

**Radford University
Faculty Senate Motions**

2016-2017

Table of Contents

Membership of the 2016-2017 Faculty Senate	3
Governance Structure of the 2016-2017 Faculty Senate	5
Status of Motions of the 2016-2017 Faculty Senate	7
16-17.01—Motion to Create Rank of Senior Instructor	10
16-17.02—Motion to Amend Language Regarding Adjunct Faculty	11
16-17.03—Motion <i>re</i> Instructor Qualifications	12
16-17.04—Motion <i>re</i> Creation of an Undergraduate Certificate in Geospatial Intelligence (GEOINT)	13
16-17.05—Motion <i>re</i> Budget Reduction Principles	14
16-17.06—Radford University Faculty Senate Resolution in Response to the Presidential Executive Order Banning and Restricting Entry into the United States by Citizens of Seven Muslim-Majority Countries	16
16-17.07—Motion to Change Core Curriculum Assessment Reporting Schedule	17
16-17.08—Motion to Allow Departments to Combine Sections When Reporting Core Curriculum Assessment Results	18
16-17.09— Motion to Change T & R Faculty Handbook Language on College Curriculum Committees	19
16-17.10—Recommendation to Create a University Internal Governance Review Committee to Replace Current University Executive Council	20
16-17.11—Motion Regarding the Format of the Student Evaluations of Faculty	22
16-17.12—Motion Concerning Balance of Online Courses at Radford University	23
16-17.13—Motion Regarding Substitutions within the Core Curriculum	24
16-17.14—Motion Regarding Changes to CORE 101, 102, and 201	25
16-17.15—Motion Allowing Substitution of Certain Communication and Philosophy Courses for CORE 201 and CORE 202	27
16-17.16—Motion for the Creation of a General Education Task Force in Response to Imminent Changes in SCHEV Guidelines	28
16-17.17—Motion Regarding the Creation of a Master of Science in Finance	30
16-17.18—Motion Recommending the Creation of a Standing Collaborative Task Force on Compensation Policy	31
16-17.19—Motion Regarding the Creation of a Merit-Raise Model	44

16-17.20—Motion Regarding Budget Priorities.....	45
16-17.21—Motion Authorizing Creation of PHRE 202 and Designating It as a Disciplinary- Prefixed Equivalent to CORE 202.....	46
16-17.22—Motion <i>re</i> Interstate Passport Initiative	47
16-17.23—Motion <i>re</i> Prioritization of MS in Finance Degree.....	48
16-17.24—Motion to Create an Arts Administration and Entrepreneurship Minor.....	49
16-17.25—Motion to Create School of Nursing Healthcare Track for Students in Information Technology, Business, or the Sciences	50
16-17.26—Motion to Add Sports Management Major and Drop Sports Administration Concentration	51
16-17.27—Motion to Add Allied Health Sciences Major and Drop Allied Health Sciences Concentration	52
16-17.28—Resolution in Honor of Dr. Joseph Scartelli on the Occasion of His Stepping Down as Interim Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs	53
16-17.29—Resolution in Honor of Faculty Senators Who Are Concluding Their Terms	55
16-17.30—Resolution in Honor of Dr. Carter Turner for His Service as President of the Faculty Senate of Radford University.....	56
16-17.31—Resolution in Honor of Dr. Kim Gainer for Her Service as Secretary of the Faculty Senate of Radford University.....	57

Membership of the 2016-2017 Faculty Senate

College of Business and Economics

Childers, Steve	at-large	jchilders2@radford.edu	2015-2017
*Duncan, Tom	at-large	tduncan3@radford.edu	2015-2017
Hernandez, Rodrigo	at-large	rjhernand@radford.edu	2015-2017
Kaushik, Abhay	Account., Finance, & Bus. Law	akaushik@radford.edu	2015-2017
Kasturi, Prahlad	Economics	pkasturi@radford.edu	2015-2017
Zarankin, Tal	Management	tzarankin@radford.edu	2016-2018
Schirr, Gary	Marketing	gschirr@radford.edu	2016-2018

*Substitute for Rodrigo Hernandez, who will return in the spring.

College of Education and Human Development

Hilden, Katie	at-large	kclouse@radford.edu	2015-2017
Bizzell, Brad	at-large	bbizzell@radford.edu	2016-2018
Triplett, Cheri	at-large	cftriplet@radford.edu	2015-2017
Gumaer, James	Counselor Education	dgumaer@radford.edu	2015-2017
Frasier, Pam	Health & Human Performance	Pfrasier2@radford.edu	2016-2018
Whittington, Anja	Recreation, Parks & Tourism	awhittington@radford.edu	2015-2017
Gilbert, Sharon	School of Teacher Education	Sgilbert13@radford.edu	2016-2018

College of Humanities and Behavioral Sciences

Ament, Suzanne	at-large	seament@radford.edu	2015-2017
Mabry, Jennifer	at-large	jlmabry@radford.edu	2015-2017
Rubens, Amy	at-large	arubens@radford.edu	2016-2018
Dunn, Scott	Communication	swdunn@radford.edu	2016-2018
Hendrix, Nicole	Criminal Justice	pnhendrix@radford.edu	2015-2017
Gainer, Kim	English	kgainer@radford.edu	2015-2017
Du Plessis, Eric	Foreign Language & Literature	ehduples@radford.edu	2016-2018
Moore, Johnny	History	jsmoore@radford.edu	2015-2017
Turner, Carter	Philosophy & Religion	cturner5@radford.edu	2016-2018
Corbin, Tanya	Political Science	tcorbin2@radford.edu	2016-2018
Caughron, Jay	Psychology	jcaughron@radford.edu	2016-2018
Page, Roby	Sociology	erpage@radford.edu	2015-2017

College of Science and Technology

Brockway, Jack	at-large	brockway@radford.edu	2016-2018
Fox, Jake	Anthropological Sciences	jfox32@radford.edu	2015-2017

Caughron, Joy	Biology	jcaughron2@radford.edu	2015-2017
Fuhrer, Tim	Chemistry	tfuhrer@radford.edu	2016-2018
Watts, Skip	Geology	cwatts@radford.edu	2016-2018
Maxwell, Stockton	Geospatial Science	rmaxwell2@radford.edu	2016-2018
Barland, Ian	Information Technology	ibarland@radford.edu	2016-2018
Sigmon, Neil	Mathematics/Statistics	npsigmon@radford.edu	2015-2017
Herman, Rhett	Physics	rherman@radford.edu	2016-2018

College of Visual and Performing Arts

Barris, Roann	at-large	rbarris@radford.edu	2016-2018
Dodson, Drew	Art	dtdodson@radford.edu	2016-2018
Berg, Robyn	Dance & Theater/Cinema	rberg3@radford.edu	2016-2018
Temple, Julie	Interior Design & Fashion	jtemple5@radford.edu	2015-2017
Kim, Youngmi	Music	ykim6@radford.edu	2016-2018

McConnell Library

Resor-Whicker, Jennifer	Library	jrwhicker@radford.edu	2015-2017
----------------------------	---------	--	-----------

Waldron College of Health and Human Services

Bierman, Vicki	at-large	vbierman@radford.edu	2016-2018
Schoppelrey, Susan	at-large	sschoppel@radford.edu	2016-2018
Park, Hyejin	Comm. Sciences & Disorders	elanter@radford.edu	2016-2018
*LaRue, Laura	Nursing	llarue@radford.edu	2016-2018
Mitchell, Douglas	Occupational Therapy	dmmitchell@radford.edu	2015-2017
Harper, Brent	Physical Therapy	bharper2@radford.edu	2016-2018
Salehin, Mashooq	Social Work	msalehin@radford.edu	2016-2018

*Replaced by Wendy Downey in Spring 2017.

Adjunct

Dawson-Downs, Paula	CEHD	2016-2017
vacant	COBE	2016-2017

[Go to Governance Structure of the 2016-2017 Senate.](#)

[Return to Table of Contents.](#)

Governance Structure of the 2016-2017 Faculty Senate

Faculty Senate Executive Council

President— Carter Turner	cturner5@radford.edu
Vice President— Susan Schoppelrey	sschoppel@radford.edu
Secretary— Kim Gainer	kgainer@radford.edu
At-large— Suzanne Ament	seament@radford.edu
At-large— Prahlad Kasturi	pkasturi@radford.edu

Parliamentarian

Childers, Steve	jchilders2@radford.edu
-----------------	--

Campus Environment Committee

Chair— Fox, Jake	jfox32@radford.edu
Dawson, Downs, Paula	pdowns@radford.edu
Frasier, Pam	pfrasier2@radford.edu
Kim, Youngmi	ykim6@radford.edu
Mabry, Jennifer	jlmabry@radford.edu
Moore, Johnny	jsmoore@radford.edu
Salehin, Mashooq	msalehin@radford.edu
Schirr, Gary	gschirr@radford.edu
Whittington, Anja	awhittington@radford.edu

Curriculum Committee

Chair— Fuhrer, Tim	tfuhrer@radford.edu
Berg, Robyn	rberg3@radford.edu
Bierman, Vicky	vbierman@radford.edu
Duncan, Tom (Fall 2016)	tduncan13@radford.edu
Dunn, Scott	swdunn@radford.edu
Harper, Brent	bharper2@radford.edu
Herman, Rhett	rherman@radford.edu
Hernandez, Rodrigo (Spring 2017)	rjhernand@radford.edu
Triplet, Cheri	cftriplet@radford.edu
Resor-Whicker, Jennifer	jrwhicker@radford.edu

Faculty Issues Committee

Chair— Barris, Roann	rbarris@radford.edu
Ament, Suzanne	seament@radford.edu
Barland, Ian	ibarland@radford.edu
Brockway, Jack	brockway@radford.edu
Downey, Wendy (Spring)	wrdowney@radford.edu
Du Plessis, Eric	ehduples@radford.edu
Gilbert, Sharon	sgilbert13@radford.edu
LaRue, Laura E. (Fall)	llarue@radford.edu
Rubens, Amy	arubens@radford.edu
Zarankin, Tal	tzarankin@radford.edu

Governance Committee

Chair— Hilden, Katie	kclouse@radford.edu
Bizzell, Brad	bbizzell@radford.edu
Caughron, Joy	jcaughron2@radford.edu
Childers, Steve	jchilders2@radford.edu
Dodson, Drew	dtdodson@radford.edu
Gainer, Kim	kgainer@radford.edu
Park, Hyejin	hpark18@radford.edu
Schoppelrey, Susan	sschoppel@radford.edu
Sigmon, Neil	npsigmon@radford.edu

Resource Allocation Committee

Chair— Kasturi, Prahlad	pkasturi@radford.edu
Corbin, Tanya	tcorbin2@radford.edu
Gumaer, James	dgumaer@radford.edu
Hendrix, Nicole	pnhendrix@radford.edu
Kaushik, Abhay	akaushik@radford.edu
Maxwell, Stockton	rmaxwell2@radford.edu
Mitchell, Douglas	dmmitchell@radford.edu
Page, Roby	erpage@radford.edu
Temple, Julie	jtemple@radford.edu
Watts, Skip	cwatts@radford.edu

[Go to Membership of the 2016-2017 Faculty Senate.](#)

[Return to Table of Contents.](#)

