committee Composition brought by the Governance Committee was removed from the table. Points in the discussion included
   i. Dr. Owen mentioned that this motion would simply delete the names of Colleges that no longer existed and add the ones that currently existed.
   ii. The discussion ended and the motion passed.

l. A motion was made from the floor to remove from the table and then retable all remaining Old Business. This motion passed.

V. New Business
a. A motion was made from the floor to have all New Business counted as “introduced” and tabled. This motion passed.

VI. Announcements

a. None.

VII. Adjournment: 4:51pm
Faculty Senate Meeting  
April 21, 2011  
Heth Hall, Room 014

Members Present: Dr. Suzanne E. Ament, Dr. Roann Barris, Dr. Andrew Ray (sub. for Dr. Joseph Chase), Dr. Farrell D. Doss, Dr. Kim D. Gainer, Mr. Anthony R. Guest, Dr. Jim Gumaer, Dr. Rhett B. Herman, Dr. Phil Sweet (sub for Dr. Blas Hernandez), Dr. Katherine Hilden, Dr. Pamela A. Jackson, Dr. Laura Jacobsen, Dr. Kay K. Jordan, Dr. Jerry M. Kopf, Dr. Mary B. LaLone, Dr. Garth N. Montgomery, Dr. Michael B. Moore, Dr. Judy Niehaus, Dr. Alex Orlov, Dr. Steve Owen, Dr. Richard Roth, Dr. Basel Saleh, Dr. David N. Sallee, Dr. Susan L. Schoppeley, Dr. Lauren Smith, Andrea J. Stanaland, Dr. Jonathan L. Tso, Dr. Edward Turner, Dr. Ed Udd, Dr. A. Craig Waggaman, Dr. Erin L. Webster Garrett, Dr. Monica M. Weinzapfel, Dr. Joseph I. Wirgau

Members Absent: Dr. Mary W. Atwell, Dr. Kevin Ayers, Mr. Timothy L. Channell, Mr. James E. Collier, Dr. Elise M Fullmer, Dr. Laura Larue, Dr. Douglas Mitchell, Dr. Helen M. Roybark, Ms. Sarah Smith, Dr. Sylvester Thompson, Dr. Isaac Van Patten, Ms. Renee Walsh

I. Call to Order: 3:33pm

II. The minutes from the April 14, 2011 meeting of the 2010-2011 Faculty Senate were approved as amended.

III. A motion was made from the floor to add the Motion to Approve FORL 103 to today’s agenda. The motion to add to the agenda passed.

IV. Reports

    a. None.

V. Old Business

    a. Motion to approve a B.A. degree in Art History brought by the FSEC. Points in the discussion included
       i. There was no discussion. The motion passed.
    
b. Motion to approve the VCCS-ITEC Articulation Agreement brought by the FSEC.
       i. There was no discussion. The motion passed.
    
c. Motion to recommend approval of Russian language courses for inclusion in Core B brought by the FSEC.
       i. There was no discussion. The motion passed.
    
d. Motion to Amend the Faculty Senate Constitution to Revise Provisions Regarding Full-time Temporary Faculty brought by the FSEC. Points in the discussion included
       i. Dr. Jordan stated that currently full-time temporary (FTT) faculty are treated the same as adjuncts in departments so they cannot vote for senators. They now have to vote for the adjunct senators. Dr. Jordan mentioned that adjuncts currently have two seats in the Faculty Senate. This motion would have FTT faculty treated like all other full-time faculty.
ii. The debate ended and the motion passed.

e. Motion to Revise Faculty Senate Bylaw #10 Regarding Adjunct/Full-time Temporary Representation in the Faculty Senate brought by the FSEC.
   i. There was no discussion. The motion passed.

f. Motion to Amend the Faculty Senate Constitution to Increase the Number of Faculty Senators brought by the FSEC.
   i. Dr. Jordan explained that the current Constitution allows between 43-49 Senators. This would increase those numbers to 49-55 Senators to account for the creation of new departments. Examples cited were the Departments of Occupational Therapy and Physical Therapy.
   ii. The discussion ended. The motion passed.

