

MINUTES
2015-2016 Faculty Senate
October 15, 2015
Heth 014

Members present: Suzanne Ament, Ian Barland, Roann Barris, Joy Caughron, Jeffrey Chase, Steve Childers, James Collier, Jake Fox, Andrew Foy, Tim Fuhrer, Kim Gainer, Jim Gumaer, Brent Harper, Nicole Hendrix, Rhett Herman, Rodrigo Hernandez, Prahlad Kasturi, Youngmi Kim, Jerry Kopf, Mary LaLone, Laura LaRue, Jennifer Mabry, Douglas Mitchell, Johnny Moore, Monica Pazmino, Mashooq Salehin, Sandra Schneider, Susan Schoppelrey, Neil Sigmon, Andrea Stanaland, Paige Tan, Julie Temple, Paul Thomas, Cheri Triplett, Carter Turner, Amy VanKirk, Jimmy Ray Ward, Skip Watts, Jennifer Whicker, Anja Whittington

Members absent: Vickie Bierman, Brad Bizzell, Eric Du Plessis, Vince Hazleton, Katie Hilden, Abhay Kaushik, Elizabeth Lanter

Guests: Dr. Joe Scartelli, Interim Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs

- I. The meeting was called to order at 3:33 p.m.
- II. The minutes for September 17, 2015, and September 24, 2015 (Special Meeting) were approved.
- III. The Faculty Senate President gave his report.
 - a. Dr. Kopf reported that Mr. Randy Marcus, Chair of the Academic Affairs Committee of the Board of Visitors, and Dr. Javaid Siddiqi, Chair of the Business Affairs Committee, would be on campus Tuesday morning, October 20th, to meet with a number of constituent groups in Academic Affairs and that a meeting with the Faculty Senate would take place from 10:45-12:00 in Heth 22. He stated that the two BOV committees were working closely together and urged senators without class conflicts to attend.
 - b. Dr. Kopf reported that on October 8, 2015, Mr. Michael Wray, chair of the Presidential Search Committee, met with the three newly elected faculty representative to the Presidential Search Committee—Dr. Paul Thomas from CHBS, Dr. David Sallee from CEHD, and Dr. Holly Cline from CVPA.
 - c. Dr. Kopf reviewed the presentation that he made in response to the “2015 Goals—Academic Affairs/Business Affairs Committee,” a statement adopted jointly by the AAC and BAC during the September meeting of the BOV. [See below for the five joint goals and for Dr. Kopf’s corresponding PowerPoint slides.]
 - d. Dr. Kopf reported that the pay raise model approved by the Faculty Senate is not being followed with respect to the most recent pay raise. He reviewed the history and process behind the creation of the model.

IV. The Provost gave his report.

- a. Dr. Scartelli encouraged senators to participate in the forums with Mr. Marcus and Dr. Siddiqi.
- b. He stated that he was working with Chad Reed, Director of Budget and Financial Planning, and Eric Lovik, Director of Institutional Research and Assessment, on determining how to present public data, such retention data from the SCHEV.
- c. He stated that he had met with deans regarding salary adjustments and that each college developed a plan that addressed its particular issues, that each plan was merit-based at its core, and that the senate formula was discussed and taken seriously.
- d. He reported that he was working with the FSEC to move forward motions passed in previous years.
- e. In response to a question about compression and inversion, he stated that the issue should be looked at but there was no official plan in place as of yet to address it.
- f. In response to a question about Academic Program Review, one of the four BOV goals, he stated that six programs were under review for the BOV, one from each college. The BOV specified that for WCHHS and CHBS, the Nursing and the Foreign Language programs be reviewed; and CEHD, COBE, CSAT, CVPA have chosen for review Special Education, Accounting, Information Technology, and Design, respectively.

