Radford University
Faculty Senate Motions

2015-2016

Table of Contents

Membership of the 2015-2016 Faculty Senate

College of Business and Economics

Childers, Steve	at-large	jchilders2@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
Stanaland, Andrea	Marketing	ajstanala@radford.edu	2014-2016
Kopf, Jerry	Management	jkopf@radford.edu	2014-2016

College of Education and Human Development

Hilden, Katie	at-large	kclouse@radford.edu	2015-2017
Bizzell, Brad	at-large	bbizzell@radford.edu	2014-2016
Triplett, Cheri	at-large	cftriplet@radford.edu	2015-2017
Gumaer, James	Counselor Education	dgumaer@radford.edu	2015-2017
Pazmino, Monica	Health & Human Performance	mpazminoc@radford.edu	2014-2016
Whittington, Anja	Recreation, Parks & Tourism	awhittington@radford.edu	2015-2017
Schneider, Sandra	School of Teacher Education	sschneider@radford.edu	2014-2016

College of Humanities and Behavioral Sciences

Ament, Suzanne	at-large	seament@radford.edu	2015-2017
Mabry, Jennifer	at-large	jlmabry@radford.edu	2015-2017
Thomas, Paul	at-large	pthomas15@radford.edu	2014-2016
Collier, James	Communication	jcollier16@radford.edu	2014-2016
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	2014-2016
Moore, Johnny	History	jsmoore@radford.edu	2015-2017
Turner, Carter	Philosophy & Religion	cturner5@radford.edu	2014-2016
Paige, Tan	Political Science	etan3@radford.edu	2014-2016
Chase, Jeffrey	Psychology	jlchase@radford.edu	2014-2016
LaLone, Mary	Sociology	mlalone@radford.edu	2015-2017

College of Science and Technology

Fox, Jake	Anthropological Sciences	jfox32@radford.edu	2015-2017
Caughron, Joy	Biology	jcaughron2@radford.edu	2015-2017
Fuhrer, Tim	Chemistry	tfuhrer@radford.edu	2014-2016
Watts, Skip	Geology	cwatts@radford.edu	2014-2016
Foy, Andrew	Geospatial Science	afoy@radford.edu	2014-2016

Barland, Ian	Information Technology	ibarland@radford.edu	2014-2016
Sigmon, Neil	Mathematics/Statistics	npsigmon@radford.edu	2015-2017
Herman, Rhett	Physics	rherman@radford.edu	2014-2016

College of Visual and Performing Arts

Ward, Jimmy Ray	at-large	jward38@radford.edu	2014-2016
Barris, Roann	Art	rbarris@radford.edu	2014-2016
VanKirk, Amy	Dance & Theater/Cinema	avankirk@radford.edu	2014-2016
Temple, Julie	Interior Design & Fashion	jtemple5@radford.edu	2015-2017
Kim, Youngmi	Music	ykim6@radford.edu	2014-2016

McConnell Library

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

Waldron College of Health and Human Services

Bierman, Vicki	at-large	vbierman@radford.edu	2014-2016
Schoppelrey, Susan	at-large	sschoppel@radford.edu	2014-2016
Lanter, Elizabeth	Comm. Sciences & Disorders	elanter@radford.edu	2014-2016
LaRue, Laura	Nursing	llarue@radford.edu	2014-2016
Mitchell, Douglas	Occupational Therapy	dmmitchell@radford.edu	2015-2017
Harper, Brent	Physical Therapy	bharper2@radford.edu	2014-2016
Salehin, Mashooq	Social Work	msalehin@radford.edu	2014-2016

Governance Structure of the 2015-2016 Faculty Senate

Faculty Senate Executive Council	
President: Kopf, Jerry M.	jkopf@radford.edu
Vice President: Turner, Carter	cturner5@radford.edu
Secretary: Gainer, Kim	kgainer@radford.edu
At-large: Barris, Roann	rbarris@radford.edu
At-large: Schoppelrey, Susan	sschoppel@radford.edu

Parliamentarian	
Childers, Steve	jchilders2@radford.edu

Campus Environment Committee	
Chair: Fox, Jake	jfox32@radford.edu
Bierman, Vicky	vbierman@radford.edu
Chase, Jeffrey	jlchase@radford.edu
Lanter, Elizabeth	elanter@radford.edu
Moore, Johnny	jsmoore@radford.edu
Pazmino-Cevallos, Monica	mpazminoc@radford.edu
Salehin, Mashooq	msalehin@radford.edu
Temple, Julie	jtemple5@radford.edu

Curriculum Committee	
Chair: Gainer, Kim	kgainer@radford.edu
Fuhrer, Tim	tfuhrer@radford.edu
Harper, Brent	bharper2@radford.edu
Herman, Rhett	rherman@radford.edu
Hernandez, Rodrigo	rjhernand@radford.edu
Thomas, Paul	pthomas15@radford.edu
Triplett, Cheri	cftriplet@radford.edu
VanKirk, Amy	avankirk@radford.edu
Whicker, Jennifer	jrwhicker@radford.edu

Faculty Issues Committee	
Chair: Barris, Roann	rbarris@radford.edu

Ament, Suzanne   seament@radford.edu
Barland, Ian   ibarland@radford.edu
Du Plessis, Eric   ehduples@radford.edu
LaLone, Mary   mlalone@radford.edu
LaRue, Laura E.   llarue@radford.edu
Schneider, Sandra   sschneider@radford.edu
Stanaland, Andrea   ajstanala@radford.edu
Whittington, Anja   awhittington@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
Collier, James   jcollier16@radford.edu
Kim, Youngmi   ykim6@radford.edu
Schoppelrey, Susan   sschoppel@radford.edu
Sigmon, Neil   npsigmon@radford.edu
Turner, Carter   cturner5@radford.edu

Resource Allocation Committee

Chair: Kasturi, Prahlad   pkasturi@radford.edu
Foy, Andrew   afoy@radford.edu
Gumaer, James   dgumaer@radford.edu
Hazleton, Vince   vhazleto@radford.edu
Hendrix, Nicole   pnhendrix@radford.edu
Kaushik, Abhay   akaushik@radford.edu
Mitchell, Douglas   dmmitchell@radford.edu
Tan, Paige   etan3@radford.edu
Ward, Jimmy Ray   jward38@radford.edu
Watts, Skip   cwatts@radford.edu

Status of Motions of the 2015-2016 Faculty Senate

DATE	TITLE	SPONSOR	OUTCOME
2015			
9/3	15-16.01—Motion to Approve the Academic Program Review Process and Template	FSEC on behalf of the Academic Program Review Committee	Passed 2/4/2016
9/24	15-16.02—Motion *re* Composition of Presidential Search Committee	Paul Thomas	Passed 9/24/2015; rules suspended to permit debate
9/24	15-16.03—Motion on the Presidential Search Process	Kim Gainer	Passed 9/24/2015; rules suspended to permit debate
10/15	15-16.04—Motion to Recommend Assessment Plans for Administrative Units and Academic Support Services That Focus on Learning Outcomes and Radford University's Academic Mission	Resource Allocation Committee	Passed as amended 2/18/2016 (originally introduced as *Motion to Recommend Assessment Plans and Programs for Administrative Units of Radford University*)
10/15	15-16.05: Motion *re* Policy and Procedures on Intellectual Property Transfer	FSEC on behalf of the Intellectual Property Committee	Withdrawn and referred to the Faculty Issues Committee 10/15/2016
10/15	15-16.06: Motion to Eliminate Quadrennial Evaluations of Department Chairs/School Directors	Governance Committee	Withdrawn 4/21/2016
10/15	15-16.07: Motion on Timeline for Student Course Evaluations	Governance Committee	Passed 10/29/2015 Reconsidered 4/21/2016 [word changed in light of passage of a later motion]
10/15	15-16.08: Motion Revising Faculty Senate By-Laws Terms of Debate	Governance Committee	Passed 10/29/2015
10/15	15-16.09: Motion Revising Section II of Faculty Senate Constitution	Governance Committee	Passed 10/29/2015
10/15	15-16.10: Motion on Faculty Senate President's Term on the Board of Visitors	Governance Committee	Passed 10/29/2015
10/15	15-16.11: Motion Revising Faculty Senate By-Laws for Written Petition	Governance Committee	Passed 10/29/2015
12/3	15-16-12: Motion *re* Choice of Optional Retirement Plans	Moved from the floor	Passed 12/3/2015; rules suspended to permit debate

2016			
2/4	15-16.13: Motion to Approve Graduate Certificate in Professional Writing	Curriculum Committee	Passed 2/18/2016
2/4	15-16.14: Motion to Approve Psychiatric Mental Health Practitioner (PMHNP) Graduate Certificate	Curriculum Committee	Passed 2/4/2016; rules suspended to permit debate
2/18	15-16.15: Motion to Create Classification of Senior Instructor	Governance Committee	Withdrawn 4/21/2016
2/18	15-16.16: Motion on Pay Raise with Promotion to Senior Instructor	Governance Committee	Withdrawn 4/21/2016
2/18	15-16.17: Motion for Changes to the Protocol for Administering Evaluations	Faculty Issues Committee	Passed as amended 3/3/2016
2/18	15-16.18: Motion on the Timing of Student Evaluations	Faculty Issues Committee	Passed as amended 3/3/2016
3/3	15-16.19: Motion re the Hiring of Administrative assistants	Resource Allocation Committee	Passed 3/24/2016
3/3	15-16.20: Motion re the Creation of the Category of Professor of Practice Faculty	Governance Committee	Motion failed 3/24/2016
3/3	15-16.21: Motion to Suspend Faculty Morale Survey in Coache Years	Campus Environment Committee	Passed 3/24/2016
3/24	15-16.22: Motion re Extension of Course Withdrawal Deadline	FSEC on behalf of the Academic Policies and Procedures Committee	Passed 4/7/2016
3/24	15-16.23: Motion re Suspension and Readmission	FSEC on behalf of the Academic Policies and Procedures Committee	Passed 4/7/2016
3/24	15-16.24: Internal Governance Committees Motion 1: Replacement of GeCAC with CCAC	Governance Committee	Passed 4/7/2016
3/24	15-16.25: Internal Governance Committees Motion 2: Add Committee on Online Instruction	Governance Committee	Withdrawn 4/7/2016
3/24	15-16.26: Internal Governance Committees Motion 3: Change to Campus Engagement Committee Status	Governance Committee	Motion failed 4/7/2016
3/24	15-16.27: Internal Governance Committees Motion 4: Annual Reports to FSEC	Governance Committee	Passed 4/21/2016
3/24	15-16.28: Internal Governance Committees Motion 5: Non-faculty-	Governance Committee	Withdrawn 4/21/2016