g. Motion to Revise Section 1.9.5 of the Teaching and Research Faculty Handbook Regarding Faculty Grievance Committee Composition brought by the Governance Committee.
   i. Dr. Owen introduced this motion and explained this was like the motion from last week that removed the names of former Colleges and replaced them with the names of the current Colleges within the University.
   ii. There was no discussion. The motion passed.

h. Motion Regarding adoption of the new Student Evaluation of Faculty form developed by the Student Evaluation of Faculty Committee brought by the Faculty Issues Committee. Points in the discussion included
   i. Dr. Hilden asked if this new form will cause the evaluation statistics to reach ceiling levels. Ms. Bethany Bodo replied that the numbers were averaging in the low- to mid-4s so this would be valid on the numerical ratings.
   ii. The discussion ended. The motion passed.

i. Motion to Increase Adjunct Pay brought by the Resource Allocation Committee. Points in the discussion included
   i. Dr. Saleh introduced this motion. He said this motion would cause adjunct faculty to get salary increases when full-time faculty received increases. This is not a “merit pay” but more along the lines of annual increases.
   ii. Dr. Gainer asked if this would be for individual adjuncts. Dr. Saleh said that this motion would call for increases for all adjuncts across the board.
   iii. Dr. Niehaus stated that adjunct salary funds did not come from the state but rather from the University’s budget. She asked if this motion would force fewer adjunct faculty to be hired at RU. Dr. Saleh responded that hopefully RU would be able to increase the pool of money for adjunct salaries. He also stated that he realized this motion was an “unfunded mandate.”
   iv. Dr. Virgau spoke in favor of this motion because it’s the right thing to do.
   v. Dr. Ament asked if there would be some minimum time for adjuncts to be here to participate in adjunct pay raises.
   vi. Dr. Gainer stated that this was not merit-based but rather an across the board adjunct pay increase.
   vii. Dr. Saleh stated that RU is not competitive for adjuncts. In many cases RU adjunct pay is half of Virginia Tech’s adjunct pay.
   viii. Dr. Udd called the question. The Senate voted to end discussion.
   ix. The motion passed.
j. Motion to Modify the Pay for Adjunct Faculty brought by the Resource Allocation Committee. Points in the discussion included
   i. Dr. Jackson asked about adjunct pay level at RU’s peer institutions. Dr. Saleh responded that there is the same variation across disciplines as there is at RU.
   ii. Dr. Kopf raised two issues. First, he would certainly like to see RU be able to pay adjuncts “five thousand or even ten thousand” dollars. But second, there is currently not enough funding to pay for the adjuncts that we need right now.
   iii. Dr. Wirgau mentioned that the policy now at RU is $3,300 for a 3-hour course across the board in COBE.
   iv. Dr. Roth asked about the path this motion would take after it passed the Faculty Senate. Dr. Jordan pointed out that the RU administration is not required to follow this motion but she was sure they would do what they could.
   v. Dr. Wirgau pointed out that some fields (17 of them) did get more adjunct pay recently.
   vi. Dr. Moore stated that he was in favor of the motion and that the Senate would be taking a stand with this motion.
   vii. Dr. Udd called the question. The Senate voted to end the discussion.
   viii. The motion passed.

k. Motion to Establish a Guideline for Adjunct Faculty Pay Differential across Disciplines brought by the Resource Allocation Committee. Points in the discussion included
   i. Dr. Turner asked if this was binding for departments if individual departments did not have the money to fulfill this motion. Dr. Saleh responded in the negative, and that the Senate was again simply taking a stand with this motion.
   ii. Dr. Van Patten was recognized by the Senate President. She pointed out that there were currently 3 people teaching in Core A with PhDs who were making $2,700 per class.
   iii. Dr. Barris asked if there were differences across disciplines for full-time faculty as well.
   iv. The discussion ended. The motion passed.