Status of Motions of the 2016-2017 Faculty Senate

DATE	TITLE	SPONSOR	OUTCOME
2016			
9/29	<u>16-17.01—Motion to Create Rank of Senior Instructor</u>	Governance	Passed 10/13/2016
10/27	<u>16-17.02—Motion to Amend Language Regarding Adjunct Faculty</u>	FSEC	Passed 11/10/2016
10/27	<u>16-17.03—Motion re Instructor Qualifications</u>	Governance	Passed 2/16/2017
11/10	<u>16-17.04—Motion re Creation of an Undergraduate Certificate in Geospatial Intelligence (GEOINT)</u>	Curriculum	Passed 12/1/2016
2017			
1/19	<u>16-17.05—Motion re Budget Reduction Principles</u>	Resource Allocation	Passed 2/16/2017
2/2	<u>16-17.06—Radford University Faculty Senate Resolution in Response to the Presidential Executive Order Banning and Restricting Entry into the United States by Citizens of Seven Muslim-Majority Countries</u>	FSEC	Passed 2/2/2017
2/16	<u>16-17.07—Motion to Change Core Curriculum Assessment Reporting Schedule</u>	Curriculum	Passed 3/2/2017
2/16	<u>16-17.08—Motion to Allow Departments to Combine Sections When Reporting Core Curriculum Assessment Results</u>	Curriculum	Passed 3/2/2017
2/16	<u>16-17.09—Motion to Change T & R Faculty Handbook Language on College Curriculum Committees</u>	Curriculum	Left on the table; IG Task Force also addressing this issue.
3/2	<u>16-17.10—Recommendation to Create a University Internal Governance Review Committee to Replace Current University Executive Council</u>	Governance	Passed 2/23/2017
3/23	<u>16-17.11—Motion Regarding the Format of the Student Evaluations of Faculty</u>	Faculty Issues	Passed 4/6/2017
3/23	<u>16-17.12—Motion Concerning Balance of Online Courses at Radford University</u>	Curriculum	Passed 4/6/2017
4/6	<u>16-17.13—Motion Regarding Substitutions within the Core Curriculum</u>	Curriculum	Passed 4/20/2017

4/20	<u>16-17.14—Motion Regarding Changes to CORE 101, 102, and 201</u>	Curriculum	Passed 4/20
4/20	<u>16-17.15—Motion Allowing Substitution of Certain Communication and Philosophy Courses for CORE 201 and CORE 202</u>	Curriculum	Left on the table.
4/20	<u>16-17.16—Motion for the Creation of a General Education Task Force in Response to Imminent Changes in SCHEV Guidelines</u>	Curriculum	Passed 4/27
4/20	<u>16-17.17—Motion Regarding Creation of a Master of Science in Finance</u>	Curriculum	Passed 4/27
4/20	<u>16-17.18—Motion Recommending the Creation of a Standing Collaborative Task Force on Compensation Policy</u>	FSEC & Resource Allocation	Passed 4/27
4/20	<u>16-17.19—Motion Regarding the Creation of a Merit-Raise Model</u>	FSEC & Resource Allocation	Passed 4/27
4/20	<u>16-17.20—Motion Regarding Budget Priorities</u>	FSEC & Resource Allocation	Left on the table.
4/20	<u>16-17.21—Motion Authorizing Creation of PHRE 202 and Designating It as a Disciplinary-Prefixed Equivalent to CORE 202</u>	Curriculum	Passed 4/20/2017
4/20	<u>16-17.22—Motion re Interstate Passport Initiative</u>	Curriculum	Withdrawn 4/27/2017
4/20	<u>16-17.23—Motion re Prioritization of MS in Finance Degree</u>	Curriculum	Failed 4/27/2017
4/20	<u>16-17.24— Motion to Create an Arts Administration and Entrepreneurship Minor</u>	FSEC	Withdrawn 4/27/2017
4/20	<u>16-17.25—Motion to Create School of Nursing Healthcare Track for Students in Information Technology, Business, or the Sciences</u>	FSEC	Left on the table.
4/27	<u>16-17.26—Motion to Add Sports Management Major and Drop Sports Administration Concentration</u>	FSEC	Withdrawn 4/27/2017
4/27	<u>16-17.27—Motion to Add Allied Health Sciences Major and Drop Allied Health Sciences Concentration</u>	FSEC	Left on the table.
4/27	<u>16-17.28—Resolution in Honor of Dr. Joseph Scartelli on the Occasion of His Stepping Down as</u>	FSEC	Passed 4/27/2017

	<u>Interim Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs</u>		
4/27	<u>16-17.29—Resolution in Honor of Faculty Senators Who Are Concluding Their Terms</u>	FSEC	Passed 4/27/2017
4/27	<u>16-17.30—Resolution in Honor of Dr. Carter Turner for His Service as President of the Faculty Senate of Radford University</u>	FSEC	Passed 4/27/2017
4/27	<u>16-17.31—Resolution in Honor of Dr. Kim Gainer for Her Service as Secretary of the Faculty Senate of Radford University</u>	FSEC	Passed 4/27/2017

[Return to Table of Contents.](#)

16-17.01—Motion to Create Rank of Senior Instructor

Referred by: Governance Committee

MOTION:

The Faculty Senate recommends the creation of the rank of Senior Instructor for Special Purpose faculty who have not attained their terminal degree.

1.6.1.1 Minimum Criteria for Faculty Promotion

(INSERT) Senior Instructor

~~Holds a Bachelor's degree in the discipline or field in which he or she will be employed to teach and has at least 18 hours of graduate credit in the field, or holds the Master's degree in the discipline or field in which he or she will be employed to teach.~~ Holds an advanced, non-terminal degree consistent with the accreditation criteria of the discipline and the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools. Must be special purpose faculty and have six years of service at Radford University as an instructor.

RATIONALE:

The creation of new position of Senior Instructor allows instructors the opportunity for applying for promotion during their sixth year of teaching. The rank of Senior Instructor rewards teaching excellence and recognizes their significant contributions to Radford University.

Passed October 13, 2016

[Return to Table of Contents.](#)

[Go to 16-17.02—Motion to Amend Language Regarding Adjunct Faculty.](#)

16-17.02—Motion to Amend Language Regarding Adjunct Faculty

Referred by: Faculty Senate Executive Council

MOTION:

The Faculty Senate recommends the following changes to section 1.1.5 of the T & R Faculty Handbook.

Deletions are stricken and recommended **new language is highlighted in red**)

1.1.5 Adjunct Faculty

Adjunct faculty positions supplement the faculty of a department wherever additional faculty are needed. Adjunct faculty include those employed for part-time teaching and those who serve a department or college in a significant capacity without compensation. Adjunct faculty hold appointments for ~~one semester or one academic year~~ **three years during which they are eligible for but not guaranteed teaching assignments**, as defined by their letter of appointment, without eligibility for tenure; where authorized by the Dean **and approved by the Provost and Vice President of Academic Affairs**, adjunct appointments may be renewed. **Such reappointments should be made anytime during the last semester of the previous appointment period.** ~~Such~~ Appointments carry rank without the opportunity for promotion during the appointment period; however, promotion may be recommended at subsequent appointments subject to the Criteria for Awarding Rank at Appointment. Adjunct faculty members receiving compensation also receive limited benefits as described in Personnel Information Manual. A terminal degree in the discipline is not required for appointment, but adjunct faculty must hold an advanced degree or equivalent credentials based on experience consistent with accreditation criteria of the discipline and the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools. Specific responsibilities of adjunct faculty are given in their letter of appointment.

In the event that an adjunct faculty member is subsequently hired in a tenure-track position, the time employed as an adjunct faculty member cannot count toward the probationary period.

RATIONALE:

Section 1.1.5 of the T&R Handbook does not reflect our current terms for adjunct faculty. We are operating with 3-year term contracts as outlined in the Adjunct Faculty Hiring Database User's Guide for Academic Departments (http://www.radford.edu/content/dam/departments/administrative/Provost/Adjunct_faculty_database.pdf). We no longer use this database but we are following the terms of contract as described on page 1. The proposed revision to Section 1.1.5 will rectify the discrepancy.

Passed November 10, 2016

[Return to Table of Contents.](#)

[Return to 16-17.01—Motion to Create Rank of Senior Instructor.](#)

[Go to 16-17.03—Motion re Instructor Qualifications.](#)

16-17.03—Motion *re* Instructor Qualifications

Referred by: Governance Committee

MOTION:

The Faculty Senate recommends the following changes to section 1.3.1.4 of the T & R Faculty Handbook.

1.3.1.4 current language:

The following shall be minimal qualifications for consideration for appointment to the faculty rank indicated:

Instructor

Holds a Bachelor's degree in the discipline or field in which he or she will be employed to teach and has at least 18 hours of graduate credit in the field, or holds the Master's degree in the discipline or field in which he or she will be employed to teach.

1.3.1.4 proposed language:

Instructor

~~Holds a Bachelor's degree in the discipline or field in which he or she will be employed to teach and has at least 18 hours of graduate credit in the field, or holds the Master's degree in the discipline or field in which he or she will be employed to teach.~~ Holds an advanced degree in the teaching discipline or master's degree with a concentration in the teaching discipline (a minimum of 18 graduate semester hours in the teaching discipline) in which he or she will be employed. Exceptions may be made to the above qualifications if a justification consistent with Southern Association of Colleges and Schools Commission on Colleges' guidelines is approved by the Provost).

RATIONALE:

This change in language is intended to bring the handbook in compliance with faculty credentials as described by SACSCOC.

Passed February 16, 2017

[Return to Table of Contents.](#)

[Return to 16-17.02—Motion to Amend Language Regarding Adjunct Faculty.](#)

[Go to 16-17.04—Motion *re* Creation of an Undergraduate Certificate in Geospatial Intelligence \(GEOINT\).](#)

16-17.04—Motion *re* Creation of an Undergraduate Certificate in Geospatial Intelligence (GEOINT)

Referred by: Curriculum Committee

MOTION:

The Faculty Senate recommends the approval of the attached proposal for the creation of a certificate in Geospatial Intelligence (GEOINT).

RATIONALE:

Business, government, and non-governmental organizations are seeking people skilled in geospatial intelligence applications, spatial analytics and cyber security. This GEOINT certificate program provides fundamental knowledge on key geographic concepts, geospatial problem-solving techniques, data fusion and geospatial technologies from a multidisciplinary perspective. This certificate program is focused on applications of GEOINT to disaster response, emergency management, infrastructure and resource management, military and police operations, big data and security of spatial data. This certificate program will offer a new and unique accreditation opportunity for the Department of Geospatial Science and provide students with a highly valued technical certification.

Resources:

- The certificate does not require any start-up resources.
- Funding for positions will only be needed when and if the program reaches a self-sustainable size.
- The Resource Allocation Committee reviewed the proposal.

For the complete proposal, see Appendix I in [2016-2017 Faculty Senate Motions: APPENDIX](#).

Passed December 1, 2016

[Return to Table of Contents.](#)

[Return to 16-17.03—Motion *re* Instructor Qualifications.](#)

[Go to 16-17.05—Motion *re* Budget Reduction Principles.](#)

16-17.05—Motion *re* Budget Reduction Principles

Referred by: Resource Allocation Committee

MOTION:

The Faculty Senate recommends the following Budget Reduction Principles.

BUDGET REDUCTION PRINCIPLES

Overarching Principle

Reductions must not jeopardize the core mission of the University and the strategic plan for the University as a whole. Even with reductions in state support, we must position the University for sustained viability and prominence within the Commonwealth of Virginia and beyond.