	related IG Committees		
3/24	15-16.29: Motion to Change Performance Outcome Categories	Governance Committee	Passed 4/21/2016
3/24	15-16.30: Motion *re* Addition of STAT 130 to Core Curriculum	Curriculum Committee	Passed 3/24/2016; rules suspended to permit debate
3/24	15-16.31: Motion *re* Updating of Core Curriculum Learning Objectives for CLSS 110 and CSST 110	Curriculum Committee	Passed 3/24/2016; rules suspended to permit debate
3/24	15-16.32: Motion *re* Changing the Prerequisites for MATH 126	Curriculum Committee	Passed 3/24/2016; rules suspended to permit debate
3/24	15-16.33: Motion *re* Movement of Topic from MATH 152 to MATH 151	Curriculum Committee	Passed 3/24/2016; rules suspended to permit debate
4/7	15-16.34: Motion to Support the Creation of a BS in Biomedical Forensic Science	Curriculum Committee	Passed 4/21/2016
4/21	15-16.35: Motion to Approve Bachelor of Science in Computer and Cyber Science	Curriculum Committee	Passed 4/28/2016
4/21	15-16.36: Motion to Approve Accounting Certificate	Curriculum Committee	Passed 4/28/2016
4/21	15-16.37: Motion to Approve Doctor of Education, as Revised	Curriculum Committee	Passed 4/28/2016
4/21	15-16.38: Motion to Approve Changes in Courses Eligible for Credit under the Core Curriculum	Curriculum Committee	Passed 4/21/2016; rules suspended to permit debate
4/21	15-16.39: Motion to Establish a Long-Term Compensation Policy or Goal	Resource Allocation Committee	Passed 4/28/2016
4/21	15-16.40: Motion *re* Promotional Pay Raises	Resource Allocation Committee	Passed 4/28/2016
4/21	15-16.41: Motion to Increase the Travel-Reimbursement Limit	Resource Allocation Committee	Passed 4/28/2016
4/21	15-16.42: Resolution in Honor of President Penelope W. Kyle	Faculty Senate Executive Council	Passed 4/21/2016; rules suspended to permit debate
4/28	15-16.43: Motion to Approve Changes to ECON 205	Faculty Senate Executive Council	Passed 4/28/2016; rules suspended to permit debate
4/28	15-16.44: Resolution in Honor of Departing Members of the Board of Visitors	Faculty Senate Executive Council	Passed 4/28/2016; rules suspended to permit debate
4/28	15-16.45: Resolution in Honor of Faculty Senators Who Are Concluding Their Terms	Faculty Senate Executive Council	Passed 4/28/2016; rules suspended to permit debate
4/28	15-16.46: Resolution in Honor of Dr. Roann Barris for Her Service to the	Faculty Senate Executive Council	Passed 4/28/2016; rules suspended to

	Faculty Senate		permit debate
4/28	15-16.47: Resolution in Honor of Dr. Jerry Kopf for His Service as President of the Faculty Senate of Radford	Faculty Senate Executive Council	Passed 4/28/2016; rules suspended to permit debate

Return to Table of Contents.

10

15-16.01—Motion to Approve the Academic Program Review Process and Template

Referred by: FSEC on behalf of the Academic Program Review Committee

MOTION:

The Faculty Senate recommends the approval of the proposed process for Academic Program Review and the accompanying template.

PROCESS:

Policy and Process for Academic Program Review during the 2016-2020 Cycle Spring 2015

As part of our internal governance process and in response to our institutional accreditor's (SACS) standards, the Academic Program Review Committee (APRC) formally reviews each undergraduate and graduate program on a 5- year cycle. We also review how we do academic program assessments and try to improve the process and its utility.

Last year the APRC examined the review process and developed a modified model. To set the stage for the revised APRC process, a subgroup of the APRC met over the summer 2014 and reviewed best practices followed by other campuses, got feedback from the upper administration, and settled on some foundational principles. These being:

What is the purpose of Academic Program Review?

1. Critical assessment (including external contexts) in order to articulate future direction and to identify existing and potential paths toward excellence.
2. Provide evidence that the program is meeting goals established by faculty based on university, state, societal, disciplinary needs and goals.
3. Measure and analyze overall productivity and quality of performance (teaching, research and scholarship, service, patient care, etc.).
4. Guide decisions regarding program funding, continuation.

Rules of Engagement

Academic Program Review will:

1. Be forward looking.
2. Be participatory--- meaningful to faculty.
3. Include external contexts (the discipline; benchmarking; peer review).
4. Be feasible, manageable, efficient (e.g., not duplicative).
5. Contribute to decision-making: result in actionable recommendations.
   a. Could include a New Budget Initiative for pursuing program excellence.
   b. Integrate assessment/evaluation, strategic planning and budget planning processes.

The Process

The revised process maintains many elements of the previous process but differs from the past practice in a couple of significant ways.

Programs that undergo national disciplinary accreditation will use a modified version of the Academic Program Review template. So as not to be duplicative, accredited programs, rather than complete the full program review template, will refer the APRC to the page or the link of their accreditation self-study/report where the APRC can locate the relevant information. If the accreditation report is silent on an item in the template, the program will provide the relevant information to the Committee. The rationale behind this change is to allow for a comparative assessment of programs, both accredited and unaccredited, based on the same metrics. If the program review process is to be used in recommending resource increases or reductions, a comparative program by program analysis is necessary.

Those programs without national accreditation in addition to completing the template will be given the opportunity and provided resources from the Provost's Office to bring in an external disciplinary peer to review their programs as part of their program review. The rationale behind this recommendation is that, since accredited programs are expected to have external reviewers as part of their processes, unaccredited programs should have the same opportunity. Second, an external peer may provide new insights and approaches that may make a program better. The standard way these peers are identified is for the program/chair/dean to forward three to five names to the Provost who selects from that list.

Sections 1 – 5 of the template are essentially the same from the previous template. Section 3 asks programs to respond to data provided by the Office of Institutional Research as is current practice and Section 4 relies on data developed in conjunction with the Office of Assessment and is current practice. One addition to Section 4 asks programs to report on what they are doing to assist students in courses with high D, W and F rates.

The major changes to this process compared to the previous process are the elements of strategic forward thinking and explicit resource requests. Section 6 is added to allow programs to explicitly state what their facilities and resource needs are since the former template did not have that element. Sections 7 and 8 ask the departments to do an environmental scan of their disciplines and think about how they might respond to those emerging disciplinary issues and developments.

A new organizational development in the evaluation process is the continuation of the Institutional Effectiveness Day held at the beginning of fall semester to focus on program and learning assessment across campus. While the planning for the day is still underway, it is anticipated that one part of the day will be an opportunity for each department to meet as a group and focus on its data provided by the Office of Institutional Research and Office of Assessment regarding productivity and achievement of learning outcomes. The goal here is to provide an opportunity for each academic unit to look internally and assess where the program is and how it may be enhanced.

2015 Annual Report Response Template

1 PROGRAM INFORMATION

1.1 Brief overview of the program
1.2 Mission statement for the program
1.3 Describe the program's relationship to other RU programs (e.g., courses support the core curriculum and/or professional programs; an interdisciplinary program is developed with other departments; etc.)

2 RESPONSES TO PREVIOUS PROGRAM REVIEW RECOMMENDATIONS

2.1 Itemize each major recommendation and describe the program's response to those recommendations.

3 PROGRAM PRODUCTIVITY AND SUSTAINABILITY ANALYSIS

3.1 Enrollment
3.2 Degree productivity
3.3 Measures of program quality (may include but are not limited to: student performance on licensure/certification exams; job placement of graduates; graduate school placement; alumni and employer survey results; student conference presentations and publications, community engagement practices, etc.)
3.4 What do the data tell you regarding the productivity and sustainability of your program?
3.5 What actions or initiatives will you implement based upon that analysis?

4 STUDENT LEARNING AND ENGAGEMENT

4.1 Briefly describe the means of assessing student learning outcomes. Means of assessing outcomes may include but are not limited to standardized tests, capstone course/program examinations, analyses of theses, portfolios and recitals, etc.
4.2 Briefly describe the plan used to assess and improve the program on an on-going basis.
4.3 Summarize improvements made as a result of the improvement plan.
4.4 For courses with high D, F, W rates, what is the department doing to improve retention in those specific courses.

5 FACULTY SCHOLARLY AND SERVICE ACTIVITIES

5.1 Teaching productivity and activities designed to enhance teaching and the curriculum
5.2 Research productivity
5.3 Service, including service to public schools and the community
5.4 Plans to enhance faculty development across th e program including such things as acquiring more reassigned time for scholarly activities, workshop participation, mentoring programs, etc.

6 FACILITIES AND RESOURCES

6.1 Address the adequacy of resources and support services needed to implement the goals and objectives of the program. These could include: library resources; laboratories; equipment; space needs; support personnel; faculty; and/or other resources.

7 DISCIPLINARY TRENDS AFFECTING THE PROGRAM

7.1 Briefly describe emerging issues and trends in the discipline
7.2 Examine how internal factors (e.g., current environment, program strengths and weaknesses, etc.), as well as external factors (e.g., economic, environment, demographic, technological, social, legal, governmental/political, competitive, etc.) could impact achievement of program goals, objectives and expected outcomes given these disciplinary trends.

8 RECOMMENDATIONS

8.1 Identify areas for improvement of the program which are within the control of the program, including curricular changes if appropriate and/or recommendations for changes that require action at the Dean, Provost or higher levels.