l. Motion to add an entry for Departments to the Internal Governance Document brought by the FSEC.
   i. There was no discussion. The motion passed.

m. Motion to add an entry for Colleges to the Internal Governance Document brought by the FSEC.
   i. There was no discussion. The motion passed.

n. Motion to recommend safety signs for skateboarders and cyclists brought by the Campus Environment Committee. Points in the discussion included
   i. Dr. Gainer asked if this motion implied that it was OK to ride bikes and skateboards on campus, and thus open up RU for lawsuits. Dr. Turner said that if they ride anywhere except for parking lots and sidewalks then they were already breaking the rules.
   ii. Dr. Wirgau stated that he was against this motion because he does not want to add to the “stuff” [signs, etc.] already on campus.
   iii. The discussion ended. The motion failed.

o. Motion to Recommend that GECAC/CCAC act with regards to the University Core A Curriculum in the manner of a Department Personnel Committee brought by the Curriculum Committee. Points in the discussion included
i. Dr. Webster Garrett stated that the Faculty Senate Curriculum Committee would like to substitute the motion under New Business today, “Motion to Make Changes to the Functions of the Core Curriculum Advisory Committee brought by the FSEC” for this current motion. This substitute motion would have GECAC/CCAC act as a personnel committee for only the CORE 201 and CORE 202 instructors.

ii. Dr. Waggaman commented that the vote in GECAC/CCAC was unanimous for this substitute motion for those committee members who voted. This motion is a way for faculty oversight for the Core. The members of GECAC/CCAC do know that if the Core Director is A&P faculty then GECAC/CCAC will not do this supervision. GECAC/CCAC will assist the Core Director in his/her job and will not usurp the Core Director’s role in hiring instructors for the Core.

iii. Dr. Gainer recalled that the functions of GECAC/CCAC were revised in the spring of 2010. She asked if the current motion would go forward before this revision process is complete. Dr. Jordan responded that the motion goes from the Faculty Senate to the Provost and then to the University Executive Council. Dr. Gainer then said that this motion would not be in force until the functions of GECAC/CCAC were modified by Dr. Bill Kennan who works with GECAC/CCAC.

iv. A general discussion ensued on the approval/implementation path for proposals like this one. Dr. Jordan pointed out that this motion is a recommendation and not a Faculty Handbook change.

v. Dr. Owen pointed out that this motion would require a lot of Faculty Handbook changes. He said that GECAC/CCAC really needed to define what they mean be “assist the Core Director” in this motion. Dr. Webster Garrett remarked that in 2000 the Faculty Senate passed a description of the General Education director, and GECAC/CCAC were actually two committees at that time. Dr. Barris pointed out this sounded like a lot of extra work for GECAC/CCAC.

vi. Dr. Udd pointed out that Core instructors would be evaluated by people not in their disciplines or even their own College. He thought this motion was too hasty and not well-defined.

vii. Dr. Gumaer remarked that he was not OK with taking department personal responsibilities away from departments.

viii. Dr. Roth stated that this motion was simply trying to “bring order or light” into an area that is now murky. He said that it was not good to not act just because we were not sure of all the details.

ix. Dr. Jackson said that this motion (substitute motion) only applies to CORE 201 and CORE 202. She said that 80% of these sections were taught by non-tenure track faculty this year. She said that many, if not most adjuncts’ evaluations were not examined this year.

x. Dr. Ament stated that she was in favor of this motion in the spirit of moving forward.

xi. Dr. Van Patten was recognized by the Faculty Senate President. She stated that to say the instructors were not evaluated was misleading. The English Chair did not want to see the three English faculty in CORE 201/202. This motion would make a hard job even more difficult.

xii. Dr. Scartelli remarked on the Core Director job search timetable. He said it would be best to do most of the choosing while the faculty was still here. However if the faculty
was OK with the search committee working in the summer then the timeline was not so critical.

