

Radford University Faculty Senate
Meeting Minutes
October 8, 2009

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

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

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

I. Call to Order and Approval of Minutes

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

II. Reports and Announcements

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

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

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

III. **Old Business**

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

IV. **New Business**

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

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

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

V. Announcements

1. None.

VI. Adjournment

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