MISSION OF RADFORD UNIVERSITY

Radford University serves the Commonwealth of Virginia and the nation through a wide range of academic, cultural, human service, and research programs. First and foremost, the university emphasizes teaching and learning and the process of learning in its commitment to the development of mature, responsible, well-educated citizens. RU develops students' creative and critical thinking skills, teaches students to analyze problems and implement solutions, helps students discover their leadership styles, and fosters their growth as leaders. Toward these ends, the university is student-focused and promotes a sense of caring and of meaningful interaction among all members of the University community. Research is viewed as a vital corollary to the teaching and learning transaction as it sustains and enhances the ability to teach effectively. Radford University believes in the dynamics of change and has a strong commitment to continuous review, evaluation, and improvement in the curriculum and all aspects of the University, so as to meet the changing needs of society.

Guiding Principles

1. We must assure a quality education for all of our students.
2. Budget reduction strategies must protect the University's ability to recruit and retain students and to provide the instruction necessary for the highest quality educational experience.
3. We must protect to the greatest extent possible the ability of students to graduate in a timely fashion.
4. Plans should be developed only after broad consultation and communicated in a transparent manner.
5. To the extent possible, we must hold harmless certain key areas and functions from budget reversions, including

- a. direct instructional costs,
 - b. recruitment and retention activities,
 - c. student advising,
 - d. activities related to accreditation, assessment and mandated reporting.
6. Budget decisions should be data-informed but not exclusively data-driven.
 7. Programs, activities and services that are central to the academic mission of the University must be appropriately supported in order to continue improving the quality of education, student access to courses and services, and faculty and staff development. Conversely, programs, activities, and services that are not central to RU's academic mission must be critically assessed, significantly reduced in scope, or mandated to find more cost-effective ways to continue.
 8. Implementation of budget reductions and realignments must not result in shifting work between units, colleges, departments, or programs unless it is a mutually agreed upon solution.
 9. Budget reductions must maintain to the extent possible the "public service" mission of the University so that research, outreach, and service obligations can continue, even though they may have to continue in a constrained manner.

BACKGROUND:

Dr. Jim Lollar, former president of the Faculty Senate, provided the Resource Allocation Committee with a Budget Reduction Principles document that has guided budget cuts that have occurred periodically at Radford University since 1998. The Resource Allocation Committee reviewed, revised and then unanimously approved these Principles. No specific strategic budget cut measure were reviewed or approved, only these guiding principles.

Passed February 16, 2017

[Return to Table of Contents.](#)

[Return to 16-17.04—Motion *re* Creation of an Undergraduate Certificate in Geospatial Intelligence \(GEOINT\).](#)

[Go to 16-17.06—Radford University Faculty Senate Resolution in Response to the Presidential Executive Order Banning and Restricting Entry into the United States by Citizens of Seven Muslim-Majority Countries.](#)

16-17.06—Radford University Faculty Senate Resolution in Response to the Presidential Executive Order Banning and Restricting Entry into the United States by Citizens of Seven Muslim-Majority Countries

Referred by: Faculty Senate Executive Council

Whereas, Radford University is enriched by the diversity of our student body, faculty, staff, and administration including our brothers and sisters from Muslim-majority countries;

Whereas, our effectiveness as a university in a 21st-century global society depends on our ability to attract the most highly qualified students, faculty, and staff from around the world;

Whereas, we have a responsibility as public intellectuals and as citizens of a pluralistic republic to speak out for tolerance and justice for all;

Whereas, the discriminatory targeting of law-abiding people from seven Muslim-majority countries contradicts our bedrock constitutional principles, including freedom of religion and the non-establishment clause;

Whereas, waves of immigrants and refugees fleeing conditions of intolerable violence and repression have settled in America, embraced it as their home, and built it into the country we enjoy today;

Whereas, our country has been culturally enriched, our sciences and industries advanced, our universities enhanced, and our community life deepened by the refugees and immigrants who have made America their home;

Whereas, our own Statue of Liberty represents the hope of freedom for immigrants and refugees coming to this country from around the world;

Whereas, the executive order in question has already caused intense anxiety for our Muslim students and faculty as well as students and faculty of immigrant families;

Be it, therefore, resolved: that the Radford University Faculty Senate calls upon the Radford community to stand in solidarity with all peaceful citizens of the world who wish to freely visit, settle and work in this country without regard to race, religion, ethnicity, or country of origin;

Be it further resolved: that we call upon our President and all government officials to pursue policies that protect national security while not discriminating against particular groups or impeding the ability of American universities to engage in our educational and research missions as effectively as possible by drawing upon the talents of students and faculty from throughout the world.

Passed February 2, 2017

[Return to Table of Contents.](#) [Return to 16-17.05—Motion re Budget Reduction Principles.](#)
[Go to 16-17.07—Motion to Change Core Curriculum Assessment Reporting Schedule.](#)

16-17.07—Motion to Change Core Curriculum Assessment Reporting Schedule

Referred by: Curriculum Committee

MOTION:

The CCAC recommends that the Core Curriculum Assessment Reporting Schedule be changed to yearly from every other year.

RATIONALE:

Some courses are listed in more than one goal area that are reported in different years, creating confusion among chairs and department assessment coordinators. In addition, some courses may not be taught during the year they are scheduled to be assessed.

Passed March 2, 2017

[Return to Table of Contents.](#)

[Return to 16-17.06—Radford University Faculty Senate Resolution in Response to the Presidential Executive Order Banning and Restricting Entry into the United States by Citizens of Seven Muslim-Majority Countries.](#)

[Go to 16-17.08—Motion to Allow Departments to Combine Sections When Reporting Core Curriculum Assessment Results.](#)

16-17.08—Motion to Allow Departments to Combine Sections When Reporting Core Curriculum Assessment Results

Referred by: Curriculum Committee

MOTION:

The CCAC recommends that departments be allowed to combine sections when reporting Core Curriculum assessment results rather be required to report on each section individually.

RATIONALE:

Assessment is intended to measure programmatic progress toward meeting learning outcomes rather than results in individual sections.

Passed March 2, 2017

[Return to Table of Contents.](#)

[Return to 16-17.07—Motion to Change Core Curriculum Assessment Reporting Schedule.](#)

[Go to 16-17.09—Motion to Change T & R Faculty Handbook Language on College Curriculum Committees.](#)

16-17.09— Motion to Change T & R Faculty Handbook Language on College Curriculum Committees

Referred by: Curriculum Committee

MOTION:

The Faculty Senate recommends the following changes to section 4.1.3.3 of the T & R Faculty Handbook.

Deletions are stricken and recommended **new language is highlighted in red.**

4.1.3.3 College Committees (in all but the College of Graduate Studies and Research) College Curriculum Committee

Membership: College Dean, (or her/his designee), two students with majors in the college, and one faculty member elected by each department in the college (and each school without departments, if applicable). Chaired by a member elected by the committee, this body reviews and approves course and curriculum proposals and revisions in the major and minor academic programs in the college. All **course** proposals and revisions approved shall be forwarded to the Undergraduate Curriculum and Catalog Review Committee, and, if affecting ~~general education~~ **the core Curriculum**, to the ~~General Education Curricular Advisory Committee and the Curriculum Committee of the Faculty Senate~~ **Core Curriculum Advisory Committee**; and/or, if affecting graduate curricula, to the Graduate Curriculum and Catalog Review Committee. Minutes of the committee's meetings shall be made available to all faculty in the college and sent to the Provost. **If the Core Curriculum Advisory Committee determines that the revisions affect the course Learning Outcomes, then the revisions shall be forwarded to the Curriculum Committee of the Faculty Senate. All course proposals shall be forwarded to the Curriculum Committee of the Faculty Senate.**

RATIONALE:

A number of course revisions are minor changes that have no effect on the Learning Outcomes of the course. Examples of these minor changes include changes to course numbering, the order of topics in a course, the order of topics in multi-course sequences, etc. The Core Curriculum Advisory Committee should determine if these changes are significant enough to warrant the Faculty Senate reviewing those proposed changes.

In addition, the committee name General Education Curricular Advisory Committee is changed to Core Curriculum Advisory Committee.

Left on the table.

[Return to Table of Contents.](#)

[Return to 16-17.08—Motion to Allow Departments to Combine Sections When Reporting Core Curriculum Assessment Results.](#)

[Go to 16-17.10—Recommendation to Create a University Internal Governance Review Committee to Replace Current University Executive Council.](#)

16-17.10—Recommendation to Create a University Internal Governance Review Committee to Replace Current University Executive Council

Referred by: Governance Committee

MOTION:

The Faculty Senate Recommends that

1. The University Executive Council should be deleted from the Internal Governance structure.
2. A University Internal Governance Review Committee should be created with the following charges:
 - a. Receive notifications of changes in position titles and personnel employed in order to update memberships in Internal Governance committees as changes are made.
 - b. Review and approve any proposals for changes in the Internal Governance structure and document coming from any IG constituency. Forward approved proposals to the President of the University for final approval. Upon final approval, make necessary changes in the Internal Governance structure and document.
 - c. Conduct a quadrennial review of Internal Governance, including committee memberships, charges and approval pathways. Identify updates and revisions of the Internal Governance structure that would strengthen its effectiveness and make necessary changes in the Internal Governance structure and document.
 - d. Any changes arising from the above will be communicated to the Assistant Provost for Academic Operations, who will update the Internal Governance website.
 - e. Provide an annual report to the Designated Administrator and Senate Presidents for dissemination to their constituents.
3. The University Internal Governance Review Committee will be composed of:
 - a. Presidents of the Faculty Senate, Administrative & Professional Faculty Senate and the Staff Senate;
 - b. Chair, Faculty Senate Governance Committee
 - c. Chair, Faculty Senate Curriculum Committee
 - d. Three tenured faculty appointed by the Faculty Senate Executive Committee for three year terms, staggered
 - e. Provost
 - f. Two other Vice Presidents designated annually by the University President.
4. The Chief of Staff for the University President will be the Designated Administrator.

RATIONALE:

- The title University Executive Council is confusing, especially given the creation of a university level Leadership Council, and does not reflect its current charge. The new title clearly distinguishes it from any other university level committee and councils and makes its purpose obvious.
- The current membership does not reflect the current administrative structure of the vice presidents.
- The current charge does not call for a regular review of internal governance and the council has not done so resulting in a structure and document that is out of sync with current practices and university structures.
- Currently nobody is responsible for receiving notifications of changes in positions and structures that would impact membership and charges of internal governance committees, another reason the IG document became out of sync.
- No mechanism currently exists for other constituencies and IG committees to make proposals to revise or update the IG structure and document that would enhance the effectiveness of the IG structure.

Passed February 23, 2017

[Return to Table of Contents.](#)

[Return to 16-17.09—Motion to Change T & R Faculty Handbook Language on College Curriculum Committees.](#)

[Go to 16-17.11—Motion Regarding the Format of the Student Evaluations of Faculty.](#)

16-17.11—Motion Regarding the Format of the Student Evaluations of Faculty

Referred by: Faculty Issues Committee

MOTION:

The Faculty Senate recommends that all evaluations will be paperless whether administered in class or through email delivery. Paper evaluations will no longer be used.

RATIONALE:

Handbook language:

1. Student evaluations for full-semester courses, **regardless of method delivery**, shall be conducted between the thirteenth and fourteenth weeks of the semester; for half-semester courses they are conducted during the sixth week of the course. **(bolding added)**

The handbook does not specify the method of obtaining student evaluations of faculty. As a result, this motion is not for a handbook change but a recommendation.