Passed February 4, 2016

15-16.02—Motion *re* Composition of Presidential Search Committee

Introduced by: Paul Thomas

Whereas shared governance is a long recognized method of achieving balance between administrative and faculty participation in university decision making processes;

Whereas the selection of a university president is one of the most momentous decisions affecting faculty and the university;

Whereas the current seventeen-member Presidential Search Committee only has three faculty representatives and therefore only three of our six colleges are represented;

Be it resolved that in order to achieve better faculty representation that the Presidential Search Committee be expanded to include one additional faculty member from each undergraduate college not currently represented.

Passed September 24, 2015

15-16.03—Motion on the Presidential Search Process

Introduced by: Kim Gainer

Whereas the selection of a new president is one of the most important tasks a University can undertake, upon which the future of the institution depends;

Whereas shared governance is a long recognized method of achieving balance between administrative and faculty participation in university decision-making processes, such as the selection of a new president;

Whereas the substantive and effective participation of the faculty and other stakeholders in this process is necessary to insure that the academic, intellectual, cultural, educational, and institutional values of a university are adequately represented;

Whereas the perception of this process as one that is open, transparent, democratic and inclusive is important to the success of the new President once he or she becomes part of the Radford University community;

Whereas the present completely confidential search process compromises shared governance and limits participation of all stakeholders in this momentous decision;

Be it resolved:

The Faculty Senate recommends that the presidential search process provide opportunities for stakeholders—including students, faculty, staff, and alumni—to meet the finalists and convey their assessment of each candidate to the Search Committee. These opportunities will be public fora at which candidates make statements and audience members pose questions, after which stakeholders may communicate their viewpoints to the Search Committee.

Passed September 24, 2015

15-16.04—Motion to Recommend Assessment Plans for Administrative Units and Academic Support Services That Focus on Learning Outcomes and Radford University's Academic Mission

Referred by: Resource Allocation Committee

Whereas the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools (SACS) mandates institutions identify expected outcomes, assess the extent to which it achieves these outcomes, and provide evidence of improvement based on analysis of the results for education programs, administrative units, and other support units (SACS Accreditation Standard 3.3.1);

Whereas administrative units and academic support services, such as the Library, Student Affairs, Financial Aid, Facilities Management, Information Technology and Human Resources make a contribution to student learning on campus, whether the impact on student learning is direct or indirect;

Whereas the rationale for assessment is to provide meaningful and useful data, that can be used to measure and improve learning outcomes;

Whereas the adoption of a transparent assessment reporting process for the whole university would maximize the impact and effectiveness of such units on the educational performance of the university;

Be it resolved:

First Resolution:
The Faculty Senate recommends that all administrative units and academic support services of the university as defined by the offices under the RU Organizational Chart [1], develop and implement assessment programs that directly address improving ~~learning~~ educational outcomes and supporting the University's academic mission. The assessment plans should emphasize the articulation of mission relevant goals and objectives, the development of metrics useful in determining unit performance, and how these performance indicators have a clear bearing on student success, and.

Second Resolution:
The Faculty Senate recommends the President of Radford University annually submit to the Board of Visitors and Faculty Senate a report concerning effectiveness and improvement of administrative units and academic support services.

Passed as amended February 18, 2016

For organizational chart of Radford University, see Appendix I in Radford University Faculty Senate Motions 2015-2016: Appendix.

15-16.05—Motion *re* Policy and Procedures on Intellectual Property Transfer

Referred by: FSEC on behalf of the Intellectual Property Committee

MOTION:

The Faculty Senate recommends the adoption of the attached document, "Radford University Intellectual Property: Policies and Procedures on Intellectual Property Transfer," as approved by the Intellectual Property Committee on September, 30, 2015.

SEE APPENDIX II: RADFORD UNIVERSITY INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY: POLICIES AND PROCEDURES ON INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY TRANSFER.

Withdrawn and referred to the Faculty Issues Committee October 15, 2015

For proposal, see Appendix II in Radford University Faculty Senate Motions 2015-2016: Appendix.

15-16.06—Motion to Eliminate Quadrennial Evaluations of Department Chairs/School Directors

Referred by: Governance Committee

MOTION:

The Faculty Senate recommends the following revisions to the *Teaching and Research Faculty Handbook* (deletions in strikethrough, insertions in red):

Section 1.3.2.1: Term of Service as Department Chair or School Director

~~Department Chairs and School Directors will be appointed for renewable four-year terms. During the spring of the third year, an in-depth formal evaluation shall be conducted by the Dean in consultation with the faculty of the department or school. (See section 1.4.2, evaluation of Chairs and Directors.) Terms of Department Chairs and School Directors may be renewed, with additional in-depth evaluations to take place in the third year of each term.~~

Continuation in the role as Department Chair or School Director shall be based on the Chair/Director's enjoying the continued trust and confidence of the faculty and Dean as reflected in the evaluations of the Chair or Director by the department faculty and by the Dean. As described in section 1.4.2 of this Handbook, annual evaluations of Department Chairs and School Directors by departmental faculty and by the Dean shall be based on the responsibilities and annual goals, shall identify specific weakness, if any, and recommendations for improvement.

Whenever weaknesses are identified in a final, signed evaluation as serious, either by the department faculty or by the Dean, the chair or director shall develop a plan for improvement and a reasonable time line, to be approved by the Dean in consultation with the department faculty, as deemed appropriate by the Dean. In the event that improvement is not satisfactorily effected within the time line, the Dean, in consultation with the department faculty, may recommend an alternative plan and time line or shall recommend to the Provost removal of the chair or director.

Section 1.4.2: Evaluation of Department Chairs and School Directors

A. Annual Evaluation

The Department/School Personnel Committee shall evaluate the Department Chair or School Director annually in two separate evaluations, one as a faculty member and one as chair or director. Both evaluations shall be conveyed to both the Department Chair or School Director and the College Dean. The College Dean shall review the Personnel Committee's evaluation of the Department Chair or School Director as a faculty member, and shall separately evaluate him or her as a chair or director, subject to review by the Provost.

Evaluations of Department Chairs or School Directors shall be prepared annually in writing before the end of the spring semester. The primary purpose of the evaluation will be to provide guidance for development and to provide assessment for decisions related to merit pay and continuation in the role. ~~These annual evaluations will be available for consideration by the~~

Dean during the detailed review that will be conducted during the third year of each Chair's or Director's four-year term.

Section 1.4.2: Evaluation of Department Chairs and School Directors

B. Quadrennial Evaluation ---This section shall be struck in toto.

Every four years, in spring of the third year of the Department Chair's or School Director's four-year term, in lieu of the annual evaluation as chair or director described in section A, an in-depth formal evaluation as chair or director shall be conducted by the Dean in consultation with the faculty of the department or school. (The policies and procedures affecting the annual evaluation of the Chair or Director as faculty member will not change.)

1. Prior to the quadrennial evaluation of the Chair or Director, each Chair or Director shall prepare and distribute to all faculty within the department or school a quadrennial report summarizing his or her accomplishments related to responsibilities as Chair or Director, and with reference to the attainment of goals established for the previous four-year period.

2. The criteria for evaluation as Chair or Director shall reflect the duties and responsibilities of the chair or director as listed in section 4.2.3.1 of this Handbook. The Department/School Personnel Committee shall circulate to all faculty of the department a Department Chair/School Director evaluation form based upon these evaluation criteria and shall include an appropriate place for an overall evaluation of the Chair or Director during his/her current four-year term. The forms will be completed and returned to the Department/School Personnel Committee.

3. Data and comments from the faculty evaluations shall be summarized by the Department/School Personnel Committee. The Department/School Personnel Committee shall then evaluate the Department Chair/School Director as a faculty member (during the current year) and separately as a chair (over the past four years), in tentative evaluations to be sent to the Department Chair or School Director. In completing the quadrennial evaluation, the Department/School Personnel Committee should take into account the Chair or School Director's annual evaluations for the previous three years. The letter or memorandum prepared by the Department/School Personnel Committee for this evaluation should be addressed to the Dean and copied to the Chair/Director.

4. Each Chair or Director will be given the opportunity to respond to both of the Personnel Committee's tentative evaluations of the Chair or Director -- as a faculty member and as a Chair or Director -- before the finalized evaluations are forwarded to the Dean. The appeal procedures shall be the same as those described for faculty.

5. The Department/School Personnel Committee's summary and overall evaluations of the Department Chair or Director as a faculty member and as a chair or director shall be forwarded to the College Dean. All data used by the Personnel Committee shall be made available to the College Dean.

6. A minority report signed by all concurring faculty may be written if either or both of the Personnel Committee's evaluations are unacceptable to a minority of the committee

members. A minority report is seen as an exception rather than standard procedure and shall include a justification for its creation. The minority report shall be submitted to the Dean as a separate document, and shall be included with the Personnel Committee's evaluations. A copy shall be sent to the Chair or Director.

7. If the Dean disagrees with the Department/School Personnel Committee's evaluation of the Chair or Director as a faculty member in his review thereof, she or he shall give the Department Chair or School Director and Personnel Committee Chair a written statement of the reason(s) for the disagreement. The Department Personnel Committee may seek clarification from the Dean on any points of perceived disagreement.

8. The Dean shall meet with the Chair or Director to discuss his/her accomplishments and goals as Chair or Director. At this time, the Dean and Chair or Director can initiate a preliminary discussion of the goals the Chair or Director anticipates setting for him/herself as Chair or Director and for the department or school for the next four years.

9. The Dean shall communicate his or her evaluation of the Department Chair or School Director as a chair or director to the Department Chair or School Director in writing. Included in this evaluation shall be a recommendation to the Provost regarding reappointment of the Chair or Director for another four-year term. The Department Chair or School Director shall have the opportunity to respond in writing to his or her evaluation as chair or director prior to the Dean's communication of a final evaluation to the Personnel Committee and to the Provost.