V. Committee reports

- a. Campus Environment: Dr. Fox reported that the committee would be administering the Faculty Morale Survey and was discussing whether the COACHE Survey should again be administered. Other issues being addressed by the committee include spousal hiring, career services for spouses, family leave policy, and a faculty retirement transition program. From the floor Dr. Barris requested that the committee consider improving accessibility for faculty.
- b. Curriculum: Dr. Gainer reported that the committee would be meeting with Dr. Kolajo for an update on the CLA+ and that it was looking into the issue of retention among transfer students.
- c. Faculty Issues: Dr. Barris reported that the committee was examining whether the language in the student evaluation instrument is appropriate for online classes. The committee would like to develop a survey to gather information

about faculty decisions to apply/not apply for sabbaticals, as well as how the application success rate.

- d. Governance: Dr. Childers reported that the committee is attempting to reconcile the IG Document with the decision matrix, as well as examining whether the IG Committees are up-to-date and functional.
- e. Resource Allocation: Dr. Kasturi reported that the committee is addressing the issue of a diminishing number of administrative assistants available to departments. He also reported that the committee had referred a motion on the assessment of administrative units.

VI. Old Business

- a. The Motion to Approve the Academic Program Review Process and Template, referred by the FSEC on behalf of the Academic Program Review Committee, remains on the table pending changes in response to feedback received by the APRC.

VII. New Business

- a. Motion to Recommend Assessment Plans and Programs for Administrative Units of Radford University, referred by the Resource Allocation Committee
- b. Motion re Policy and Procedures on Intellectual Property Transfer, referred by the Faculty Senate Executive Council on behalf of the Intellectual Property Committee—***Withdrawn and referred to the Faculty Issues Committee.***
- c. Motion to Eliminate Quadrennial Evaluations of Department Chairs/School Directors, referred by the Governance Committee
- d. Motion on Timeline for Student Course Evaluations, referred by the Governance Committee
- e. Motion Revising Faculty Senate By-Laws Terms of Debate, referred by the Governance Committee
- f. Motion Revising Section II of Faculty Senate Constitution, referred by the Governance Committee
- g. Motion on Faculty Senate President's Term on the Board of Visitors, referred by the Governance Committee
- h. Motion Revising Faculty Senate By-Laws for Written Petition, referred by the Governance Committee

VIII. Announcements

- a. Mr. Randy Marcus, Chair of the Academic Affairs Committee of the BOV, and Dr. Javaid Siddiqi, Chair of the Business Affairs Committee, are meeting

with members of the Faculty Senate Tuesday, October 20, 2015, from 10:45-12:00 in Heth 22.

IX. The meeting was adjourned at 4:08 p.m.

2015 Goals – Academic Affairs/Business Affairs Committee

In today's environment of diminishing state support, rising costs and increasing competition for students in higher education, universities and their governing boards must pursue innovative approaches to the unique challenges and opportunities they face.

The Academic Affairs and Business Affairs Committee's 2015-2016 goals are designed to provide Committee Members and the entire Board a deeper understanding of Radford's finances, programmatic offerings and costs, faculty compensation and tuition structures. The Committees will review and analyze this information and provide recommendations to the incoming administration for consideration as they develop the vision and strategic plan for Radford's future.

1. **Level set financial structure for all Board members** – For the Board to effectively perform its fiduciary responsibilities, all members must have comprehensive knowledge of the university's financial structure including how much revenue the university brings in, where the money comes from, what it is spent on and what non-discretionary current and future commitments exist. Richard Alvarez has agreed to give a special briefing on these issues to the full Board at the September meeting.
2. **Cost/Benefit Analysis of all Programs Offered** – To ensure Radford's academic programs are maximizing resources, meeting needs of current and prospective students and preparing our graduates for future success, the Academic Affairs Committee requests a detailed cost and benefit analysis for all programs offered.

The analysis should include, but not be limited to, a programmatic level review of costs, return on investment, student demand, completion rates, graduate outcomes, alignment with interests of target recruits and current and future workforce demands.