Paperless evaluations are widely used across campus at this time. Some of the colleges have already made a 100% commitment. Research has shown that they do not lead to significantly different completion rates. They can be done through an emailed distribution process or in the classroom. The SGA unanimously supports this change. Such evaluations can be processed quickly and easily, reducing the delay in returning results to faculty, and when they are not completed, there is no paper wasted. The SEF IG has made revisions to the online evaluation form to make it more reflective, where possible, of the unique qualities of teaching online. Going paperless is a major cost-saving strategy. It is also compatible with the younger generation's preferred mode of communication.

Passed April 6, 2017

[Return to Table of Contents.](#)

[Return to 16-17.10—Recommendation to Create a University Internal Governance Review Committee to Replace Current University Executive Council.](#)

[Go to 16-17.12—Motion Concerning Balance of Online Courses at Radford University.](#)

16-17.12—Motion Concerning Balance of Online Courses at Radford University

Referred by: Curriculum Committee

MOTION:

The Faculty Senate recommends that decisions regarding the number, scope and proportion of online offerings be driven and governed by the curriculum committees for each department. When considering these decisions departments should consider at least the following questions:

- 1) Can the quality and rigor of the courses be assured to match those of our in-person courses?
- 2) Will the class sizes associated with the online courses be kept at a level that will assure a fair workload for the faculty that will be preparing, instructing and grading the work of these courses?
- 3) Are there factors relating to accreditation for the university and/or the specific program that should be considered?

RATIONALE:

It is likely that a large portion of Radford's future growth will come as a result of expansion of our online offerings. It is of the utmost importance to our students and our future that this be done in a way that assures the highest quality of instruction for our students and the continuation of Radford University's core mission and values. We believe that decisions regarding online curriculum matters are best made by faculty in each specific discipline.

Passed April 6, 2017

[Return to Table of Contents.](#)

[Return to 16-17.11—Motion Regarding the Format of the Student Evaluations of Faculty.](#)

[Go to 16-17.13—Motion Regarding Substitutions within the Core Curriculum.](#)

16-17.13—Motion Regarding Substitutions within the Core Curriculum

Referred by: Curriculum Committee

MOTION:

The Faculty Senate approves the following catalog change:

Current catalogue language:

So that a student's RU education might have as much disciplinary breadth as possible, students must fulfill core curriculum requirements with courses with prefixes different from that of their major. An exception may be made for one course in Goals 5-11 and either a CORE 201 or CORE 202 equivalent. Furthermore, students are restricted from taking more than one course with the same prefix to fulfill requirements in University Core B; and students are restricted from taking more than one course with the same prefix to fulfill requirements in College Core A.

Proposed catalogue language:

So that a student's RU education might have as much disciplinary breadth as possible, students may apply no more than two courses to the Core Curriculum that have the same prefix as that of their major ~~must fulfill core curriculum requirements with courses with prefixes different from that of their major. An exception may be made for one course in Goals 5-11 and either a CORE 201 or CORE 202 equivalent. Furthermore, students are restricted from taking more than one course with the same prefix to fulfill requirements in University Core B; and students are restricted from taking more than one course with the same prefix to fulfill requirements in College Core A.~~

RATIONALE:

Currently students may apply two courses to the Core Curriculum that have the same prefix as that of their major. This motion would allow them to continue to apply a maximum of two courses but would remove distribution requirements so that the courses may be applied within any of the four Core Curriculum categories* and in any combination.

*University Core A, University Core B, College Core A, College Core B

Passed April 20, 2017

[Return to Table of Contents.](#)

[Return to 16-17.12—Motion Concerning Balance of Online Courses at Radford University.](#)

[Go to 16-17.14—Motion Regarding Changes to CORE 101, 102, and 201.](#)

16-17.14—Motion Regarding Changes to CORE 101, 102, and 201

Referred by: Curriculum Committee

MOTION:

The Faculty Senate approves the changes to CORE 101, 102, and 201 specified in the attached documents.

RATIONALE:

For changes to CORE 101:

The current title and description of the “Opposing Viewpoints” assignment have not led students to produce essays that completely fulfill the outcomes envisioned for the assignment in 2013 by the Core Syllabi Revision Focus Groups.

Feedback from instructors and students indicates that the assignment proved to be problematic for two reasons. Primarily, the title of the assignment led teachers and students to the impression that they needed to locate and work with texts that staked claims in binary opposition to each other, i.e., Democrat/Republican, Pro-Life/Pro-Choice. This misunderstanding prevented many students from fulfilling the original goals for the assignment, which were to require students to examine how different writers construct and support positions on the same subject in myriad ways, with multiple points of overlap and departure.

Secondly, the assignment’s objective only to “*identify* ethos, logos, and pathos” (emphasis added) did not challenge our students to evaluate or analyze a writer’s appeals to character, logic, or emotion. Students often did not demonstrate a detailed understanding of how different rhetorical appeals functioned within an argument.

Finally, the assignment does not adequately convey the Core Syllabi Revision Focus Groups’ vision of continuity between this assignment and Core 102’s “Speech Analysis” Assignment. In a separate proposal, we suggest changing the latter assignment’s title to “Approaches to Oral Argument.” That proposal also suggests changes to the assignment description and objectives.

This revised assignment will more accurately reflect the original goals of the Focus Groups, present a realistic but challenging task for students in Core 101, and provide for a much more integrated and cumulative learning experience for students in the 100-level Core classes.

For changes to CORE 102:

The current “Speech Analysis” assignment, approved in spring 2013, does not adequately convey the Core Syllabi Revision Focus Groups’ vision of continuity between this assignment and Core 101’s “Opposing Viewpoints” assignment. (A separate proposal suggests changing the latter assignment’s title to “Approaches to Written Argument.” That CORE 101 proposal also suggests changes to the assignment description and objectives.)

Students and instructors require a stronger articulation of how the “Speech Analysis” assignment reinforces the skills of rhetorical analysis practiced in Core 101 and builds upon them by asking students to pay special attention to how rhetors adapt persuasive techniques for oral communication. The proposed changes to the assignment’s title, description, and objectives will articulate these connections.

This revised assignment more accurately reflects the original goals of the Focus Groups by challenging Core 102 students with a richer set of intellectual tasks and providing a much more integrated and cumulative learning experience for students in the 100-level Core classes.

For changes to CORE 201:

Core 201 currently requires an annotated bibliography. Professors have reported dissatisfaction with this project, as it seems to encourage students to discuss each source in isolation from one another, and students fail to see connections between sources.

Meanwhile, the program has been attempting to assess the 201 objective: “Effectively synthesize and integrate arguments and information” (located under Goal 1 in the document) using the argument analysis, but we have discovered this objective is not a good fit for that assignment.

As a result, in the fall of 2015, three professors piloted a research synthesis in place of the annotated bibliography. The resulting papers showed much more engagement with the sources and a deeper reflection on the information literacy process. Encouraged, we had six professors volunteer to pilot the research synthesis in fall of 2016. The library collected the resulting 400 papers and used the Core A information literacy rubric, plus the “effectively synthesize” objective, to rate a sampling for 40 papers.

The research synthesis assignments scored well on the rubric, including the new objective. Feedback from the professors who participated in the pilot was also positive. The results were shared with the Assessment Office, the Core Director, and the Core instructors. With their support, it is now proposed to officially change the Core 201 assignment from an annotated bibliography to research synthesis.

For additional information, see Appendix II: 16-17.14—Motion Regarding Changes to CORE 101, CORE 102, and CORE 201 in [2016-2017 Faculty Senate Motions: APPENDIX](#).

Passed April 20, 2017

[Return to Table of Contents.](#)

[Return to 16-17.13—Motion Regarding Substitutions within the CORE Curriculum.](#)

[Go to 16-17.15—Motion Allowing Substitution of Certain Communication and Philosophy Courses for CORE 201 and CORE 202.](#)

16-17.15—Motion Allowing Substitution of Certain Communication and Philosophy Courses for CORE 201 and CORE 202

Referred by: Curriculum Committee

MOTION:

The Faculty Senate authorizes the following changes in the Undergraduate Catalog under the heading “University Core A. Core Foundations (12 hours required).”

Current Language:

Required (12 hours)

All students must pass each of the following four courses, which should be completed during the student’s first four semesters:

- CORE 101. Essentials of Written and Oral Communication.
- CORE 102. Advanced Written and Oral Communication.
- CORE 201. Topics in Critical Inquiry. (MKTG 201 or POSC 201 may be taken in place of CORE 201)
- CORE 202. Topics in Ethical Inquiry. (POSC 202 may be taken in place of CORE 202)

Substitute Language:

Required (12 hours)

All students must pass each of the following four courses, which should be completed during the student’s first four semesters:

- CORE 101. Essentials of Written and Oral Communication.
- CORE 102. Advanced Written and Oral Communication.
- CORE 201. Topics in Critical Inquiry. (COMS 114, COMS 240, MKTG 201, or POSC 201 may be taken in place of CORE 201*)
- CORE 202. Topics in Ethical Inquiry. (PHIL 111, PHIL 112, PHIL 213 or POSC 202 may be taken in place of CORE 202*)

*Courses applied to CORE 201 or CORE 202 may not simultaneously be applied to other Core Curriculum requirements.

RATIONALE:

Currently transfer students are allowed to apply these courses to CORE 201 and CORE 202. This motion extends that option to currently enrolled students.

Left on the table.

[Return to Table of Contents.](#)

[Return to 16-17.14—Motion Regarding Changes to CORE 101, 102, and 201.](#)

[Go to 16-17.16—Motion for the Creation of a General Education Task Force in Response to Imminent Changes in SCHEV Guidelines.](#)

16-17.16—Motion for the Creation of a General Education Task Force in Response to Imminent Changes in SCHEV Guidelines

Referred by: Curriculum Committee

MOTION:

The Faculty Senate recommends

- that a task force be created to recommend revisions in Radford University's Core Curriculum consistent with new SCHEV general education guidelines,
- that the task force be constituted immediately upon approval by the Faculty Senate,
- that the task force commence work no later than August 10, 2017,
- that the task force report to the Core Curriculum Advisory Committee (CCAC) by Friday of the twelfth week of the fall semester for review and action by CCAC before a recommendation is submitted to the Faculty Senate, and
- that the task force consist of the following members:

Voting Members

- One representative each from CEHD, COBE, CSAT, CVPA, WCHHS, two representatives from CHBS (one for Humanities, one for Behavioral Sciences), chosen by the deans, and one information literacy specialist, chosen by the Dean of the McConnell Library

Non-Voting Members

- One member of the Academic Advising Committee, chosen by its membership
- One professional writing specialist, chosen by the Professional Writing program staff
- One oral communication specialist, chosen by the School of Communication faculty
- One representative from the Office of Academic Assessment
- One undergraduate, chosen by the SGA cabinet
- An instructor, administrator, or acting administrator to represent participants in the Core Curriculum Program, chosen by the Assistant Provost for Academic Programs.
- An instructor, administrator, or acting administrator to represent participants in the Scholar-Citizen Initiative, chosen by the Assistant Provost for Academic Programs.

The voting members may consult additional subject matter experts as deemed necessary. The non-voting members may attend all meetings, will be asked to attend meetings at which their subject-matter expertise or institutional knowledge will be particularly relevant, and will be asked to provide feedback on drafts of reports and proposals.

RATIONALE:

- New SCHEV general guidelines have been drafted, are nearing the final stage of revision, and will be voted on in July of 2017.
- The new SCHEV guidelines will necessitate significant changes to Radford University's Core Curriculum, including aligning the current curriculum with the new general education goals, which are anticipated to include at a minimum written communication, quantitative literacy, critical thinking, and civic engagement.
- SCHEV may require that the changes take effect by the Fall of 2018.
- The mandate to revise the curriculum and the likelihood that the revised curriculum will take effect in a year's time require that a task force be promptly constituted.