10. The College Dean shall forward her or his evaluation of the Department Chair or School Director as a chair or director, including the Dean's recommendation for reappointment of the chair or director for another term, together with the evaluation of that role by the Department/School Personnel Committee, to the Provost, with copies sent to the Department Chair and to the Department Personnel Committee. In a case of a departure by the Dean from the evaluation by the Personnel Committee, the Committee may seek clarification from the Dean on the reason(s) for the departure.

11. The College Dean's evaluation of the Department Chair or School Director as a chair, and all pertinent data including any written responses from the Chair or Director and/or the Personnel Committee, shall be reviewed by the Provost, who shall provide written justification for any disagreement with the Dean's evaluation. In the event of disagreement by the Department Chair or School Director with the Dean's evaluation of him or her as chair or director or with the Dean's recommendation regarding reappointment for another term, the Provost shall render a decision in the matter.

12. If the Chair or Director wishes to appeal either his or her annual evaluation as faculty member or his or her quadrennial evaluation as chair or director, or the review(s) thereof by the Dean or the Provost, respectively, the process followed shall be consistent with that for faculty appeals. The final evaluations of the Department Chair or School Director both as a faculty member and as a chair or director, following any possible appeals, become part of the Department Chair's or School Director's personnel file, and shall serve as the basis for merit pay increases, for any possible reappointment, tenure, or promotion, and for decisions on retention as Department Chair or School Director.

13. ~~Chairs/Directors who are reappointed for subsequent four-year terms must submit for the review and approval of the Dean written copies of the of the goals they have established for themselves as chairs/deans and of their departments/schools during their next term. These goals must be submitted to the Dean by May 15 of the year of the quadrennial review. The degree to which these goals are fulfilled shall be assessed as part of the Chair's/Director's next quadrennial evaluation.~~

RATIONALE:

Quadrennial evaluations of Chairs/Directors were instituted more than five years ago. Chairs have reported that the process is burdensome and duplicates the information provided on their annual reports. Deans have likewise not embraced the quadrennial review process.

A motion was passed by the Faculty Senate on April 11, 2013 to accomplish two things:
1. Institute a set term of four years for department chairs and school directors, and
2. Eliminate the quadrennial evaluation

The Provost declined to take this motion forward to the Board of Visitors. Arguments against a set term (four-year renewable terms) included: lack of support among chairs and directors and the fact that departmental faculty can, at any time, hold a vote of "no confidence" in a chair or direct and request their removal.

The present motion drops item 1 from above (institute a set term) but still eliminates the quadrennial evaluation. The removal of the quadrennial evaluation is in response to feedback from Deans, department chairs, and directors stating that it was burdensome and was not providing information different from what is provided in their annual reports.

Withdrawn April 21, 2016

15-16.07—Motion on Timeline for Student Course Evaluations

Referred by: Governance Committee

MOTION:

The Faculty Senate recommends the following changes to the *T&R Faculty Handbook* related to the timeline for student course evaluations.

Current Language:
Section 1.4.1.4.2 Evaluation Procedures for Special Purpose, Full-time Temporary, and Part-time Faculty
…
The Personnel Committee shall administer student evaluations of special purpose and full-time temporary faculty between the twelfth and the fourteenth weeks of the semester for all courses, every semester. The appeals procedures shall also be the same as for tenure-track faculty.
….
Proposed Revision:
Section 1.4.1.4.2 Evaluation Procedures for Special Purpose, Full-time Temporary, and Part-time Faculty
…
The Personnel Committee shall administer student evaluations of special purpose**,** and full-time temporary**, and part-time** faculty between the ~~twelfth~~ **thirteenth** and the fourteenth weeks of the semester for all courses, every semester. The appeals procedures shall also be the same as for tenure-track faculty.
...
RATIONALE:

The *Handbook* currently specifies that student course evaluations must be conducted between the eleventh and fourteenth weeks of the semester for tenured and tenure-track faculty (Section 1.4.1.3, item 1). The Handbook later specifies that student course evaluations must be conducted between the twelfth and fourteenth weeks for special purpose, full-time temporary, and part-time faculty. This creates unnecessary complexity for Personnel Committees. The proposed revision extends the timeline for special purpose, full-time temporary, and part-time faculty to the eleventh to fourteenth weeks of the semester to be consistent with the timeline for tenured and tenure-track faculty.

In addition, Section 1.4.1.4.2 specifies "Part-Time Faculty" in the title of this section, but this group is not included in the handbook language. The change inserts "part-time faculty" in the first sentence of this section to rectify this error.

Passed October 29, 2015
Reconsidered April 21, 2016
[word changed in light of
passage of a later motion]

15-16.08—Motion Revising Faculty Senate By-Laws Terms of Debate

Referred by: Governance Committee

MOTION:

The Faculty Senate recommends the following language be added after item 11 of the *By-Laws* of the Radford University Faculty Senate to codify terms of debate.

Proposed Addition:
Initial arguments by the presenter of a motion shall be limited to five minutes. Subsequent discussion of motions shall be limited to three minutes per speaker. A Senator may speak twice to a motion, but may only take her or his second turn after everyone else has had the opportunity to speak.

RATIONALE:

Rarely do arguments for motions currently extend beyond this time limit, and often motions are made to limit arguments. This *By-Law* change will, in effect, codify current practices.

Passed October 29, 2015

15-16.09—Motion Revising Section II of Faculty Senate Constitution

Referred by: Governance Committee

MOTION:

The Faculty Senate recommends the following changes to the *Constitution* of the Radford University Faculty Senate to remove duplicate language in Section II.

Current Language:

II. OFFICERS/EXECUTIVE COUNCIL OF THE FACULTY SENATE

The offices of the Faculty Senate shall consist of the following: President, Vice President, Secretary, Parliamentarian, and two at-large members to the Executive Council of the Faculty Senate. Other offices may be established by majority vote of the Senate as they may be advisable or necessary. The Executive Council of the Faculty Senate shall consist of the President, Vice-President, Secretary, and two at-large members.

The offices of the Faculty Senate shall consist of the following: President, Vice President, Secretary, Parliamentarian, and two at-large members to the Executive Council of the Faculty Senate. Other offices may be established by majority vote of the Senate as they may be advisable or necessary. The Executive Council of the Faculty Senate shall consist of the President, Vice-President, Secretary, and two at-large members.

Proposed Revision (eliminate duplicate paragraph):
The offices of the Faculty Senate shall consist of the following: President, Vice President, Secretary, Parliamentarian, and two at-large members to the Executive Council of the Faculty Senate. Other offices may be established by majority vote of the Senate as they may be advisable or necessary. The Executive Council of the Faculty Senate shall consist of the President, Vice President, Secretary, and two at-large members.

RATIONALE:

The change is necessary to remove duplicate language.

Passed October 29, 2015

15-16.10—Motion on Faculty Senate President's Term on the Board of Visitors

Referred by: Governance Committee

MOTION:

The Faculty Senate recommends the following changes to the *Constitution* of the Radford University Faculty Senate.

Current Language:

III. DUTIES OF THE OFFICERS OF THE FACULTY SENATE

The President of the Faculty Senate shall preside at all meetings. He or she is empowered to call special meetings as hereinafter provided. The President is an ex officio member of all Faculty Senate committees. The President of the Faculty Senate and the At-Large Members of the Executive Council shall serve as Radford's representatives to the State Faculty Senate. In this particular capacity, these representatives will serve through the annual spring meeting of the State Faculty Senate of the year following their election.

Proposed Addition (add to end of Section V):

The President of the Radford University Faculty Senate shall serve as faculty representative on the Board of Visitors. For a newly elected president elected during the initial Senate organizational meeting, his/her term as the faculty representative on the Board of Visitors shall begin on July 1 following their election. The Faculty Senate President shall serve no more than two consecutive terms as faculty representative to the Board of Visitors. If the same individual serves more than two terms as Faculty Senate President, the faculty representative to the Board shall be appointed from a list of three faculty members submitted to the Board of Visitors by the Faculty Senate. Should the faculty representative resign as Faculty Senate President during his/her term on the Board of Visitors, the new senate president shall fill the remaining term on the Board of Visitors for the individual who resigned. In the event that an individual assumes the role as faculty representative on the Board of Visitors for a period of 180 days or more, that period will count as one full term on the Radford University Board of Visitors.

RATIONALE:

These changes are being made to ensure the Constitution is consistent with the revised By-Laws of the Board of Visitors. In addition, the changes create continuity of representation to the BOV by ensuring that the term of the Faculty Senate President coincides with the term of other members of the Board of Visitors (that is, it begins on July 1). A Senate President who is elected in late April or early May cannot be expected, if she or he is new to the position, to represent the faculty at the May meeting of the Board of Visitors.

Passed October 29, 2015

15-16.11—Motion Revising Faculty Senate By-Laws for Written Petition

Referred by: Governance Committee

MOTION:

The Faculty Senate recommends the following language be added after item 10 of the *By-Laws* of the Radford University Faculty Senate to clarify what constitutes a "written petition."

Proposed Addition:
Delivery of written petitions may be physical or electronic. Petitions should describe the problem, the action you want taken, and an electronic signature by signees including signee name, department, and email address. A rolling forward email (showing all prior replies) containing an itemized affirmation and agreement to the petition by each supporter may substitute for electronic signatures.

RATIONALE:

The Faculty Senate Constitution allows for petition in several instances, though no formal definition exists. Generally, when a petition is sought, the issue can be considered of "high importance." A lack of clarification makes it possible for rulings to be made that would stifle minority voices.

Passed October 29, 2016

15-16.12—Motion *re* Choice of Optional Retirement Plans

Moved from the floor

Given that TIAA-CREF and Fidelity are two of the largest and highest rated faculty retirement programs and that the vast majority of faculty in Virginia are enrolled in one or the other, and given that other universities are being allowed to continue to use current plans, Radford University faculty would like to retain the same option that other faculty in the state enjoy and strongly oppose being forced to use ICMA.

Passed December 3, 2015

15-16.13—Motion to Approve Graduate Certificate in Professional Writing

Referred by: Curriculum Committee

MOTION:

The Faculty Senate recommends the approval of the proposal for a Graduate Certificate in Professional Writing.

RATIONALE:

For proposal, see Appendix III in Radford University Faculty Senate Motions 2015-2016: Appendix.