xiii. A motion was made to table this motion and place it under Old Business for next week’s meeting. The motion to table passed.

p. Motion to Approve Revisions to POSC 110 brought by the FSEC. Points in the discussion included

i. This motion was introduced and it was stated that this motion would change the designation of POSC 110 from a Social Science to a Humanities category in Core B.

ii. A motion was made to suspend the rules and vote on the main motion. The motion to suspend the rules passed.

iii. The main motion passed.

q. Motion to Approve FORL 103 brought by the FSEC.

i. A motion was made to suspend the rules and vote on the motion. The motion to suspend the rules passed.

ii. The motion passed.

r. A motion was made from the floor to have all Old Business not debated to be tabled and continued in the next Senate meeting.

i. The motion passed.

VI. New Business

a. A motion was made from the floor to have all New Business counted as “introduced” and tabled. This motion passed.

VII. Announcements

a. None.

VIII. Adjournment: 4:52pm
Members Present: Dr. Suzanne E. Ament, Dr. Mary W. Atwell, Dr. Kevin Ayers, Dr. Roann Barris, Mr. Timothy L. Channell, Dr. Joseph Chase, Mr. James E. Collier, Dr. Farrell D. Doss, Dr. Kim D. Gainer, Mr. Anthony R. Guest, Dr. Rhett B. Herman, Dr. Katherine Hilden, Dr. Pamela A. Jackson, Dr. Laura Jacobsen, Dr. Kay K. Jordan, Dr. Jerry M. Kopf, Dr. Mary B. LaLone, Dr. Laura Larue, Dr. Garth N. Montgomery, Dr. Michael B. Moore, Dr. Judy Niehaus, Dr. Steve Owen, Dr. Richard Roth, Dr. Helen M. Roybark, Dr. Basel Saleh, Dr. David N. Sallee, Dr. Susan L. Schoppelrey, Dr. Lauren Smith, Ms. Sarah Smith, Andrea J. Stanaland, Dr. Sylvester Thompson, Dr. Jonathan L. Tso, Dr. Edward Turner, Dr. Ed Udd, Dr. A. Craig Waggaman, Dr. Erin L. Webster Garrett, Ms. Renee Walsh, Dr. Monica M. Weinzapfel, Dr. Joseph I. Wirgau

Members Absent: Dr. Elise M Fullmer, Dr. Jim Gumaer, Dr. Blas Hernandez, Dr. Douglas Mitchell, Dr. Alex Orlov, Dr. Isaac Van Patten

I. Call to Order: 3:34pm

II. The minutes from the April 21, 2011 meeting of the 2010-2011 Faculty Senate were approved as amended.

III. Reports

   a. The Senate President’s report was delivered by Dr. Kay K. Jordan. She thanked the senators for a very productive year.
   b. Dr. Erin Webster Garrett delivered a report from the Child Care Task Force. The final report is online on the Senate website (found under Current→Reports→Task Force Reports).

IV. Old Business

   a. The Motion to Adopt Changes to Core Characteristics brought by the FSEC was brought off the table and discussed. Points in the discussion included
      i. Dr. Waggaman introduced the motion and reported that Dr. Susan Van Patten, Acting Core Director suggested the compromise wording of the motion.
      ii. Dr. Herman mentioned that he brought this to GECAC/CCAC due to two of his students having a schedule this coming fall that simply did not allow for them to take CORE 201 this fall. Their particular schedules were listed in the motion’s rationale. These students were enrolled in RU’s 3:2 Engineering program with Virginia Tech.
      iii. Dr. Barris commented that CORE 201 is based on sequential learning goals. This motion would throw off the basis for her CORE 201 class, for example. She mentioned this was also another exemption such as those for transfer students so this motion was another way to get rid of the Core requirements.
iv. Dr. Gainer said that she did not think this was a method to get students to take CORE 202 before taking CORE 201. She did not think this motion would weaken the Core Curriculum. She said that the various Advising Centers would work to keep students on track through the Core.