While the report may include appropriate contextual information, the committee expects no bias in the presentation of the data. The Academic Affairs Chairman and other committee members are available to work with the Interim Provost to refine the request and review available information in greater detail.

3. **Review of Faculty Compensation Level and Structure** – The Academic Affairs Committee requests a comprehensive review of Radford's faculty compensation structure. The review should include an overview for committee members of the current structure, pay levels, discretionary raises, requirements to achieve and benefits of tenure. The analysis should include a comparison of similar universities in similar markets and those that we compete against for faculty, not only other Virginia institutions or those in Radford's SCHEV peer cohort.

The committee should also receive information on faculty recruitment, retention and existing unfilled positions, an analysis of anticipated retirements and a gender pay equity.

Additionally, the committee requests information on other successful performance models currently utilized by other universities.

The Academic Affairs Chairman and other committee members are available to work with the Interim Provost to refine the request and review available information in greater detail.

4. **Learning Outcome Assessments** - For accreditation purposes, the faculty has to have plans for learning outcomes assessment. Essentially, this is an evaluation of what students have learned and what they can do when they graduate.

The Academic Affairs and Business Affairs Committees would like to receive high level assessment information including how student learning assessment occurs at Radford and what faculty and administration do with the resulting information. In particular, the committee members are interested in how the assessments are used to improve teaching and to improve learning, including such possibilities as re-designing curriculum, offering faculty development options, re-shaping learning goals or offering more online tutorials. Finally, based on longitudinal assessment data, do we know if the educational experience at Radford is being strengthened?

5. **Tuition Models** – To address the growing financial stresses on public institutions and student’s families, more institutions in Virginia and across the country have begun to adopt alternative tuition models.

The Business Affairs Committee requests report of the various alternative tuition models either implemented or considered by universities in Virginia or in other states. Additionally, the committee requests a report on the use of differential tuition currently at Radford programs and the potential benefits and challenges to expanding differential pricing to other programs.

The goal is for Business Affairs Committee members to be experts on tuition options, so they affectively make recommendations to the full Board.

Faculty Representative's Report to the Board of Visitors Academic Affairs' Committee

RADFORD
UNIVERSITY

Dr. Jerry Kopf, President of the Faculty Senate

Faculty Senate Executive Council 2015-2016

At the May meeting the Faculty Senate elected the following officers to serve as the Executive Council of the Faculty Senate for 2015-2016

- President: Dr. Jerry Kopf, Professor of Management
- Vice President: Dr. Carter Turner, Associate Professor and Chair, Department of Philosophy and Religion
- Secretary: Dr. Kim Gainer, Professor of English
- At large: Dr. Roann Barris, Professor and Chair, Department of Art
- At large: Dr. Susan Schoppelrey, Professor, School of Social Work

Review of 2014-15

The Senate consists of 46 members elected by each department and college on campus. A complete list of Senators can be found at:

<http://www.radford.edu/content/faculty-senate/home/contacts.html> .

Senators are assigned to one or more committees. Committees include

- Campus Environment
- Curriculum
- Faculty Issues
- Governance, and
- Resource Allocation

Review of 2014-15

- The full Senate and Committees alternate meetings every week on Thursdays during the academic year. Over the summer the Faculty Senate Executive Council (FSEC) reviews the progress reports for the previous year from each committee chair, reviews the morale surveys, seeks input from faculty and administrators, and drafts goals for each Committee for the next year. At the first meeting of the academic year each committee elects a chair and reviews and revises the goals provided by the FSEC. The committees and the FSEC add additional items as they come up during the year.