Passed February 18, 2016

15-16.14—Motion to Approve Psychiatric Mental Health Practitioner (PMHNP) Graduate Certificate

Referred by: Curriculum Committee

MOTION:

The Faculty Senate recommends the approval of the proposal for a Psychiatric Mental Health Practitioner (PMHN) Graduate Certificate.

RATIONALE:

For proposal, see Appendix IV in Radford University Faculty Senate Motions 2015-2016: Appendix.

<div align="right">Passed February 4, 2016</div>

Return to Table of Contents.

Return to 15-16.13—Motion to Recommend Assessment Plans for Administrative Units and Academic Support Services That Focus on Learning Outcomes and Radford University's Academic Mission.

Go to 15-16.15—Motion to Eliminate Quadrennial Evaluations of Department Chairs/School Directors.

15-16.15—Motion to Create Classification of Senior Instructor

Referred by: Governance Committee

MOTION:

The Faculty Senate recommends the creation of the classification of Senior Instructor for Special Purpose faculty who have not attained their terminal degree. These Special Purpose faculty will have the option of applying for promotion to this new classification after six years of successful employment. Upon receiving this promotion, the Senior Instructor will receive a contract that is renewable after every three years of service, instead of the year-to-year contract renewals offered under the current system for Special Purpose faculty. The Senior Instructor will retain the same service responsibilities previously held as a Special Purpose faculty member but with higher status.

In order to create the classification of Senior Instructor faculty, the Faculty Senate recommends the following insertions (outlined in blue bold italics) be added to the Teaching and Research Faculty Handbook.

T&R HANDBOOK LANGUAGE

EMPLOYMENT

1.1 TEACHING AND RESEARCH FACULTY EMPLOYMENT CLASSIFICATIONS

1.1.1 Tenured Faculty

1.1.2 Tenure-Track Faculty

Insert:
1.1.3 Senior Instructor Faculty
Senior instructor faculty positions provide special faculty functions such as clinical supervision, writing instruction, or internship supervision. Senior instructor faculty hold continuing, full-time appointments, subject to reappointment every three years, without eligibility for tenure, and are subject to reappointment as described in section 1.5 of this Handbook. Such appointments carry full benefits, as outlined in the Personnel Information Manual, except in cases of certain leaves. A terminal degree in the discipline is not required for appointment; however, senior instructor faculty must hold an advanced degree consistent with the accreditation criteria of the discipline and the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools.

In the event that a senior instructor faculty member is hired in a tenure-track position, his or her probationary period is subject to the policies described in section 1.6 of this Handbook. Once hired to a tenure-track position, a faculty member cannot subsequently return to a senior instructor faculty position.

1.1.4 Special Purpose Faculty
1.1.5 Full-time Temporary Faculty
1.1.6 Adjunct Faculty
1.1.7 Visiting Faculty
1.1.8 In-Residence Faculty

1.1.9 Eminent Scholars
1.1.10 Research Faculty

1.4 EVALUATION
1.4.1.3 Student Evaluations of Faculty

In the "Schedules" section,

Insert:
a. Tenured faculty *and Senior Instructors:* ...

1.4.1.4 Faculty Evaluation Procedures

Insert:
1.4.1.4.1 Evaluation Procedures for Tenured and Tenure-track Faculty *and Senior Instructors*
Also, in subsection 2,

Insert:
... The Department Chair shall use the three previous years' student evaluations in the annual teaching evaluation of each tenured faculty member *and Senior Instructor.*
Also, in subsection 3

Insert: A weighted average of the three categories (teaching, professional contributions, and university service) shall be used to determine the overall evaluation of each faculty member. The range of acceptable weights for each category *for Tenured and Tenure-track faculty* is as follows, with the stipulation that the sum of the weights must equal 100%:

Teaching:	40% - 75%
Professional Contributions:	15% - 40%
University Service:	5% - 30%

The range of acceptable weights for each category for Senior Instructor faculty is as follows, with the stipulation that the sum of the weights must equal 100%:

Teaching:	*75% - 100%*
Professional Contributions:	*0% - 20%*
University Service:	*0% - 10%*

1.4.3.1 Faculty Evaluation of College Deans

Insert in subsection (item 4):
4.   The Committee shall summarize the data and comments from the faculty evaluations by type of faculty (tenured and tenure-track; *senior instructor;* special purpose and full-time temporary; and adjunct faculty, unless there is only one person in a category) for each College Dean and make appropriate recommendations based on the data. …

1.5 REAPPOINTMENT
Insert:
Teaching faculty subject to annual reappointment include tenure-track faculty, special purpose faculty, and those full-time temporary faculty hired with an option for renewal. *Exceptions to annual reappointment are those faculty who attain the classification of Senior Instructor. Senior Instructors apply for reappointment every three years.*

1.5.2 Procedures for Recommending Reappointment or Non-Reappointment of *Senior Instructor Faculty,* Special Purpose Faculty and Full-time Temporary Faculty with an option for Renewal

The procedures for recommending the reappointment or non-reappointment of *senior instructor faculty*, special purpose faculty and full-time faculty with an option for renewal shall …

1.6 PROMOTION

1.6.1.1 Minimum Criteria for Faculty Promotions

Senior Instructor
Must be special purpose faculty and have six consecutive years of full-time service at the classification of instructor at Radford University.

Assistant Professor …
1.12 LEAVES OF ABSENCE

1.12.1.2 Extended Professional Leave
Extended Professional Leave may be granted to allow tenured, tenure-track, *senior instructor,* and special purpose faculty members to undertake activities such as seeking nationally recognized fellowships

1.12.2.5 Personal Leave without Pay
Tenured, tenure-track, *senior instructor,* and special purpose faculty members wishing to take personal leave …

1.14 STANDARDS OF CONDUCT, SANCTIONS, AND TERMINATION FOR CAUSE

1.14.2.1 Bases for Termination
Employment of a faculty member, regardless of tenure status *or contract status*, may be terminated for cause.

3.2 EXTRA EMPLOYMENT

3.2.1 Purpose and Scope

It is the University policy that no full-time faculty member may engage in other employment, not in any private business or profession during their employment by the University, in a manner or to an extent that affects or is deemed likely to affect their usefulness as an employee of the University. This policy defines extra employment and establishes the reporting and application procedures to be followed by individuals seeking approval for extra employment. It identifies the criteria by which applications are to be judged.

The policy applies to all full-time faculty while they are employed by Radford University. In this context, the term full-time faculty includes all tenured, tenure track, *senior instructor,* special purpose, and full-time temporary faculty. For individuals on academic year appointments the policy applies during summer months only if and while they are employed by Radford University to teach in Summer Session.

RATIONALE:

Many Special Purpose faculty members have been teaching at Radford University for over six years, with some approaching at least ten years of service. These faculty graciously volunteer their time and often perform extra duties far beyond their job descriptions. They are outstanding faculty members and are highly valued. However, it has been the policy of Radford University that their contracts must be renewed yearly, with approval required from the departmental Personnel Committee all the way up to the President.

The Faculty Senate feels that these yearly contract renewals are unnecessary, requiring unneeded extra paperwork, time, and stress to administrative personnel and to the Special Purpose faculty going through the process. Therefore, the Faculty Senate recommends the creation of this new Senior Instructor classification for Special Purpose Faculty members who have not attained terminal degrees, which upon promotion would allow these faculty members to apply for reappointment after every three years of service. This would provide a method of rewarding these faculty members, most of whom under the current system are ineligible for tenure or any type of promotion, for outstanding work.

The creation of the new position of Senior Instructor allows Special Purpose faculty who have not attained terminal degrees the opportunity for applying for promotion after six years of service. These additions to the Teaching and Research Faculty Handbook are necessary for reappointment guidelines, to provide the minimum criteria necessary for promotion, and to align the Senior Instructor with the same rights extended to other faculty members.

Withdrawn April 21, 2016

15-16.16—Motion on Pay Raise with Promotion to Senior Instructor

Referred by: Governance Committee

MOTION:

The Faculty Senate recommends Special Purpose faculty members without a terminal degree receive a pay raise commensurate with other faculty promotions upon promotion to Senior Instructor.

RATIONALE:

The promotion to Senior Instructor indicates that Special Purpose faculty without a terminal degree are outstanding faculty members and are highly valued. This pay raise would provide a method of rewarding these faculty members for outstanding work. In addition, this pay raise would provide a mechanism to assist Radford University in retaining these individuals, many of whom perform extra duties far beyond their job descriptions.

Withdrawn April 21, 2016

15-16.17—Motion for Changes to the Protocol for Administering Evaluations

Referred by: Faculty Issues Committee

<u>MOTION</u>:

The following changes will be made under 1.4.1.3 Student Evaluations of Faculty:

Original language:

To ensure standardized administration of student evaluations, PLEASE READ THE FOLLOWING TO THE CLASS (**do not omit or add anything**):

Student evaluations are a very important part of each faculty member's overall evaluation. Professors will use comments you make to help them improve their teaching and classroom procedures. You are encouraged to be honest, direct and thoughtful – these evaluations are entirely confidential and students are not penalized for expressing their opinions about their professors. No discussions should take place while you are completing the form: each form represents one student's personal assessment of the instructor and class. After you complete this, the evaluation will be submitted to a secure server. Instructors will not see the results of these evaluations until after course grades have been submitted. You will receive a single sheet that includes the evaluation questions, responses, and a section in which to provide your comments about the course and the instructor. There are questions on both sides of the sheet. Please provide all of your responses on the form provided. So that it is scanned properly, be sure to complete the form using a pen with blue or black ink. Instead of bubbling in the response, use an X to mark your responses. If you wish to change a response, fill in the square completely where you placed the wrong answer and use an X to indicate your new answer. After you complete this, the evaluations will be placed in a sealed envelope by the person administering the evaluation.