v. Dr. Wirgau said that he also contacted GECAC/CCAC due to the schedules of some chemistry majors not allowing time to take CORE 201 in the fall of their sophomore years. He said that all he and Dr. Herman wanted with this motion was some flexibility in their advising to their students, and in the timing of when the 4 CORE classes were taken by students. He also remarked that he had been told that forcing students to take CORE 101:102:201:202 in absolute sequence was unenforceable anyway.

vi. Dr. Udd called the question. The vote to call the question passed.

vii. The main motion passed.

b. The Motion to Recommend that GECAC/CCAC act with regards to the University Core A Curriculum in the manner of a Department Personnel Committee brought by Faculty Senate Curriculum committee was taken off the table and debated. Points in the discussion included

i. Dr. Webster Garrett introduced this motion. This is a substitute motion for a number of previous motions regarding GECAC/CCAC acting in the manner of a department personnel committee for CORE classes. She said that the FSCC took the points brought up in the previous Senate meeting and worked to get this current substitute motion.

ii. The Senate voted to accept this substitute motion from the FSCC for the original motion.

iii. Dr. Udd asked if the FSCC would accept a friendly amendment to be sure that all 3 subcommittee members were from different Colleges. Dr. Kopf asked why the subcommittee would need 3 Colleges represented. Dr. Jordan mentioned that all CCAC members were tenured and this might require all CCAC members to be tenured (since only tenured faculty members may serve on department personnel committees). The FSCC members present were polled and they accepted the friendly amendment. The words inserted were "...from no less than three different Colleges (if possible)... ." These were inserted into the bullet point section defining the election of the subcommittee. This was inserted into the motion online during the Senate meeting.

iv. Dr. Barris remarked that if she were evaluated by her chair as well as by someone else then she might quit teaching in the Core. This motion does not address how unusual it is teaching in the Core (e.g. regarding evaluations). She said she sees this motion as very problematic.

v. Dr. Gainer directed a question to Dr. Barris asking if she knows that not all CORE instructors are covering all of the items in the syllabi. Dr. Barris replied, "I may have implied that." Dr. Gainer then said that because the 4 CORE courses are sequential we need this motion in order to ensure uniformity.

vi. Dr. Jacobsen inquired as to the percentage of CORE faculty associated with departments. Dr. Webster Garrett remarked that 5 adjuncts are associated only with CORE and are not associated with any department. She said that the CCAC will develop the criteria for evaluation of these faculty.

vii. Dr. Van Patten was recognized by the Senate President. She remarked that this motion restricting its overnight to CORE 201 and CORE 202 instructors will help ensure consistency in those classes.
viii. Dr. Ament commented that it would seem to be better to have others (other College faculty) on this committee rather than just Art faculty members since “Core” is not her own department.

ix. Dr. Owen said he was in favor of this motion. This was because guaranteeing one member of CORE on CCAC would give strong support of Core involvement.

x. Dr. Chase suggested a friendly amendment of adding “201:202” to the 4th bullet point in the selection criteria for the sub-committee. The friendly amendment was accepted by the FSCC.

xi. Dr. Jacobsen asked why CORE 101 and CORE 102 were left out of this motion. Dr. Webster Garrett responded that those classes were already housed within the English Department and thus the structure [addressed in this motion] already existed there.

xii. The discussion ended and the main motion passed.

c. The Motion to Make Changes to the Functions of the Core Curriculum Advisory Committee brought by the FSEC was taken off the table and debated. Points in the discussion included

i. Dr. Waggaman introduced this motion. He said that this and the prior motion have “parallel paths.” This resulted from a lot of work this week [by the GECAC/CCAC]. Dr. Jordan said that these two motions would need to be reconciled.

ii. Dr. Waggaman said this motion was an amended version of the one from the GECAC/CCAC. The Senate voted to accept this substitute motion for the original motion.

iii. Dr. Jordan remarked that this motion is from the GECAC/CCAC via the FSEC while the previous motion (above) was from the FSCC.

