2011-2012 Faculty Senate Meeting
January 19, 2012
Heth Hall, Room 014


Members Absent: Maggie Bassett, Vince Hazleton, Blas Hernandez, Douglas Mitchell, Michael Sinclair, Lauren Smith, Lynne Taylor

Guests: Dr. Sam Minner

I. Call to Order: 3:33pm

II. The minutes from the December 8, 2011 Senate meeting were approved.

III. Reports

a. Senate President’s Report: Dr. Roth’s comments included:
   i. He went to Richmond for Higher Education Advocacy Day, which was organized by the Faculty Senate of Virginia and the VCU Chapter of the AAUP. He and others talked with a number of legislators on a number of issues. Those issues included the one-time VRS/ORP (Virginia Retirement System/Optional Retirement Plan) switch and a proposed 50% tuition waiver for dependents of faculty.
   ii. The QEP Director’s position is open and there are currently 2 applicants for it. They hope to have this position filled soon. Information about the QEP in general may be found on its website at http://www.radford.edu/content/qep/home.html.
   iii. The Question & Answer page on the Faculty Senate website is working and he encourages people to submit questions. The Senate secretary can access that site and will pass along questions to the Senate President. The Q&A site allows for anonymous submissions.

b. Provost’s Report: Dr. Minner’s comments included:
   i. The firm that will handle the building of the new CSAT building has been chosen. Once this firm signs the contract they will be announced.
   ii. There are several searches ongoing. The Dean of the Waldron College of Health and Human Services is a national search. The original search for the Vice President for University Advancement failed, a new one was started and things are looking good with this search. RU is currently getting the search started for the Vice Provost for Enrollment Planning and management.
iii. Enrollment right now is stronger than last year at this time. Applications are up 9% and there were 287 new students who enrolled at RU for the spring 2012 semester. Admissions had hoped for about 200 students and this significantly larger number is good.

iv. Academic Affairs has a number of initiatives ongoing. These include reviews of the International Education and Honors programs, setting up professional development for department chairs, and the new Wintermester for online classes.

v. Academic Affairs is also looking at a number of First Amendment issues, e-books and their appropriate usage on campus, the overall use of paper on campus, and the lack of technical support (study/experimental design, statistical analysis) for grant-proposal writers.

vi. RU is starting a modest staff professional development program that may start with brown bag lunches.

vii. RU is working on a new initiative this spring for some type of as-yet-specified “administrative residency” (for lack of an official term for this). This is planned to especially encourage women and underrepresented minorities.

viii. The deans report that they are all on track for their “stretch goals” for grant writing and submission.

ix. The work with the New College Institute (NCI) is “on hold” at the moment.

x. Visiting Writer Mary Blew is coming to RU. Steven Vetter will be coming in March as RU’s first Woodrow Wilson Fellow. Other lecturers and performers will follow in the future.

xi. RU’s financial situation is looking good enough that most funding requests will be funded.

xii. Compensation for faculty is still a top priority for President Kyle and the Board of Visitors.

xiii. Dr. Minner said that he had “a handle” on the current status of salary compression, inversion and equity.

xiv. He does not know anything about the new student activities center since that is not an academic building. Dr. Roth suggested that senators could ask Roy Saville, Director of Facilities Planning and Construction.

c. Dr. Erin Webster Garrett reported on the QEP. Her comments included:
   i. Her group will post the draft of the QEP early next week on D2L where senators can get it.
   ii. The proposed budget for the QEP has 40% of the funds for faculty support and development, and 28% for the Director, her/his administrative assistant, and office support.
   iii. Dr. Webster Garrett gave a tour of the QEP website. That website is http://www.radford.edu/content/qep/home.html.
   iv. SACS will conduct their on-site review March 27-29, 2012.
   v. Dr. Hrezo asked if we will need a new QEP in 10 years if we (RU) still like this current one? Dr. Webster Garrett responded that she didn’t know since she could not guess what SACS will be doing 10 years from now.

d. Committee Reports:
   i. Campus Environment—None.
   ii. Curriculum—None.
Faculty Issues—None.
Governance—None.
Resource Allocation—None.