Passed April 27, 2017

[Return to Table of Contents.](#)

[Return to 16-17.15—Motion Allowing Substitution of Certain Communication and Philosophy Courses for CORE 201 and CORE 202.](#)

[Go to 16-17.17—Motion Regarding the Creation of a Master of Science in Finance.](#)

16-17.17—Motion Regarding the Creation of a Master of Science in Finance

Referred by: Curriculum Committee

MOTION:

The Faculty Senate recommends creation of the attached proposal for a Master of Science in Finance, pending approval of three proposed courses described within.

RATIONALE:

See Appendix III: 16-17.17—Motion Regarding the Creation of a Master of Science in Finance in [2016-2017 Faculty Senate Motions: APPENDIX](#).

Passed April 27, 2017

[Return to Table of Contents.](#)

[Return to 16-17.16—Motion for the Creation of a General Education Task Force in Response to Imminent Changes in SCHEV Guidelines.](#)

[Go to 16-17.18—Motion Recommending the Creation of a Standing Collaborative Task Force on Compensation Policy.](#)

16-17.18—Motion Recommending the Creation of a Standing Collaborative Task Force on Compensation Policy

Referred by: Faculty Senate Executive Council and Resource Allocation Committee

MOTION:

The Faculty Senate recommends that the Radford University administration create a standing collaborative task force to make recommendations to the President on matters pertaining to both short-term and long-term compensation policy.

Charges:

The task force will meet on a regular basis to

- develop criteria and propose allocation methods for occasions when monies become available for university-wide pay raises,
- develop and recommend a university-wide long-term compensation policy,
- monitor progress toward meeting compensation goals, and
- report to the Faculty Senate by the sixth week of each Spring semester.

Membership:

- President or his/her designee
- Vice President for Finance and Administration or his/her designee
- President of the Faculty Senate
- Chair of the Faculty Senate Resource Allocation Committee

RATIONALE:

Radford University Faculty Compensation Plan - An Academic Affairs Budget Priority Initiative.

National Trends

The University of Virginia Board of Visitors in February 2013 approved a resolution supporting the goal of raising average faculty salaries into the top 20 among University of Virginia's Association of American University Peers. President Teresa A. Sullivan had described the **initiative** as her **most urgent priority**. She referred to the Princeton Review of UVA's "Best Value" public university and how the aspirations that will emerge from the ongoing development of a **new strategic plan and vision for the future**, however, depends upon retaining and attracting the best faculty. The President's plans to boost faculty salaries would require \$65 million over four years.

In July 2014, the Ohio University Board of Trustees acted on the recommendations from the Faculty Total Compensation Task Force and set aside \$2.04 million as one step in a multi-year plan to move faculty compensation levels to third among four year public universities in Ohio. Executive Vice-President and Provost Pam Benolt noted that the plan would **increase the University's competitiveness** when it comes to the recruitment and retention of faculty.

Similar concerns have arisen at other places such as at the University of Washington where the faculty voted on a plan to alleviate salary compression (2016), and at Kansas State University where a 2015 Faculty Compensation Task Force was charged to develop a three year compensation improvement plan with specific goals and strategies consistent with the K-State's goals for competitive faculty compensation. The report recognizes that in order to retain and attract high performing faculty, competitive salaries and compensation packages are essential. The Chancellor's cabinet at Texas Women's University approved the Compensation Philosophy Document (2014) and came up with a Faculty Short Term and Long Term Action List by creating a multi-member task force.

Regional Ranking of Radford University

Radford University has been named by The Princeton Review as one of the best 138 colleges in the Southeast. 2017 marks the ninth time Radford University has been rated as one of the best colleges in the Southeast by The Princeton Review since 2008.... **"The professors here would have to be Radford's greatest strength,"** Source: RU News August 11, 2014.

The US News and World Report ranked Radford University 47th in its most recent ranking of Colleges and Universities in the South. Here are a few more accolades

Radford University continues to be recognized **for the strength of its academic programs, success of its sustainability efforts, and dedication to excellence.**

"Best Colleges and Universities in the Southeast"

– The Princeton Review, 2004 - 17

"Best Regional Universities" in the South

– U.S. News & World Report, 2013, 2014, 2015, 2016, 2017

"Top Public Schools" – South - #16

– U.S. News & World Report, 2017

"College of Distinction"

– Colleges of Distinction, 2016 and 2017

"Best Bang for the Buck" Universities

– Washington Monthly Magazine, Sept.-Oct 2013, Sept.-Oct 2014, Sept.-Oct. 2015, Sept.-Oct. 2016

"Best Value Colleges"

– The Princeton Review, 2013, 2014

"Best Colleges for Veterans - South"

– U.S. News & World Report, 2016 and 2017

"Best RN Programs in Virginia"

– RegisteredNursing.org, 2017

"Best for Vets"

– Military Times, 2015

"Best Dorms" Ranked #3 in Virginia and among the top 100 nationwide

– Niche Rankings, 2015

"Top Online Education Programs" (Doctor of Nursing Practice)

– U.S. News & World Report, 2012

"Top Public Master's Universities in the South"

– U.S. News & World Report, 2010, 2011, 2012

"Top Interior Design Schools in the South"

– DesignIntelligence, 2014

"Top 10 Interior Design Programs in the Nation"

– DesignIntelligence, 2011

"Best Business Schools"

– The Princeton Review, 2012, 2013, 2014, 2015, 2016, 2017

"Top Green Colleges in the Nation"

– The Princeton Review, 2010, 2011, 2012, 2013, 2014, 2015, 2016

"President's Higher Education Community Service Honor Roll"

– Corporation for National and Community Service, 2009, 2013, 2014, 2015

One of only 13 U.S. schools with "Multiple Strong Programs" in Teacher Preparation

– National Council on Teacher Quality, 2013

2011 Goldwater Scholarship Recipient

Junior Biology Major Brandon Newmyer

Awarded First Doctoral Degrees in August 2011 Designated All-Steinway School in September 2011

Source: RU Website.

RU Faculty Compensation Issue

Despite the accolades cited above, one ranking that is not commensurate with the heightened perception of Radford University as a Best Value Public University relates to how well its faculty is paid and compensated.

The percentile ranking (2013-14) among national peer institutions for Radford University places full professors at the 21st percentile, associate professors at the 25th percentile and assistant professors at the 34th percentile. The corresponding percentile ranking among the Commonwealth of Virginia Higher Education Institutions places professors at the 29th percentile, associate professors at the 36th percentile and assistant professors at the 36th percentile.

Just two years later, the corresponding percentile ranking (2015-16) for average salaries among national peer institutions for Radford University places full professors at the 16th percentile, associate professors at the 20th percentile and assistant professors at the 45th percentile. The corresponding percentile ranking among the Commonwealth of Virginia Higher Education Institutions places professors at the 26th percentile, associate professors at the 33rd percentile and assistant professors at the 33rd percentile.

This shows that full professors and associate professors lost ground competitively among all national peer institutions due to unaddressed salary compression and inversion issues that have lingered far too long and get worse each year.

Within the Commonwealth of Virginia Institutions, Radford University Professors at all ranks have lost ground just within the past year. This will be a problem to attract, promote and retain professor at competitive levels in the profession.

The declining salary level has been a long term problem at Radford University as President Donald Dedmon had wanted to raise salaries from around the 40th percentile to the 60th percentile almost three decades ago among Radford's peer institutions. This has been a dream unrealized for long term professors who have remained devoted and dedicated to serving Radford University.

Professors and students are at the heart of the learning transaction at any university. There is a strong need to have a sustained multi-year financial plan to deal with total faculty compensation that will also address equity issues (inversion and compression issues by years in rank and by discipline) and the full range of benefits (including employee health benefits by evaluating the impact of the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act on total compensation). **That is the need of the hour.**

Goal

As a first step, the Academic Division must prioritize Faculty Compensation Plan to achieve 50th percentile ranking across all ranks among its national peer institutions. The US News and World Report uses information on Faculty Compensation and Class Size for its rankings of Colleges and Universities. Eventually Radford University must have the goal through improving Faculty Compensation and Class Size to move RUs ranking to be among the top 10 in the regional ranking of Colleges and Universities in the South. This would have a salutary impact on The Princeton Review ranking as well. The current deficiency in faculty compensation at Radford University is estimated around \$4 to \$4.5 million. This must be achieved through a combination of resource reallocation and new moneys without affecting staffing adequacy levels, lowering of class size or cuts in undergraduate or graduate academic programs. Quality must be maintained.

Academic Affairs Strategic Priorities

1. Excellence in Undergraduate Education
 - faculty (compensation)

- class size
 - disciplinary accreditation
 - program assessment
2. High Impact Practices
 - competitive advantage
 - learning outcomes
 3. Personal, Professional, Career Services
 4. New Graduate Programs

Why Should Faculty Salaries and Class Sizes be the Top Strategic Priorities?

1. Faculty salaries and class sizes directly impacts:
 - Our competitive advantage. Our mission and competitive advantage is based on providing high impact faculty based learning experiences to students who need personal attention.
 - Faculty Morale. Low salaries were one of the top three reasons on both the Harvard and Senate surveys for extremely low morale.
 - Our Brand and Image. Investment and Commitment to the core instructional mission is an important influence on key stake holders perceptions of University excellence.

Achieving Excellence in Undergraduate Education

- Competent motivated faculty skilled in high impact pedagogy
- Competent motivated students
- Class sizes that are small enough to allow high impact pedagogy
- Evaluation models that evaluate both pedagogy and outcomes
- Continuous improvement driven by research

Improving RUs ranking in U.S. News and World Report (weights for ranking)

- Undergraduate academic reputation (22.5 percent)

- Retention (22.5 percent)
- Faculty resources (20 percent)
- Student selectivity (12.5 percent)
- Financial resources (10 percent)
- Graduation rate performance (7.5 percent)
- Alumni giving rate (5 percent)

Faculty resources (20 percent)

1. Research shows that the more satisfied students are about their contact with professors, the more they will learn and the more likely they are to graduate. We use six factors from the 2013-2014 academic years to assess a school's commitment to instruction.
 - Class size has two components: the proportion of classes with fewer than 20 students (30 percent of the faculty resources score) and the proportion with 50 or more students (10 percent of the score).
 - Faculty salary (35 percent) is the average faculty pay, plus benefits, during the 2012-2013 and 2013-2014 academic years, adjusted for regional differences in the cost of living using indexes from the consulting firm Runzheimer International. We also weigh the proportion of professors with the highest degree in their fields (15 percent), the student-faculty ratio (5 percent) and the proportion of faculty who are full time (5 percent).