Revised language:

To ensure standardized administration of student evaluations, PLEASE READ THE FOLLOWING TO THE CLASS **(do not omit or add anything)**:

~~Part A –~~ **For all evaluations: Please read this before you begin.**

*Student evaluations are an important part of each faculty member's overall evaluation. Professors will use comments you make to help them improve their teaching and classroom procedures. You are ~~encouraged~~ **asked** to be honest, ~~direct~~ **professional,** and thoughtful ~~— these evaluations are entirely confidential and students are not penalized for expressing their opinions about their professors.~~ **in your responses. Please be professional in your evaluation. Offensive comments (whether related to race, gender, age, disability, or culture) reflect poorly on you as an individual and on the Radford University community as a whole. This is not an image that we support or encourage..** No discussions should take place while you are completing the ~~form~~ **evaluation**: each ~~form represents one student's personal assessment~~ **student provides his/her independent** assessment of the ~~instructor and class~~ **course and the instructor**. **These evaluations are entirely confidential and they cannot be traced back to the people who complete them.** ~~After you complete this, the~~*

evaluation will be submitted to a secure server. Instructors will not see the result of these evaluations until after course grades have been submitted. **Your comments are very important; consider them carefully.** *You will receive a single sheet that includes the evaluation questions, responses, and a section in which to provide your comments about the course and the instructor. There are questions on both sides of the sheet. Please provide all of your responses on the form provided. So that it is scanned properly, be sure to complete the form using a pen with blue or black ink. Instead of bubbling in the response, use an X to mark your responses. If you wish to change a response, fill in the square completely where you placed the wrong answer and use an X to indicate your new answer. After you complete this, the evaluations will be placed in a sealed envelope by the person administering the evaluation.*

Part B – for paper evaluations

Read prior to administering paper evaluations in class. These instructions do not apply to other types of evaluations.

You will receive a single sheet that includes the evaluation questions, responses, and a section in which to provide your comments about the course and the instructor. There are questions on both sides of the sheet. Please provide all of your responses on the form provided. So that it is scanned properly, be sure to complete the form using a pen with blue or black ink. Instead of bubbling in the response, use an X to mark your responses. If you wish to change a response, fill in the square completely where you placed the wrong answer and use an X to indicate your new answer. After you complete this, the evaluations will be placed in a sealed envelope by the person administering the evaluation.

Part B: for in-class, online evaluations. These instructions are to be read before administering online, in-class evaluations:

You will be given a piece of paper with a QR code on it. This is your personal link to the evaluation of the course and the instructor. No one else has this code and no one else can use it. Enter the code in your device, complete the evaluation according to online instructions, submit it, and you are finished. Throw away your code since it cannot be used again.

RATIONALE:

Some concern has been expressed by faculty about the tone of comments made in evaluations. Without denying students the right to say whatever they want, we believe that it is possible to emphasize the need to be professional in their evaluations. This emphasis may come in several places. Here we propose small changes to the protocol included in the FTR handbook. We also are suggesting that the directions given in the protocol should be adapted to the medium used for the evaluation. This motion treats the protocol as consisting of two parts, A and B. A should be included with all evaluations. B will change according to the method of administration (email, QR code or paper). In the paragraphs above, areas in red are additions to the original.

Passed March 3, 2016

15-16.18—Motion on the Timing of Student Evaluations

Referred by: Faculty Issues Committee on behalf of the Student Evaluation of Faculty Committee

MOTION:

The following changes will be made under **1.4.1.3 Student Evaluations of Faculty:**

Original Language:

Student evaluations for full-semester courses shall be conducted between the eleventh and fourteenth weeks of the semester; for half-semester courses they are conducted during the sixth week of the course. If all students in a course are not scheduled to meet simultaneously in the same place with an instructor or proctor between the eleventh and fourteenth weeks of the semester, then the student evaluation may be administered electronically. In the case of online evaluations, the faculty member must designate a 24-hour period within the specified window during which evaluations will take place. Summer sessions are excluded, unless evaluations are requested by the faculty member.

Revised Language:

Student evaluations for full-semester courses**, regardless of method of delivery,** shall be conducted between the ~~eleventh~~ thirteenth and fourteenth weeks of the semester; for half-semester courses they are conducted during the sixth week of the course. If all students in a course are not scheduled to meet simultaneously in the same place with an instructor or proctor between the ~~eleventh~~ thirteenth and fourteenth weeks of the semester, then the student evaluation may be administered electronically. In the case of ~~online~~ evaluations of online courses, the faculty member ~~must~~ may designate a 24-hour period within the specified window during which evaluations will take place. ~~Summer sessions are excluded, unless evaluations are requested by the faculty member~~.

RATIONALE:

The current situation of administering electronic evaluations is unmanageable for the assessment office, due to the variations in requests for administration. The Student Evaluation of Faculty Committee asked us to work with it to resolve this problem while still meeting faculty needs to use electronic evaluations outside of the classroom. Although a two-week window for evaluations that are administered by email does not give faculty control over the precise date of administration, it does ensure that evaluations are conducted close to the end of the semester. It also enhances the likelihood that evaluations will be completed and turned in.

The proposed change eliminates the use of a 24-hour period to be designated by the faculty member and standardized the administration time for all courses to the thirteenth and fourteenth weeks of the semester. Departments and faculty may still choose the precise day of administration within the two-week window for evaluations administered in class. With online courses, faculty may email instructions to their class but they will not be able to enforce a 24-hour period. The latitude of the 24-hour period was the cause of a great deal of the administrative difficulties faced by the assessment office. It was also problematic since it did not relate to the procedure used for in-class evaluations.

This motion does not apply to summer sessions as they are generally not assessed or shorter sessions such as Wintermester. In those instances, the 24-hour window will continue to be the most effective solution, as long as students are pre-notified by email.

Passed March 3, 2016

15-16.19—Motion *re* the Hiring of Administrative Assistants

Referred by: Resource Allocation Committee

Whereas Administrative Assistants play a very vital role in assisting faculty with travel, research paper preparation, departmental events, clubs, fraternities and sororities for which faculty serve as advisors, faculty search, class evaluations and research centers;

and

Whereas the administrative assistants help the Chairs and Directors with monitoring of budgets, printer use, telecommunication equipment use, inventory of equipment and supplies, preparation of one time requests, faculty teaching schedules, liaison work with the registrar office, supervising student helps and organizing departmental events;

and

Whereas great hardship has been placed on some departments to expend their supplies money and telecommunications budget in order to pay for part-time administrative assistants;

and

Whereas there has been no attempt to rationalize salaries, promotions and the rewards system for administrative assistants over a decade leading to poor morale and heavy workload conditions;

BE IT RESOLVED:

The Faculty Senate hereby recommends to the administration that additional administrative assistants be hired on a priority basis in each academic department for the 2016-17 AY and that the overall ratio in the university be brought down to one administrative assistant per ten faculty members with very small departments (5-8 faculty members) sharing administrative assistants; that the pay scale be revised and work conditions be improved to increase morale; where appropriate promotions be considered without transfer to some other departments; and that exceptionally large departments be also allotted additional part-time administrative assistants.

Passed March 24, 2016

15-16.20—Motion *re* the Creation of the Category of Professor of Practice Faculty

Referred by: Governance Committee

<u>MOTION</u>:

The faculty senate recommends the Teaching and Research Faculty Handbook be amended as follows to add the employment classification of Professor of Practice.

1.1.10 Professor of Practice Faculty

Professor of practice faculty positions provide teaching, university service, and professional contributions in disciplines where professional preparation of students is a major goal. Professor of practice faculty hold part-time or full-time positions, without eligibility for tenure, and are subject to annual reappointment as described in section 1.5 of this Handbook. Such appointments carry rank with opportunity for promotion, and carry benefits as outlined in the Personnel Information Manual, except in the cases of certain leaves.

Individuals appointed to a professor of practice rank must have a graduate or professional degree in the discipline (or a related discipline), professional certification(s) if relevant, and significant professional experience resulting in specialized expertise.

Academic departments retain the authority and responsibility to make decisions about whether to employ professors of practice to deliver aspects of their instructional program or to carry out other aspects of the departmental mission. Use of a professor of practice faculty member to fill a tenure track line does not prevent the department from returning to a tenure track faculty position in the future.

1.4.1.4.2   Evaluation Procedures for Special Purpose, *Professor of Practice*, Full-time Temporary, and Part-time Faculty

The evaluation of special purpose, *professor of practice*, and full-time temporary faculty shall adhere to the same procedures as those for tenure-track faculty except that the range of weights for each category of evaluation shall be:

Teaching: 75% - 100%
Professional Service: 0% - 20%
University Service: 0% - 15%

The Personnel Committee shall administer student evaluations of special purpose, *professor of practice*, and full-time temporary faculty between the twelfth and the fourteenth weeks of the semester for all courses, every semester. The appeals procedures shall also be the same as for tenure-track faculty.

1.5.2   Procedures for Recommending Reappointment or Non-Reappointment of Special Purpose Faculty, Full-time Temporary Faculty with an option for Renewal, and *Professor of Practice faculty*.

The procedures for recommending the reappointment or non-reappointment of special purpose faculty, ~~and~~ full-time faculty with an option for renewal, *and professor of practice faculty* shall be the same as for tenure-track faculty except that, in lieu of appeals, the faculty member may provide a written response to the recommendation, which shall be forwarded with the recommendation to the next level.

1.6 PROMOTION

Promotion in rank is restricted to tenured, tenure-track, ~~and~~ special purpose ~~faculty~~, *and professor of practice faculty* including tenured faculty serving in administrative or professional positions.

RATIONALE:

Through Virginia's interpretation and implementation of the Affordable Care Act (ACA), a gap was exposed in the Teaching and Research Faculty Employment Classifications. Radford University's options for teaching positions are limited to full-time faculty positions, or part-time adjunct positions, with no provision for part-time faculty who perform the full range of faculty activities including teaching, research, university service, and professional service.

Other universities across Virginia either already had part-time faculty classifications when this law was enacted or quickly created part-time teaching positions so the caliber of teaching faculty would not be compromised and part-time faculty could work up to and be compensated for 75% of a typical faculty load. This provides those universities the ability to attract and retain high quality, part-time faculty members.