Motions adopted by the Senate 2014-2015

If committees decide action is warranted on a particular issue they develop and approve motions which are then forwarded to the full Senate for approval. Over the last year a number of topics were addressed. Motions addressed a variety of issues. Examples include motions on:

- Approval of the Core Curriculum Assessment Plan
- Approval of revisions to the General Education Goal 11 learning outcomes.
- A recommendation to form a University committee on Online Education
- Approval of policies and procedures for determining credit hours
- Establishment of written Departmental criteria for promotion and tenure
- A recommendation to enhance dual career services

Motions adopted by the Senate 2014-2015

- Approved a proposed name change for the College of Graduate Education
- Debated, but did not pass, a motion calling for a tobacco free campus
- Approved a motion with respect to providing midterm grade feedback
- Approved a MS in Athletic Training
- Approved a Certificate in Design Thinking
- Approved a Inter-professional Gerontology Certificate
- Approved a motion requesting faculty use of Health and Wellness Center
- Approved a motion to require revenue and cost budget information in curriculum proposals
- Approved a motion to amend IG Document description of Academic Program Review Committee

Motions adopted by the Senate 2014-2015

- Approved a motion to provide a means for transferring credit for courses more than ten years old
- Approved a MS in Biological and Forensic Science
- Approved a proposal for a Fall break
- Approved a proposal to clarify the faculty workload policy
- Approved a proposal to clarify the compensation policy for work outside the nine-month contract and a motion clarifying compensation for overloads
- Approved the Creation of a Doctor of Occupational Therapy Program
- Approved a motion recommending the adoption of the faculty compensation model for any raises above 2%

Motions adopted by the Senate 2014-2015

These motions are not being submitted for discussion or approval, but simply to give the Board some insight into the nature of the Senate's work and the kind of topics addressed during the preceding academic year. If approved by the Senate, the motions, as amended, are forward to the Provost or other appropriate official for consideration for implementation. If proposals require additional approval, the Provost then decides which of the proposals to submit to the President and/or the Board of Visitors for formal approval. The Board has already approved a number of the proposals but, because of the transition to a new interim Provost, we have a back log of approved motions waiting on decisions by the Provost. Dr. Scartelli and I are committed to working together to clear that back log as quickly as possible.

Faculty Perspective on Committee Goals

Cost-Benefit Analysis of all Academic Programs

Academic program review is an important, essential, continuous process that occurs constantly at the course, department, college and university level.

Determining the costs and benefits of a program is a complex process that goes to the core of the shared governance concept. Faculty feel strongly that

- under commonly accepted principles of shared governance faculty should have the primary responsibility for initiating, designing, reviewing, assessing, revising, and terminating academic courses or programs.
- faculty should have the opportunity to participate in deciding what the appropriate costs and/or benefits criteria are, how they are measured, how they are interpreted, how they are analyzed, and how they are used to make decisions.
- established, approved program review processes should be used to conduct any program cost/benefit analysis.

Faculty Perspective on Committee Goals

Review of Faculty Compensation

The faculty strongly supports the review of faculty compensation levels and strategies and appreciates the Board's willingness to address this important issue. It is the faculty's hope that the outcome of the review would be:

- A clearly defined goal consistent with SCHEV's recommendation to move faculty salaries to the 60 percentile within five years.
- A commitment to use the compensation model approved by the Senate, Provost, President, and Vice President of Business Affairs as the official faculty compensation policy because it is a rational policy consistent with best practices in HR and, over time, will address both the level of compensation, compression and equity issues, and reward meritorious performance.

Faculty Perspective on Committee Goals

Review of Student Assessment

The faculty appreciates the Board's interest in another increasingly important topic. Assessment is another continuous process that occurs daily at the course, department, college, and university level. It is important not only for accreditation purposes but for the continuous improvement of our academic courses, faculty, and programs. It is our hope that the Board will encourage active faculty participation in the review and discussion of assessment.

Faculty Perspective on Committee Goals

Review of Alternative Tuition Models, Including Differential Tuition

The faculty welcomes a discussion of innovative approaches to tuition that might lead to better support for academic programs. This is also a very complex issue with many intended and unintended potential consequences. We hope the Board will also solicit active faculty input in this discussion so we capture the best thinking of everyone involved and do the best job possible of analyzing the consequences of various tuition strategies.