Average Salaries by Rank at Peer Institutions for AY 2013-14

Name of the University	Full Professors Avg. Salary	Rank	Associate Professors Avg. Salary	Rank	Assistant Professors Avg. Salary	Rank	Instructors Avg. Salary	Rank
Appalachian State University	\$64,100	23	\$71,700	12	\$62,900	13	\$43,700	19
Bloomsburg University of Pennsylvania	\$105,800	7	\$84,200	7	\$65,400	6	\$48,100	13
California State University, Chico	\$89,700	14	\$69,100	19	\$64,200	10		
California State University, San Bernardino	\$92,100	12	\$70,900	15	\$63,200	12		
Gonzaga University								
Hofstra University	\$145,200	1	\$100,900	1	\$79,600	2	\$72,200	2
Indiana University of Pennsylvania	\$106,200	6	\$84,600	6	\$62,800	14	\$50,100	12
Kutztown University of Pennsylvania	\$105,400	8	\$82,600	9	\$64,100	11	\$46,000	16
Loyola Marymount University								
Minnesota State University, Mankato	\$88,300	16	\$71,300	14	\$64,200	9	\$45,100	17
Monmouth University	\$116,000	5	\$95,700	2	\$69,800	5	\$51,500	11
Radford University	\$83,300	19	\$69,500	18	\$62,200	16	\$52,400	10
Rowan University								
Salisbury University	\$86,300	17	\$70,000	17	\$65,100	7	\$65,900	3
Seattle University	\$123,500	4	\$86,400	5	\$75,300	4	\$64,800	4
St. Cloud State University	\$84,600	18	\$70,100	16	\$62,000	17	\$46,700	15
SUNY College at Brockport	\$96,900	9	\$73,900	10	\$60,200	18	\$58,000	7
Texas Christian University	\$127,400	2	\$93,500	4	\$78,400	3	\$64,300	5
The University of Tampa	\$94,100	10	\$83,300	8	\$65,000	8	\$56,200	8
University of Northern Colorado	\$88,700	15	\$66,300	20	\$55,200	23	\$43,300	20
University of Northern Iowa	\$92,200	11	\$72,800	11	\$62,800	15	\$56,100	9
University of Wisconsin, Eau Claire	\$74,900	22	\$62,300	22	\$59,900	19	\$47,700	14
University of Wisconsin, Oshkosh	\$76,500	21	\$61,900	23	\$57,300	21	\$83,100	1
Western Carolina University	\$91,700	13	\$71,600	13	\$59,600	20	\$40,800	21
William Paterson University of New Jersey	\$125,000	3	\$95,100	3	\$80,000	1	\$63,700	6
Winthrop University	\$81,800	20	\$65,800	21	\$57,100	22	\$44,700	18

Source: Academe

Average Salaries by Rank at Peer Institutions for 2014-15

Name of the University	Full Professor	Rank	Associate Professor	Rank	Assistant Professor	Rank	Instructor	Rank
Appalachian State University	\$90,891	16	\$71,154	17	\$64,152	15	\$49,968	13
Bloomsburg University of Pennsylvania	\$107,784	10	\$85,158	8	\$67,140	6	\$48,573	15
California State University-Chico	\$88,164	21	\$69,093	20	\$66,051	9	-----	---
California State University-San Bernardino	\$91,404	14	\$72,000	15	\$64,917	11	-----	---
Gonzaga University	\$114,651	6	\$79,191	12	\$61,893	21	\$48,159	16
Hofstra University	\$146,691	1	\$101,376	1	\$84,825	1	\$94,932	1
Indiana University of Pennsylvania-Main Campus	\$108,738	8	\$85,833	6	\$64,296	14	\$50,157	12
Kutztown University of Pennsylvania	\$107,838	9	\$84,735	9	\$64,521	12	\$46,683	19
Loyola Marymount University	\$115,443	4	\$85,392	7	\$66,627	7	\$52,236	10
Minnesota State University-Mankato	\$93,771	13	\$78,111	13	\$67,239	5	\$48,852	14
Monmouth University	\$107,226	11	\$87,318	5	\$66,060	8	\$47,691	17
Radford University	\$85,545	22	\$70,038	18	\$62,514	19	\$52,515	9
Rowan University	\$111,798	7	\$84,528	10	\$53,964	26	\$42,228	22
Saint Cloud State University	\$89,442	19	\$75,438	14	\$65,754	10	\$50,913	11
Salisbury University	\$83,844	23	\$68,994	21	\$62,217	20	\$65,808	2
Seattle University	\$122,913	3	\$88,047	3	\$76,815	3	\$61,605	5
SUNY College at Brockport	\$88,335	20	\$67,329	22	\$55,341	25	\$46,872	18
Texas Christian University	\$127,890	2	\$94,635	2	\$78,732	2	\$64,692	3
The University of Tampa	\$97,497	12	\$84,501	11	\$64,305	13	\$58,671	7
University of Northern Colorado	\$89,460	18	\$66,645	24	\$56,583	24	\$44,496	20
University of Northern Iowa	\$90,072	17	\$71,874	16	\$63,171	18	\$61,974	4
University of Wisconsin-Eau Claire	\$76,959	26	\$63,648	25	\$63,522	17	\$55,746	8
University of Wisconsin-Oshkosh	\$78,660	25	\$62,919	26	\$64,116	16	-----	---
Western Carolina University	\$90,972	15	\$69,273	19	\$59,976	22	\$40,077	23
William Paterson University of New Jersey	\$115,236	5	\$87,723	4	\$72,414	4	\$59,049	6
Winthrop University	\$80,532	24	\$67,185	23	\$58,725	23	\$43,758	21

Source: IPEDS Human Resources Survey (Equated 9-Month Salaries)

Average Salaries by Rank at Peer Institutions for 2015-16

Name of the University	Full Professor	Rank	Associate Professor	Rank	Assistant Professor	Rank	Instructor	Rank
Appalachian State University	\$91,431	18	\$72,216	18	\$64,350	15	\$54,198	9
Bloomsburg University of Pennsylvania	\$106,569	10	\$83,781	10	\$65,979	12	\$48,843	15
California State University-Chico	\$92,394	15	\$75,546	16	\$69,570	5	-----	---
California State University-San Bernardino	\$93,780	14	\$77,067	15	\$67,554	8	-----	---
Gonzaga University	\$114,939	5	\$78,840	12	\$61,443	22	-----	---
Hofstra University	\$147,591	1	\$102,573	1	\$89,136	1	\$75,699	1
Indiana University of Pennsylvania-Main Campus	\$108,036	9	\$85,095	9	\$64,179	17	\$49,068	14
Kutztown University of Pennsylvania	\$106,065	11	\$83,412	11	\$62,055	21	\$46,683	18
Loyola Marymount University	\$117,252	3	\$86,085	6	\$66,357	9	\$45,468	19
Minnesota State University-Mankato	\$95,067	13	\$78,363	13	\$68,598	6	\$50,364	13
Monmouth University	\$111,690	8	\$89,244	3	\$66,204	11	\$45,000	20
Radford University	\$88,812	22	\$71,604	19	\$65,808	13	\$54,189	10
Rowan University	\$111,870	7	\$85,599	7	\$63,414	19	\$43,983	21
Saint Cloud State University	\$90,765	19	\$77,193	14	\$68,265	7	\$53,064	11
Salisbury University	\$84,312	23	\$69,426	21	\$63,324	20	\$64,125	3
Seattle University	\$116,064	4	\$86,571	5	\$73,656	2	\$54,630	8
SUNY College at Brockport	\$89,559	21	\$68,796	22	\$56,196	25	\$48,348	16
Texas Christian University	\$127,602	2	\$90,531	2	\$71,784	3	\$61,974	4
The University of Tampa	\$102,339	12	\$85,293	8	\$65,736	14	\$59,472	6
University of Northern Colorado	\$90,549	20	\$66,600	24	\$56,052	26	\$47,502	17
University of Northern Iowa	\$92,070	17	\$72,576	17	\$64,251	16	\$68,148	2
University of Wisconsin-Eau Claire	\$76,914	26	\$63,108	25	\$63,567	18	\$55,098	7
University of Wisconsin-Oshkosh	\$79,785	25	\$62,532	26	\$66,276	10	\$50,499	12
Western Carolina University	\$92,169	16	\$70,119	20	\$60,381	24	\$41,013	23
William Paterson University of New Jersey	\$114,192	6	\$86,670	4	\$69,939	4	\$60,093	5
Winthrop University	\$80,082	24	\$68,031	23	\$61,263	23	\$43,605	22

Source: IPEDS Human Resources Survey (Equated 9-Month Salaries)

Average Salaries by Rank at Peer Institutions from 2006 to 2015

Average 9-Month Base Faculty Salary										
Year	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015
Radford University	\$60,836	\$61,473	\$64,187	\$63,709	\$63,353	\$65,714	\$68,100	\$69,308	\$70,418	\$72,429
Professor	\$74,243	\$75,883	\$78,214	\$77,217	\$76,766	\$78,757	\$81,449	\$83,095	\$85,947	\$88,951
Associate Professor	\$58,918	\$61,943	\$65,129	\$64,310	\$64,910	\$65,938	\$68,227	\$69,411	\$69,921	\$71,542
Assistant Professor	\$54,300	\$55,309	\$56,979	\$57,209	\$56,717	\$58,444	\$60,512	\$62,091	\$62,429	\$65,737
Instructor	\$42,547	\$43,777	\$46,936	\$49,316	\$49,010	\$51,012	\$52,612	\$52,298	\$52,580	\$54,247
Peer Institutions	\$68,108	\$70,653	\$73,021	\$74,606	\$76,024	\$76,563	\$75,249	\$76,411	\$77,479	\$78,495
Professor	\$88,221	\$91,633	\$95,438	\$96,175	\$98,416	\$98,966	\$96,809	\$98,541	\$100,648	\$101,323
Associate Professor	\$69,122	\$72,060	\$74,720	\$75,703	\$76,774	\$76,817	\$75,419	\$76,573	\$78,084	\$78,611
Assistant Professor	\$57,149	\$59,262	\$61,378	\$62,387	\$63,348	\$63,893	\$63,046	\$63,884	\$65,334	\$65,981
Instructor	\$47,040	\$48,828	\$50,425	\$51,736	\$52,046	\$52,269	\$52,678	\$52,878	\$53,779	\$53,040

Source: Institutional Research, Reporting and Assessment, Radford University 2014. IPEDS Human Resources Survey (Equated 9-Month Salaries)

Average Salaries by Rank at Commonwealth of Virginia Institutions for AY 2013-14

Name of the University	Full Professors Avg. Salary	Rank	Associate Professors Avg. Salary	Rank	Assistant Professors Avg. Salary	Rank	Instructors Avg. Salary	Rank
Christopher Newport University	\$101,600	7	\$77,100	7	\$61,100	11	\$52,800	4
College of William and Mary	\$122,700	4	\$89,600	2	\$73,500	3	\$51,200	7
George Mason University	\$133,800	2	\$87,900	4	\$73,500	4	\$57,000	1
James Madison University	\$91,000	9	\$71,100	9	\$64,200	8	\$54,700	3
Longwood University			\$65,800	13	\$59,600	12	\$55,700	2
Norfolk State University	\$80,000	13						
Old Dominion University	\$114,100	6	\$81,300	6	\$70,100	6	\$49,300	10
Radford University	\$83,300	11	\$69,500	10	\$62,200	10	\$52,400	5
University of Mary Washington	\$82,900	12	\$66,300	12	\$62,600	9	\$50,100	8
University of Virginia	\$150,800	1	\$99,500	1	\$87,000	1	\$51,500	6
University of Virginia's College at Wise								
Virginia Commonwealth University	\$118,000	5	\$82,900	5	\$71,700	5	\$46,300	12
Virginia Military Institute	\$93,800	8	\$67,400	11	\$58,900	13	\$43,400	13
Virginia State University	\$87,900	10	\$71,800	8	\$64,300	7	\$47,200	11
Virginia Tech	\$127,000	3	\$88,600	3	\$75,400	2	\$50,000	9

Source: Academe

Average Salaries by Rank at Commonwealth of Virginia Institutions for AY 2014-2015