There is a need for part-time faculty to serve in a comprehensive nature: teaching, making professional contributions and providing service to the university. Our current Special Purpose Faculty and Clinical faculty descriptions are very limiting and only allow a narrow scope of work. The recommended addition to the employment classification provides a part-time (and full-time) option that would allow for full professional participation and would allow us to attract and retain faculty with high levels of expertise. This option provides flexibility for all departments and fills a gap that could otherwise hinder recruitment and retention of certain faculty.

Motion failed March 24, 2016

15-16.21—Motion to Suspend Faculty Morale Survey in COACHE Years

Referred by: Campus Environment Committee

MOTION:

The Faculty Senate will suspend application of the Faculty Morale Survey in years when the COACHE survey is being administered simultaneously, effective beginning in Spring 2016.

RATIONALE:

During years when the COACHE survey is being administered, the addition of the Faculty Morale Survey is excessive for several reasons:

- the surveys produce very similar results;
- during these semesters, we run the risk of over-surveying the faculty;
- over-surveying the faculty can have an impact on response rates;
- simultaneous use of the two surveys runs the risk of having one instrument affect the responses of the other.

Annual administration of the Faculty Morale Survey by the Faculty Senate Curriculum Committee will resume in Spring 2017.

Passed March 24, 2016

Return to Table of Contents.

15-16.22—Motion *re* Extension of Course Withdrawal Deadline

Referred by: Faculty Senate Executive Council on behalf of the Academic Policies and Procedures Committee

MOTION:

The deadline for individual course withdrawals shall be extended from the current eight weeks to ten weeks and the language in the catalogue shall be changed accordingly.

Catalog Revision

Withdrawal from One or More, But Not All Courses

The student must secure a withdrawal slip from the Office of the Registrar. Undergraduates wishing to withdraw from an on-campus course must have the slip signed by the student's academic advisor or an advisor in the student's advising center and then return all copies to the Office of the Registrar. Undergraduates wishing to withdraw from an off-campus course must have the withdrawal slip signed by the student's academic advisor (preferred), an advisor in the student's advising center or the instructor of the course from which the student is withdrawing. The withdrawal is not complete until the signed slip has been returned to the Office of the Registrar. If a full-time student withdraws from all classes, but at different times during a given fall or spring semester, the individual withdrawals are changed to a university withdrawal.

Students must contact the Student Accounts Office in Heth Hall to initiate a request for a refund of tuition if they drop a class or classes prior to the census date and if the reduced class load qualifies them for a tuition refund.

A student who drops a class prior to the conclusion of schedule adjustment will receive no grade. A student who withdraws from class after schedule adjustment but before the end of the ~~eighth~~ tenth week of the semester (or ~~60~~ 70 percent of the total class meetings of a summer session or any other non-traditional course, whichever comes first) will receive a grade of "W." Students may not withdraw from individual classes following the end of the ~~eighth~~ tenth week of the semester.

A student may not withdraw from more than five classes during the course of undergraduate studies at Radford University. After a student has withdrawn from five classes, any subsequent withdrawal will result automatically in a grade of "F."

Withdrawals from classes prior to Fall Semester 1988, courses dropped during schedule adjustment, or withdrawal from all classes at the university do not enter the five-class withdrawal limitation.

RATIONALE:

In contrast with the majority of public institutions in the Commonwealth, Radford University places a limit upon the number of individual course withdrawals students are allowed. Students, especially those who are new to higher education, need more time than is currently the case to make informed decisions about the use of those course withdrawals. Extending the course

withdrawal time period by two weeks will enable students to avoid making hasty decisions to withdraw from courses in which there is a reasonable likelihood for academic recovery. It will also provide the opportunity for them to use academic policy wisely by withdrawing from courses in which the chances of recovery are remote.

This policy change should be implemented in conjunction with an extension in the deadline for faculty to submit midterm grades. (An extension of this deadline does not require AP&P approval; the RU Registrar has indicated that making this change would not be problematic for his office.) We recommend that the midterm submission deadline be extended from the middle of the seventh week to the end of the eighth week of the fall and spring semesters and the corresponding date for shorter terms.

As part of RU's retention efforts, advising staffs, UNIV 100 faculty, and residential life staff are attempting to use midterm grades in interventions with struggling students. Moving the midterm submission deadline would both give faculty time to include another week's worth of coursework in the calculation of midterm grades (making midterm grades more meaningful) and provide additional time for interventions with students experiencing severe academic difficulties.

The table below describes the current and proposed deadlines:

	Current	Proposed
Midterm Grade Submission Deadline	10:00 a.m. Wednesday of Week 7	10:00 a.m. Friday of Week 8
Individual Course Withdrawal Deadline	5:00 p.m. Friday of Week 8	5:00 p.m. Friday of Week 10

Passed April 7, 2016

15-16.23—Motion *re* Suspension and Readmission

Referred by the Faculty Senate Executive Council on behalf of the Academic Policies and Procedures Committee

MOTION:

Students who have been dismissed from Radford University shall be permitted to apply for readmission under the terms of the Academic Renewal Policy and the catalogue shall be changed accordingly.

Catalog Revisions

Multiple Suspensions and Dismissal

A student who has been suspended once for academic reasons, is readmitted, and who falls below the suspension threshold for a second time is dismissed from the university. Such students are permanently ineligible to enroll at Radford in the future eligible for readmission only under the terms of the Academic Renewal Policy. (See below.)
****

Terms of Suspension

A student suspended for the first time may not enroll in the next regularly scheduled semester. (Please see readmission information below.) A student who has been suspended once for academic reasons, is readmitted, and who falls below the suspension threshold for a second time is dismissed from the university. Such students are permanently ineligible to enroll at Radford in future semesters. eligible for readmission only under the terms of the Academic Renewal Policy, which requires an absence from RU of no less than four full calendar years. (See Academic Renewal Policy, below.) A student who is readmitted under the terms of the Academic Renewal Policy must earn a 2.0 grade point average or better for the first 12 hours attempted upon returning and must maintain a cumulative grade point average that meets or exceeds the suspension threshold following subsequent semesters. Failure to do so will result in academic dismissal from the university and makes the student ineligible for readmission.
****
Exception to Academic Policy

The Radford University Undergraduate Catalog is the basic authority for academic requirements at Radford University. All students are expected to follow the catalog in the pursuit of their degrees. On occasion, extraordinary circumstances may, however, justify minor departures from the catalog requirements. Students who believe their situation warrants a deviation from academic policy may petition for an exception. Students should consult with their advising coordinator to explore the feasibility of petitioning for an exception to academic policy.

Undergraduate students who need to petition for an exception to academic policy must fill out the Undergraduate Student Academic Petition form, available in advising centers. There are several academic requirements for which exceptions are never made, even through the academic petition process: the minimum grade point average (2.00) to graduate, the minimum number of semester hours (120) to graduate; the minimum number of semesters hours (45) earned at Radford University to graduate (unless the student is graduating under the provisions of an articulation agreement between Radford University and a Virginia community college in which the possibility of graduating with fewer than 45 Radford University hours is clearly stipulated, or if the student is a veteran or active duty member of the armed forces of the United States.) The armed forces exception to the existing policy must be approved by the Provost and Vice President of Academic Affairs; the number of class withdrawals (5) a student may use; the number of repeats (3) permitted; the number of earned credits (60) at Radford needed to qualify for Latin Honors.

In addition, no exceptions to the academic suspension policy will be made for new or continuing students. Finally, students who are dismissed from the university for academic reasons may not petition for readmission. (See "Terms of Suspension" and "Academic Renewal Policy," above.)

The college dean of the petitioning student has the authority to approve or disapprove the student's request for an exception to academic policy upon review of recommendations from the student's academic advisor, department chair and instructor (as appropriate), and – if deemed necessary – in consultation with the registrar. The dean will submit the form to the Office of the Registrar.

RATIONALE:

Currently, students who fall below the suspension threshold twice are dismissed from RU and are permanently ineligible to enroll in the future. This policy would appear to be unnecessarily draconian. While it obviously makes it impossible for such students to ever earn degrees from RU, it effectively makes it extremely difficult for them to transfer to and earn a degree from *any* four-year institution.

The Academic Renewal policy currently in effect permits the readmission of students who did not leave the institution in good academic standing—typically, after having been academically suspended once— provided they were away no less than four calendar years. Under the provisions of Academic Renewal, all previously earned letter grades remain on the student's official transcript, but the student carries no GPA at the time of re-enrollment. In addition, the student retains credit hours for all courses passed with a grade of "C" or better. He/she loses credit for courses passed with a grade of "D."

Due to the four-year absence requirement, students readmitted under Academic Renewal are always older than traditional RU students. They tend to be more intellectually and emotionally mature and have more focused career goals. Most have been academically successful upon their return and have eventually earned degrees.

If this policy is changed, students who have been dismissed must still face a significant penalty: a delay of four full years before they can resume their academic careers. However, giving students who have been dismissed the opportunity to be readmitted under the terms of Academic Renewal offers such students hope through providing them a final opportunity to pursue an RU degree. As with all Academic Renewal students, such students must achieve a 2.00 GPA during their first 12 hours of enrollment to avoid permanent dismissal.

If this proposal is approved, it will be retroactive to allow all students who have already been dismissed from Radford University the option of applying for readmission under the terms of the Academic Renewal Policy.

Passed April 7, 2016

15-16.24—Internal Governance Committees Motion 1: Replacement of GECAC with CCAC

Referred by: Governance Committee

MOTION:

Faculty Senate recommends to the University Executive Council that the name of the General Education Curricular Advisory Committee (GeCAC) be changed to the current Core Curriculum Advisory Committee (CCAC).

RATIONALE:

GeCAC no longer exists. CCAC currently serves the same functions.

For Background and Rationale of Internal Governance Committee Recommendations, see Appendix V in Radford University Faculty Senate Motions 2015-2016: Appendix.

Passed April 7, 2016

Return to Table of Contents.

15-16.25—Internal Governance Committees Motion 2: Add Committee on Online Instruction

Referred by: Governance Committee

MOTION:

Faculty Senate recommends to the University Executive Council that the Committee on Online Instruction be added to the current Internal Governance document.