IV. Old Business

a. The Motion concerning criteria to be used in evaluation of faculty was removed from the table and introduced by Dr. Gainer. She said that this motion was created since a number of evaluation criteria used by chairs to evaluate faculty were not precise, some were quite old, and some were outdated. Dr. Barris said that new faculty needed transparent criteria because of wide differences across campus. This motion simply puts things in writing.
   i. Dr. Chase said that the Faculty Handbook has promotion and tenure guidelines, but not guidelines for chairs in their evaluations of faculty.
   ii. Dr. Barris said that this motion adds to the Handbook.
   iii. Dr. Hrezo said that she saw two problems with this motion. One is that the annual review called for in this motion seemed to be too much.. Dr. Wirgau agreed with this.
      1. Dr. Minner said that he didn’t think that he (as Provost) needed to approve these items at all since these were department decisions. He and the Deans follow the rules, but should not be involved in approval of discipline-specific rules.
      2. Dr. Barris said that the Provost would only be approving that departments are writing things down clearly. Dr. Minner agreed that he could approve the process, but not the criteria themselves.
      3. Dr. Gainer said that there is currently no process for keeping these criteria in front of someone.
   iv. Dr. Kopf said that this should not be confused with the promotion and tenure process. This is really to clarify Chairs’ and Deans’ evaluation processes.
   v. Dr. Hrezo said that she thought this motion as written didn’t say what the committee intended it to say. Dr. Ferrari said that it appeared to take power out of Chairs’ hands.
   vi. Dr. Chase told how he had a published rubric for faculty evaluations when he was a chair, but that his own Personnel Committee disagreed with his evaluations numbers for himself (since he followed his published rubric). This motion would force Chairs and Personnel Committees to work together.
   vii. Dr. Wirgau called the question. The show-of-hands vote (“division” on prior voice vote) failed and the Senate was still in discussion.
   viii. Dr. Gainer moved to refer this motion back to the committee by tabling. The vote to table passed.

b. The Motion to change the reporting period and the starting date for personnel evaluation was removed from the table. Dr. Kopf moved to re-table and the vote to re-table passed.

c. The Motion concerning limitation on university withdrawal was taken off the table and was introduced by Registrar Matthew Brunner. His comments included:
   i. This motion was made to bring RU in line with all other schools in Virginia. This was to alleviate the need for students to use up their medical withdrawal in place of their one allowed University withdrawal. The original limitation was put in place in order to stop financial aid fraud. However current safeguards for financial aid fraud make it so that this limitation is no longer needed.
   ii. The motion passed by voice vote.
d. The Motion concerning Cambridge International Examination transfer credit was introduced by Registrar Matthew Brunner. His comments included:
   i. This motion was made to bring RU in line with all other schools in Virginia. He emphasized that departments have the ultimate say in what counts for credit in their disciplines.
   ii. The motion passed by voice vote.

e. The Motion supporting the dissolution of the School of Environmental and Physical Science was introduced by Dr. Herman. His comments included:
   i. This motion was made due to the presence of the School no longer being necessary. It was created in a time of financial exigency and had been hoped to give the programs within the school financial advantages within the University. In addition it had been hoped that the originally-promised administrative support for the programs would have materialized. However those advantages never materialized, and the faculty within the School unanimously decided to separate.
   ii. This motion is supported by the Dean of the College of Science and Technology as well as the Provost. They feel that it is time for the individual programs to become departments in order to establish their identities, recruit students and compete for funding.
   iii. The motion passed by voice vote.

f. The motion regarding allocation of faculty raises in 2011-2012 fiscal year was removed from the table. This motion was re-tabled by voice vote.

g. The motion regarding involvement of the Faculty Senate in the Continued Evolution of the QEP document was removed from the table. This motion was re-tabled by voice vote.

V. New Business
   i. None.

VI. Announcements
   a. None.

VII. Adjournment: 4:47pm