iv. Dr. Udd asked if this substitute motion could incorporate the same language changes as were incorporated into the previous motion. Dr. Waggaman said that not all members of GECAC/CCAC were present. However that committee’s chair (Dr. Moira Baker) has seen this and would be OK with those changes, to those word changes would be OK with all of GECAC/CCAC. Dr. Shoppelrey made the friendly amendment to add in the wording “semi-annual” for the CCAC submitting their evaluations of the Core Director’s effectiveness; to add the “no less than 3 colleges (if possible)” to the bullet describing the election of the sub-committee; and adding “CORE 201:202” to the 4th item, which deals with hearing student grievances. The GECAC/CCAC accepted the friendly amendment.

v. The Senate voted to accept the amended substitute motion in place of the main motion.

vi. Dr. Moore asked if the 10 voting and 3 non-voting members of GECAC/CCAC met this morning [the day of this Senate meeting]. Dr. Waggaman said that the committee had met, and since this substitute motion is the subject of a Senate motion debated one week ago then the previous week’s discussion should have illumina the issue. De. Moore expressed his concern that many [Senators’] constituents have not seen this new motion.

vii. Dr. Udd said that he thinks the substitute motion is a good one and addresses the problems discussed in last week’s Senate meeting.

viii. Dr. Barris said that she thinks this process was still too rushed and that discussion was cut off very quickly.
ix. Dr. Gainer said that the Core itself was rushed into production hastily. She said that after 2 years of Core it is time to establish a strong groundwork for it. “Two years without infrastructure is enough.”

x. Dr. Niehaus called the question. The vote to call the question carried.

xi. The main (as substituted and amended) motion passed.

d. The Motion to Recommend the Position of Core Director be Designated as T&R brought by the Faculty Senate Curriculum Committee was taken off the table and debated. Points in the discussion included

i. Dr. Webster Garrett introduced the motion.

ii. Dr. Waggaman said that he strongly supported this motion. GECAC/CCAC has already passes similar motions. This motion carries tremendous symbolism because the Core is all about teaching.

iii. Dr. Chase said that he was concerned because of history. He cited a case he knew personally where a T&R faculty member has 100% reassigned time. This person did this for 2 years until s/he was finally designated at A&P faculty. How could a T&R faculty member in this position meet tenure and promotion criteria?

iv. Dr. Scartelli said that the Core Director would be expected to teach one class in the Core and would have to maintain their other T&R criteria.

v. Dr. Van Patten was recognized by the Senate President. She said that she did this [taught in the Core] and that it was hard. She stated she had no preference for T&R vs. A&P, but that she would encourage the Provost to write the contract to spell out the duties carefully.

vi. Dr. Jackson said that A&P faculty are not evaluated by faculty members as are T&R faculty.

vii. Dr. Bill Kennan was recognized by the Senate president. He stated that he had no opinion on the motion. However if this is a T&R position then he wondering what would be the promotion path. If this is a T&R position then CCAC would become a tenure-and-promotion-granting body. CCAC would have to work “terribly hard” to do this.

viii. Dr. Kopf asked if the Core Director would be a member of a department. Dr. Scartelli mentioned that this person would already be a member of a department since this would be an internal search.

ix. Dr. Roybark said that she was concerned because COBE’s ACSB accreditation has too many requirements [to allow someone from COBE to be Core Director]. Even full professors [in COBE] have to publish.

x. A motion was made from the floor to extend the current Senate meeting to 4:58pm. This motion passed.

xi. Dr. Barris stated that she was in favor of this motion since the Core Director was like a department chair.

xii. Dr. LaLone said that she was in favor of this motion since this position is at the heart of teaching.

xiii. Dr. Webster Garrett stated again that she was in favor of this motion. It’s a symbolic rule and most chairs are T&R faculty members.

xiv. The discussion ended. The motion passed.