Name of the University	Full Professor	Rank	Associate Professor	Rank	Assistant Professor	Rank	Instructor	Rank
Christopher Newport University	\$105,201	7	\$78,669	6	\$63,945	8	\$54,972	4
College of William and Mary	\$128,655	3	\$95,688	2	\$71,181	4	\$59,238	1
George Mason University	\$131,625	2	\$86,931	3	\$72,018	3	\$56,736	3
James Madison University	\$89,217	8	\$69,741	11	\$64,458	7	\$44,190	14
Longwood University	\$79,767	14	\$67,005	12	\$59,193	13	\$57,528	2
Norfolk State University	\$87,084	9	\$72,765	8	\$61,389	11	\$54,378	5
Old Dominion University	\$108,504	6	\$78,237	7	\$69,696	5	\$53,919	6
Radford University	\$85,545	11	\$70,038	10	\$62,514	9	\$52,515	7
The University of Virginia's College at Wise	\$75,780	15	\$66,348	13	\$56,871	14	\$48,411	10
University of Mary Washington	\$80,586	13	\$64,269	14	\$61,398	10	\$52,434	8
University of Virginia-Main Campus	\$151,911	1	\$100,656	1	\$87,930	1	\$51,399	9
Virginia Commonwealth University	\$115,443	5	\$80,154	5	\$65,997	6	\$47,367	12
Virginia Military Institute	\$84,933	12	\$60,579	15	\$53,028	15	\$38,592	15
Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University	\$121,914	4	\$85,941	4	\$77,328	2	\$48,339	11
Virginia State University	\$86,238	10	\$70,479	9	\$60,138	12	\$45,693	13

Source: IPEDS Human Resources Survey (Equated 9-Month Salaries)

Average Salaries by Rank at Commonwealth of Virginia Institutions for AY 2015-2016

Name of the University	Full Professor	Rank	Associate Professor	Rank	Assistant Professor	Rank	Instructor	Rank
Christopher Newport University	\$107,361	7	\$82,467	7	\$66,438	7	\$58,338	5
College of William and Mary	\$130,464	3	\$99,207	2	\$73,548	4	\$63,486	1
George Mason University	\$134,172	2	\$88,407	4	\$74,151	3	\$56,457	6
James Madison University	\$91,674	8	\$73,071	9	\$66,411	8	\$55,440	7
Longwood University	\$80,793	14	\$68,499	12	\$62,622	10	\$63,009	2
Norfolk State University	\$84,564	10	\$73,800	8	\$62,550	11	\$58,455	4
Old Dominion University	\$111,735	6	\$83,691	6	\$72,351	5	\$49,995	11
Radford University	\$88,812	9	\$71,604	10	\$65,808	9	\$54,189	8
The University of Virginia's College at Wise	\$61,074	15	\$54,180	15	\$43,893	15	\$37,008	15
University of Mary Washington	\$81,432	13	\$66,240	13	\$62,091	12	\$59,184	3
University of Virginia-Main Campus	\$159,066	1	\$107,037	1	\$92,043	1	\$53,892	9
Virginia Commonwealth University	\$120,150	5	\$84,906	5	\$68,643	6	\$47,727	12
Virginia Military Institute	\$84,528	11	\$64,710	14	\$50,049	14	\$40,140	14
Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University	\$128,754	4	\$91,557	3	\$82,521	2	\$51,660	10
Virginia State University	\$81,900	12	\$70,452	11	\$59,400	13	\$45,054	13

Source: IPEDS Human Resources Survey (Equated 9-Month Salaries)

Radford University still has a significant number of sections too large for high impact pedagogy

Fall 2013 Undergraduate Class Size

College	2 - 9	10 - 19	20 - 29	30 - 39	40 - 49	50 - 99	100+	Total
College of Business and Economics	7	10	23	54	15	21	2	132
College of Education and Human Development	16	63	64	26	1	4	4	178
College of Humanities and Behavioral Sciences	18	117	144	53	76	52	4	464
College of Science and Technology	16	26	62	48	49	25	5	231
College of Visual and Performing Arts	28	71	16	5	8	14	4	146
Waldron College of Health and Human Services	2	13	8	8	7	7	0	45
Not in an academic college	3	30	124	0	0	0	0	157
Total	90	330	441	194	156	123	19	1,353

Fall 2014 Undergraduate Class Size

College	2 - 9	10 - 19	20 - 29	30 - 39	40 - 49	50 - 99	100+	Total
College of Business and Economics	3	11	20	51	30	13	3	131
College of Education and Human Development	15	70	65	24	2	4	3	183
College of Humanities and Behavioral Sciences	31	115	153	63	67	48	3	480
College of Science and Technology	14	31	48	53	63	19	4	232
College of Visual and Performing Arts	35	59	21	6	4	14	4	143
Waldron College of Health and Human Services	1	13	14	1	12	5	0	46
Not in an academic college	3	25	123	0	0	0	0	151
Total	102	324	444	198	178	103	17	1,366

Recommendations

If we hope to achieve excellence as an academic institution we cannot continue to use low salaries and high teaching loads to lower the instructional cost per credit hour and while using the margin to fund other, less important, priorities. What can the Board do?

- Recommendation 1: Establish a long term compensation policy or goal. The President, Vice President of Business Affairs, Provost, and Senate can agree on the composition of a standing task force with rotating membership that would make recommendations in a report on short term and long term faculty compensation on a priority basis for an explicit Radford University policy. It would also be charged with monitoring progress toward the goal each year and also report on the long term trend. This task force would report to the senate by the end of Fall term each academic year.
- Recommendation 2: Provide enough faculty dedicated to instruction in order to maintain class sizes comparable to those of peer institutions before allocating resources to other priorities.

Passed April 27, 2017

[Return to Table of Contents.](#)

[Return to 16-17.17—Motion Regarding the Creation of a Master of Science in Finance.](#)

[Go to 16-17.19—Motion Regarding the Creation of a Merit-Raise Model.](#)

16-17.19—Motion Regarding the Creation of a Merit-Raise Model

Referred by: Faculty Senate Executive Council and Resource Allocation Committee

MOTION:

The Faculty Senate recommends the creation of an ad hoc Merit-Pay Task Force to develop recommendations for policies to be applied uniformly in years when monies for merit raises are available.

Charge: The task force will

- review the pay-raise model approved previously by the Faculty Senate,
- update recommendations for eliminating or reducing inequities resulting from inversion and compression,
- update recommendations for incorporating merit into the formula for pay-raises,
- make recommendations regarding market adjustment by discipline, and
- forward its proposed Merit-Raise Policy to the Standing Collaborative Task Force on Compensation Policy by the end of Fall term 2017.

Membership:

- Deans of the undergraduate colleges (6 members) or their designees
- Two representatives chosen by the Council of Chairs
- President of the Faculty Senate
- Chair of the Faculty Senate Resource Allocation Committee
- One full professor appointed by the FSEC*
- One associate professor appointed by the FSEC*
- One assistant professor appointed by the FSEC*

*Faculty appointed by the FSEC must be selected from colleges other than those represented by the President of the Faculty Senate and the Chair of the Faculty Senate Resource Allocation Committee.

RATIONALE:

Compression and inversion continue to be issues, and efforts should be made to allocate merit-raises in a manner that does not exacerbate compensation inequities.

For further information, see rationale under [16-17.18—Motion Regarding the Creation of a Standing Collaborative Task Force on Compensation Policy](#).

Passed April 27, 2017

[Return to Table of Contents.](#)

[Return to 16-17.18—Motion Regarding the Creation of a Standing Collaborative Task Force on Compensation Policy.](#)

[Go to 16-17.20—Motion Regarding Budget Priorities.](#)

16-17.20—Motion Regarding Budget Priorities

Referred by: Faculty Senate Executive Council and Resource Allocation Committee

MOTION:

The Faculty Senate recommends that Radford University prioritize the distribution of resources to maintain class sizes comparable to those of peer institutions.

RATIONALE:

In a time when retention is a significant issue, the university should prioritize holding the line on class sizes.

Cuseo, J. (2007). The empirical case against large class size: Adverse effects on the teaching, learning, and retention of first-year students. *Journal of Faculty Development*, 21(1), 5-21.

Budgetary constraints are creating a current climate of cost containment, within which increasing class size may be seen as a quick and convenient cost-cutting strategy. Empirical evidence suggests that there are eight deleterious outcomes associated with increasingly larger class size. This article synthesizes research relating to these eight consequences of large class size and analyzes its implications for the success of undergraduate students in general, and first-year college students in particular. The article concludes with a discussion of the implications of the reviewed research for (a) the effective education of today`s undergraduates, (b) identification of optimal class size, (c) administrative decision-making, and (d) institutional mission, priorities, and values. [ABSTRACT FROM AUTHOR]

Diette, T. M., & Raghav, M. (2015). Class size matters: Heterogenous effects of larger classes on college student learning. *Eastern Economic Journal*, 41(2), 273-283.

Colleges want to increase retention and graduation rates, but they are also under pressure to control costs. Increasing class size is a common method to reduce per student costs. This paper examines the relationship between class size and student achievement. Using data from a selective liberal arts college, we show that grades of students decrease as class size increases. Moreover, relatively vulnerable students such as first-years or those with low SAT scores experience on average larger negative effects from increases in class sizes. The findings suggest that attempts to control costs may harm students, particularly those least likely to graduate. [ABSTRACT FROM AUTHOR]

For further information, see rationale under [16-17.18—Motion Regarding the Creation of a Standing Collaborative Task Force on Compensation Policy](#).

Left on the table.

[Return to Table of Contents.](#)

[Return to 16-17.19—Motion Regarding the Creation of a Merit-Raise Model.](#)

[Go to 16-17.21—Motion Authorizing Creation of PHRE 202 and Designating It as a Disciplinary-Prefixed Equivalent to CORE 202.](#)

16-17.21—Motion Authorizing Creation of PHRE 202 and Designating It as a Disciplinary-Prefixed Equivalent to CORE 202

Referred by: Faculty Senate Executive Committee on behalf of Core Curriculum Advisory Committee

MOTION:

The Faculty Senate authorizes the creation of PHRE 202 and designates it as a disciplinary-prefixed equivalent to CORE 202.

RATIONALE:

The creation of this course and its designation as equivalent to CORE 202 is consistent with this previously approved motion:

Motion to Adopt Language in the Description of the Core Curriculum Regarding Approval of Department-Prefixed Courses as Equivalent to CORE 201 or CORE 202

Referred by: Faculty Senate Executive Council on behalf of the Core Curriculum Advisory Committee

MOTION:

Students may fulfill the CORE 201 and/or CORE 202 requirement by taking courses that have been designated as equivalent to Core 201 or 202. Each designated course

- will meet the same prerequisite requirements as the equivalent Core A course;*
- will be listed in the course offerings as counting for the equivalent Core A course; and*
- will be listed in the student's Degree Audit as meeting the requirement for the appropriate Core A course.*

RATIONALE:

On April 10, 2014, the Faculty Senate approved a Motion to Allow Departments to Develop Discipline-Based Alternatives to CORE 201 and CORE 202. This motion “direct[ed] the Core Director to issue a call for course proposals that would allow departments to develop discipline-based alternatives to Core 201 and Core 202.” The call for course proposals was duly issued and has resulted in the approval of three courses that are equivalent either to CORE 201 or CORE 202: Marketing 201, Political Science 201, and Political Science 202. This motion formalizes the role of these courses and any future such courses within the Core Curriculum and gives notice to the Registrar of the need to list and count such courses as appropriate.

For additional information, see Appendix II: 16-17.21—Motion Authorizing Creation of PHRE 202 and Designating It as a Disciplinary-prefixed Equivalent to CORE 202 in [2016-2017 Faculty Senate Motions: APPENDIX](#).

Passed April 20, 2017

[Return to Table of Contents.](#)

[Return to 16-17.20—Motion Regarding Budget Priorities.](#)

[Go to 16-17.22—Motion re Interstate Passport Initiative.](#)

16-17.22—Motion *re* Interstate Passport Initiative

Referred by: Curriculum Committee

MOTION:

The Faculty Senate proposes that Radford University join the Interstate Passport Initiative.

RATIONALE:

The purpose of the Interstate Passport Initiative is to “reduce the unnecessary repetition of academic work after students transfer with an emphasis on quality and streamlining pathways to graduation.” The Interstate Passport Initiative will make it easier for students to transfer general education credits, which will help with student retention and decrease the costs of the four-year degree.

For additional information, see Appendix IV: 16-17.22—Motion re Interstate Passport Initiative in [2016-2017 Faculty Senate Motions: APPENDIX](#).

Withdrawn April 27, 2017

[Return to Table of Contents.](#)

[Return to 16-17.21—Motion Authorizing Creation of PHRE 202 and Designating It as a Disciplinary-Prefixed Equivalent to CORE 202.](#)

[Go to 16-17.23—Motion *re* Prioritization of MS in Finance Degree.](#)

16-17.23—Motion *re* Prioritization of MS in Finance Degree

Referred by: Curriculum Committee

MOTION:

The Faculty Senate recommends the MS in Finance Degree Proposal receive priority over the other degree proposals that are currently awaiting approval by the upper administration.

RATIONALE:

By prioritizing the MS in Finance Degree Proposal, we allow this program to start in the Fall 2018 semester. Currently there are no MS Finance programs in Virginia. This would give us the opportunity to be the first in the commonwealth with this program. In addition, the MS in Finance Degree Proposal requires less funding compared to the other degree proposals currently awaiting approval by the upper administration.

Failed April 27, 2017

[Return to Table of Contents.](#)

[Return to 16-17.22—Motion *re* Interstate Passport Initiative.](#)

[Go to 16-17.24—Motion to Create an Arts Administration and Entrepreneurship Minor.](#)

16-17.24—Motion to Create an Arts Administration and Entrepreneurship Minor

Referred by: Faculty Senate Executive Council

MOTION:

The Faculty Senate approves the creation of an Arts Administration and Entrepreneurship Minor.

RATIONALE:

See Proposal Description with Rationale in [2016-2017 Faculty Senate Motions: Appendix](#) under Appendix VI: 16-17.24—Motion to Create an Arts Administration and Entrepreneurship Minor.

Withdrawn April 27, 2017

[Return to Table of Contents.](#)

[Return to 16-17.23—Motion re Prioritization of MS in Finance Degree.](#)

[Go to 16-17.25—Motion to Create School of Nursing Healthcare Track for Students in Information Technology, Business, or the Sciences.](#)

16-17.25—Motion to Create School of Nursing Healthcare Track for Students in Information Technology, Business, or the Sciences

Referred by: Faculty Senate Executive Council

MOTION:

The Faculty Senate approves the creation of a School of Nursing Healthcare Track for Students in Information Technology, Business, or the Sciences.

RATIONALE:

See Proposal Description with Rationale in [2016-2017 Faculty Senate Motions: Appendix](#) under Appendix VII: 16-17.25—Motion to Create School of Nursing Healthcare Track for Students in Information Technology, Business, or the Sciences.

Left on the table.

[Return to Table of Contents.](#)

[Return to 16-17.24—Motion to Create School of Nursing Healthcare Track for Students in Information Technology, Business, or the Sciences.](#)

[Go to 16-17.26—Motion to Add Sports Management Major and Drop Sports Administration Concentration.](#)

16-17.26—Motion to Add Sports Management Major and Drop Sports Administration Concentration

Referred by: Faculty Senate Executive Council

MOTION:

The Faculty Senate approves the Addition of a Sports Management Major and the Dropping of the Sports Administration Concentration.

RATIONALE:

See Proposal Description with Rationale in [2016-2017 Faculty Senate Motions: Appendix](#) under Appendix VIII: 16-17.26—Motion to Add Sports Management Major and Drop Sports Administration Concentration.

Withdrawn April 27, 2017

[Return to Table of Contents.](#)

[Return to 16-17.25—Motion to Create School of Nursing Healthcare Track for Students in Information Technology, Business, or the Sciences.](#)

[Go to 16-17.27—Motion to Add Allied Health Sciences Major and Drop Allied Health Sciences Concentration.](#)

16-17.27—Motion to Add Allied Health Sciences Major and Drop Allied Health Sciences Concentration

Referred by: Faculty Senate Executive Council

MOTION:

The Faculty Senate approves the Addition of an Allied Health Sciences Major and the Dropping of the Allied Health Sciences Concentration.

RATIONALE:

See Proposal Description with Rationale in [2016-2017 Faculty Senate Motions: Appendix](#) under Appendix IX: 16-17.27—Motion to Add Allied Health Sciences Major and Drop Allied Health Sciences Concentration.

Left on the table.

[Return to Table of Contents.](#)

[Return to 16-17.26—Motion to Add Sports Management Major and Drop Sports Administration Concentration.](#)

[Go to 16-17.28—Resolution in Honor of Dr. Joseph Scartelli on the Occasion of His Stepping Down as Interim Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs.](#)

16-17.28—Resolution in Honor of Dr. Joseph Scartelli on the Occasion of His Stepping Down as Interim Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs

Resolution in Honor of Dr. Joseph Scartelli

on the Occasion of His Stepping Down as

Interim Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs

WHEREAS Dr. Scartelli has served Radford University with dedication in many capacities, both as a faculty member and as an administrator, since 1981, including as Program Director of Music Therapy from 1981 to 1988 and as Dean of the College of Visual and Performing Arts from 1988 to 2009 and again from 2011 to 2014.

WHEREAS Dr. Scartelli in December of 2009 accepted the call to serve as Interim Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs, serving in that position until July of 2011,

WHEREAS Dr. Scartelli in July of 2015 again accepted the call to serve as Interim Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs,

WHEREAS as Interim Provost Dr. Scartelli has been open and responsive to faculty,

WHEREAS Dr. Scartelli has consistently made himself available to the Faculty Senate Executive Council,

WHEREAS Dr. Scartelli has consistently made himself available to the Faculty Senate, keeping its members informed and answering questions in a transparent manner,

NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED

that on behalf of the Teaching and Research Faculty of Radford University, the Faculty Senate expresses its sincere appreciation for Dr. Scartelli's service to Radford University and expresses its best wishes for his future both at the University and beyond.

Passed April 27, 2017

[Return to Table of Contents.](#)

[Return to 16-17.27—Motion to Add Allied Health Sciences Major and Drop Sports Administration.](#)

[Go to 16-17.29—Resolution in Honor of Faculty Senators Who Are Concluding Their Terms.](#)

16-17.29—Resolution in Honor of Faculty Senators Who Are Concluding Their Terms

Resolution in Honor of Faculty Senators

Who Are Concluding Their Terms

WHEREAS, our colleagues have given unselfishly of their time to represent their departments and colleges on the Faculty Senate; and

WHEREAS, our colleagues have addressed the charges assigned to their committees with great care; and

WHEREAS, our colleagues have ably fulfilled their mandate to keep their constituents informed about motions before the Faculty Senate; and

WHEREAS, our colleagues have conscientiously brought to the attention of the Faculty Senate issues of concern to their constituents; and

WHEREAS, the Faculty Senate would like to take this opportunity to express its sincere and heartfelt gratitude for our colleagues' many hours of tireless service and unselfish leadership on behalf of the faculty; now

Therefore, BE IT RESOLVED that the members of the Faculty Senate record their sincere appreciation to the individuals named below for their valuable contributions to the Faculty Senate; and

BE IT FURTHER resolved that this testimonial be made a part of the official record of this body and that a copy be presented to each of our colleagues.

Joy Caughron
Steve Childers
Paula Dawson-Downs
Kim Gainer
Rodrigo Hernandez
Laura LaRue
Jennifer Mabry
Jennifer Resor-Whicker
Amy Rubens
Neil Sigmon
Julie Temple
Anja Whittington

Dr. Carter Turner
President of the Faculty Senate

Passed April 27, 2017

[Return to Table of Contents.](#)

[Return to 16-17.28—Resolution in Honor of Dr. Joseph Scartelli on the Occasion of His Stepping Down as Interim Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs.](#)

[Go to 16-17.30—Resolution in Honor of Dr. Carter Turner for His Service as President of the Faculty Senate of Radford University.](#)

16-17.30—Resolution in Honor of Dr. Carter Turner for His Service as President of the Faculty Senate of Radford University

**Resolution in Honor of
Dr. Carter Turner for His Service
as President of the Faculty Senate of Radford University**

WHEREAS, Dr. Carter Turner has served with distinction as the President of the Faculty Senate from May 2016 through April 2017; and

WHEREAS, Dr. Turner played an important role by serving as the Faculty’s representative to the Board of Visitors; and

WHEREAS, Dr. Turner gave unselfishly of his time to advocate on behalf of the faculty with both the Administration and the Board of Visitors; and

WHEREAS, the Faculty Senate would like to take this opportunity to express its sincere and heartfelt gratitude for his many hours of tireless service and unselfish leadership on behalf of the faculty; now

Therefore, BE IT RESOLVED that the members of the Faculty Senate record their sincere appreciation to Dr. Turner for his valuable contributions to the Faculty Senate; and

BE IT FURTHER resolved that this testimonial be made a part of the official record of this body and that a copy be presented to Dr. Turner.

Passed April 27, 2017

[Return to Table of Contents.](#)

[Return to 16-17.29—Resolution in Honor of Faculty Senators Who Are Concluding Their Terms.](#)

[Go to 16-17.31—Resolution in Honor of Dr. Kim Gainer for Her Service as Secretary of the Faculty Senate of Radford University.](#)

16-17.31—Resolution in Honor of Dr. Kim Gainer for Her Service as Secretary of the Faculty Senate of Radford University

**Resolution in Honor of
Dr. Kim Gainer for Her Service as
Secretary of the Faculty Senate of Radford University**

WHEREAS, Dr. Kim Gainer has served with distinction as the Secretary of the Faculty Senate from May 2012 through April 2017; and

WHEREAS, Dr. Gainer played an essential role in allowing the Faculty Senate to conduct its business for five years; and

WHEREAS, Dr. Gainer gave unselfishly of her time to organize the business of the Faculty Senate and to keep Senators informed of such business; and

WHEREAS, the Faculty Senate would like to take this opportunity to express its sincere and heartfelt gratitude for her many hours of tireless service and unselfish leadership on behalf of the faculty; now

Therefore, BE IT RESOLVED that the members of the Faculty Senate record their sincere appreciation to Dr. Gainer for her valuable contributions to the Faculty Senate; and

BE IT FURTHER resolved that this testimonial be made a part of the official record of this body and that a copy be presented to Dr. Gainer.

E. Carter Turner
Faculty Senate President

Passed April 27, 2017

[Return to Table of Contents.](#)

[Return to 16-17.30—Resolution in Honor of Dr. Carter Turner for His Service as President of the Faculty Senate of Radford University.](#)