e. The Motion to Recommend that the Vice Provost for Academic Affairs act with regards to the Core Curriculum in the manner of a College Dean brought by the Faculty Senate
Curriculum Committee was taken off the table and debated. Points in the discussion included
i. Dr. Webster Garrett introduced the motion.
ii. Dr. Van Patten was recognized by the Senate President. She said that this the Core Director were a T&R position then this motion would violate the Faculty Handbook. This is because the Core Director would already be evaluated by their own department chair and College dean.
iii. Dr. Webster Garrett said this motion came about because there is no clear chain of evaluations for the Core Director.
iv. Dr. Udd moved to table the motion. The motion to table the main motion passed.
f. The Motion to Recommend the Selection Process for the Screening and Hiring of the Director of the Core Curriculum brought by the Faculty Senate Curriculum Committee was taken off the table and debated. Points in the discussion included
i. Dr. Webster Garrett introduced the motion. She stated that this motion came about to ensure that the process of selecting the Core Director is transparent.
ii. Dr. Udd called the question. The motion to call the question passed.
iii. The main motion passed.
g. The Motion to Update References to the Graduate College in the Faculty Handbook brought by the FSEC was taken off the table and debated. Points in the discussion included
i. Dr. Owen introduced the motion.
ii. The question was called from the floor. The vote to call the question passed.
iii. The main motion passed.
h. The Motion on faculty members running for or holding political office brought by the FSEC was not taken off the table. Thus the motion dies.

V. New Business
   a. None.

VI. Announcements
   a. None.

VII. Adjournment: 4:58pm
2011-2012 Faculty Senate Meeting
April 28, 2011
Heth Hall, Room 014

Members Present: Dr. Suzanne E. Ament, Dr. Kevin Ayers, Dr. Roann Barris, Dr. Steven Beach, Dr. Robert Borass, Dr. Candice Benjes-Small, Dr. Julia Castleberry, Mr. Timothy L. Channell, Dr. Joseph Chase, Mr. James E. Collier, Dr. Farrell D. Doss, Dr. Lori Ellis, Dr. Mary Ferrari, Dr. Jake Fox, Dr. Kim D. Gainer, Dr. Vince Hazelton, Dr. Rhett B. Herman, Dr. Katherine Hilden, Dr. Lucy Hochstein, Dr. Margaret Hrezo, Dr. Pamela A. Jackson, Dr. Abhay Kaushik, Dr. Jerry Kopf, Dr. Mary B. LaLone, Dr. Laura Larue, Dr. Kevin LoPresto, Dr. Richard Roth, Dr. Helen M. Roybark, Dr. Basel Saleh, Dr. Susan L. Schoppelrey, Dr. Bob Sheehy, Dr. Neil Sigmon, Dr. Lauren Smith, Dr. Kenneth Smith, Dr. Andrea J. Stanaland, Dr. Jonathan L. Tso, Dr. Edward Carter Turner, Dr. Erin L. Webster Garrett, Dr. Joseph I. Wirgau

Members Absent: Dr. Blas Hernandez, Dr. Cathy Hudgins, Dr. Douglas Mitchell, Dr. Michael B. Moore, Dr. James Newman, Dr. Lynne Taylor

I. Call to Order: 5:05pm

II. There were no minutes to approve.

III. Reports

   a. 2010-2011 Senate President Dr. Kay Jordan greeted the 2011-2012 Senate.

IV. Old Business

   a. None.

V. New Business

   a. Election of Senate Officers—the following officers were elected for the 2011-2012 Senate:
      i. President: Dr. Rick Roth
      ii. Vice President: Dr. Joe Chase
      iii. Secretary: Dr. Rhett Herman
      iv. At-Large (2): Dr. Pamela Jackson, Dr. Jerry Kopf
      v. Parliamentarian: Dr. Joseph Wirgau
      vi. Nominees for Faculty Representative to the Board of Visitors (3): Dr. Rick Roth, Dr. Joe Chase, Dr. Rhett Herman

VI. Announcements

   a. None.

VII. Adjournment: 5:25pm