RATIONALE:

Faculty Senate passed a motion recommending the formation of this university committee in spring 2015. The Committee on Online Instruction meets the faculty-related governance criteria relating to curriculum issues.

For Background and Rationale of Internal Governance Committee Recommendations, see Appendix V in Radford University Faculty Senate Motions 2015-2016: Appendix.

Withdrawn April 7, 2016

15-16.26—Internal Governance Committees Motion 3: Change to Campus Engagement Committee Status

Referred by: Governance Committee

MOTION:

Faculty Senate recommends to the University Executive Council that a new committee designation be created in the Internal Governance document called Campus Engagement Committees (CECs). CECs should be defined as university committees that 1) are not faculty-related governance committees, 2) have faculty representatives appointed by Faculty Senate and, 3) may be asked to report to the FSEC.

1. Enrollment Management Committee
2. Intercollegiate Athletics Committee
3. Academic Advising Committee
4. Undergraduate Curriculum and Catalog Review Committee
5. Student Evaluations of Faculty Committee
6. Student Athlete Appeals Committee
7. Parking and Traffic Committee
8. Bookstore Committee
9. Dining Services Advisory

RATIONALE:

These committees are critical to the university's function and/or affect faculty welfare but do not meet the four criteria for faculty-related governance. CECs do not meet any of the faculty-related governance criteria. Furthermore, the Faculty Senate recommends that the following committees be designated as Campus Engagement Committees in the Internal Governance document.

For Background and Rationale of Internal Governance Committee Recommendations, see Appendix V in Radford University Faculty Senate Motions 2015-2016: Appendix.

Motion failed April 7, 2016

15-16.27—Internal Governance Committees Motion 4: Annual Reports to FSEC

Referred by: Governance Committee

MOTION:

Faculty Senate recommends to the University Executive Council that, in order to inform the work of the Senate, the Faculty Senate Executive Council (FSEC) receives copies of the annual reports and recommendation/proposal forms from the Internal Governance committees populated by the FSEC by May 31st.

RATIONALE:

All IG committees are required to submit an annual report and recommendation/proposal form to the designated administrator by March 15 (p. 7, Internal Governance document). These committees affect faculty welfare, curriculum, and/or the University's budget, and as such their work is of concern to the Faculty Senate.

For Background and Rationale of Internal Governance Committee Recommendations, see Appendix V in Radford University Faculty Senate Motions 2015-2016: Appendix.

Passed April 21, 2016

15-16.28—Internal Governance Committees Motion 5: Non-Faculty-Related IG Committees

Referred by: Governance Committee

MOTION:

Faculty Senate recommends to the University Executive Council that the Faculty Senate Executive Committee no longer be responsible for appointing faculty representatives to these committees because they do not meet the criteria of faculty-related internal governance.

1. Convocation & Commencement Committee
2. Library Committee
3. Co-curricular Activities and Facilities Committee
4. Committee on Clubs and Organizations
5. Student Affairs Executive Council
6. Student Media Steering Committee
7. Financial Aid Advisory Committee
8. Outstanding Student Worker Selection Committee
9. Scholarly Lecture Committee
10. Student Awards Committee
11. Student Health Advisory Committee
12. University Performance Series Committee
13. Building and Grounds Committee
14. Information Technology Resource Committee
15. Alumni Association
16. University Foundation
17. Animal Care and Use Committee
18. Institutional Review Board for the Review of Research of Human Subjects

RATIONALE:

These committees do not meet any of the four criteria that define faculty-related governance. Committees that are neither faculty-related internal governance committees nor CECs, should not necessarily be disbanded but will not report to Faculty Senate. We strongly recommend that the designated administrator and related constituencies should review the committees to determine whether they serve an internal governance function. We further recommend that the designated administrator would be responsible for populating needed faculty representation on these university committees (see page 5, II.E. for a description).

For Background and Rationale of Internal Governance Committee Recommendations, see Appendix V in Radford University Faculty Senate Motions 2015-2016: Appendix.

<div align="right">Withdrawn April 21, 2016</div>

15-16.29—Motion to Change Performance Outcome Categories

Referred by: Governance Committee

MOTION:

The Faculty Senate recommends the following changes under Item 3 in Section 1.4.1.4.1. Evaluation Procedures for Tenured and Tenure-track Faculty:

Current language:

The Department Chair shall assign a numerical value to the descriptive term that represents her or his assessment of a faculty member in each of the three evaluation categories, as follows:

Outstanding	4.5 - 5.0
Above Expectations	3.5 - 4.49
Meets Expectations	3.0 - 3.49
Meets Expectations Minimally	2.5 - 2.99
Below Expectations	2.0 - 2.49
Poor	Below 2.0

Revised language:

The Department Chair shall assign a numerical value to the descriptive term that represents her or his assessment of a faculty member in each of the three evaluation categories, as follows:

Outstanding	4.5 - 5.0
Above Expectations	3.5 - 4.49
Meets Expectations	3.0 - 3.49
~~Meets Expectations Minimally~~ Below Expectations	2.~~5~~0 - 2.99
~~Below Expectations~~ Unacceptable	Below 2.0 ~~- 2.49~~

RATIONALE:

Currently, the adjectival ranking for performance is as follows:

Outstanding: 4.5 - 5.0
Above Expectations: 3.5 - 4.49
Meets Expectations: 3.0 - 3.49
Meets Expectations Minimally: 2.5 - 2.99
Below Expectations: 2.0 - 2.49
Poor: Below 2.0

(1.4.1.4.1 Evaluation Procedures for Tenured and Tenure-track Faculty, p. 18)

➢ However, the standard used to determine post-tenure review is listed as follows:

A tenured faculty member whose overall evaluation rating falls below 3.0 or whose teaching rating falls below 3.0 is subject to post-tenure review which, after due process, may result in sanctions up to and including dismissal.

(1.4.1.4.1 Evaluation Procedures for Tenured and Tenure-track Faculty, p. 18)

As written, there is a conflict between obtaining a score that is considered "meeting expectations minimally" and being placed on post-tenure review. In fact, one is not meeting expectations if post-tenure review is triggered.

We move that new adjectival categories, more aligned with implications and outcomes, be used. Further, as there are no substantive differences between achieving rating in the 2.5 or 2.0 range, we collapse those two categories into a 1 point spread. Further, this one point range creates symmetry to the "above expectations" range. The Governance Sub Committee moves that the following change be made:

> *Outstanding: 4.5 - 5.0*
> *Above Expectations: 3.5 - 4.49*
> *Meets Expectations: 3.0 - 3.49*
> *Below Expectations: 2.0 - 2.99*
> *Unacceptable: Below 2.0*

Passed April 21, 2016

15-16.30—Motion *re* Addition of STAT 130 to Core Curriculum

Referred by: Curriculum Committee

MOTION:

The Faculty Senate approves the addition of STAT 130 to the list of courses under College Core B: Supporting Skills and Knowledge.

RATIONALE:

For proposal, see Appendix VI in Radford University Faculty Senate Motions 2015-2016: Appendix.

<div align="right">Passed March 24, 2016</div>

15-16.31—Motion *re* Updating of Core Curriculum Learning Objectives for CLSS 110 and CSST 110

Referred by: Curriculum Committee

MOTION:

The Faculty Senate approves the updating of the Core Curriculum learning objectives for CLSS 110 and CSST 110.

RATIONALE:

For proposal, see Appendix VII in Radford University Faculty Senate Motions 2015-2016: Appendix.

Passed March 24, 2016

15-16.32—Motion *re* Changing the Prerequisites for MATH 126

Referred by: Curriculum Committee

MOTION:

The Faculty Senate approves the change in prerequisites for MATH 126.

RATIONALE:

For proposal, see Appendix VIII in Radford University Faculty Senate Motions 2015-2016: Appendix.

Passed March 24, 2016

15-16.33—Motion *re* Movement of Topic from MATH 152 to MATH 151

Referred by: Curriculum Committee

Motion:

The Faculty Senate approves the movement of the topic "L'Hôpital's Rule" from MATH 152 to MATH 151.

Rationale:

For proposal, see Appendix IX in Radford University Faculty Senate Motions 2015-2016: Appendix.

Passed March 24, 2016

Return to Table of Contents.

Return to 15-16.32—Motion *re* Changing the Prerequisites for MATH 126.

Go to 15-16.34—Motion to Support the Creation of a BS in Biomedical Forensic Science.

15-16.34—Motion to Support the Creation of a BS in Biomedical Forensic Science

Referred by: Curriculum Committee

Motion:

The Faculty Senate recommends the approval of the Undergraduate Major in Biomedical Forensic Science contingent upon new resources being acquired to fund the "one additional full-time faculty hire and an adjunct" specified in the proposal under "Resource Needs for New Program."

The Faculty Senate further recommends that, as resources become available, the Undergraduate Major in Biomedical Forensic Science be initiated prior to the Master of Science in Biomedical and Forensic Sciences.

Rationale:

The program

- will meet the increasing need, nationally as well as locally, for well-trained biomedical and forensic (including digital) scientists,

- will prepare students for professional careers in state and national forensic science crime labs, biomedical or pharmaceutical labs, cybersecurity and digital forensics employment, as well as entrance into professional medical and law school programs or graduate studies in the natural or forensic sciences,

- will provide students with research skills and experience to make them more competitive for successful careers in forensic pathology, forensic medicine, and biomedical research,

- is unique and innovative in its emphasis on research, and

- is in accordance with the RU Mission Statement (as well as upcoming trends in higher education) in being student-focused and in providing ample opportunity for peer-directed and self-learning through small-group discussions, problem-solving, and high-impact experiences.

Passed April 21, 2016

For proposal, see Appendix X in Radford University Faculty Senate Motions 2015-2016: Appendix.

15-16.35—Motion to Approve Bachelor of Science in Computer and Cyber Science

Referred by: Curriculum Committee

Motion:

The Faculty Senate recommends the approval of a Bachelor of Science in Computer and Cyber Science.

Rationale:

- The area of cyber security already is a high demand field, and demand is expected to increase. The Commonwealth of Virginia is in the forefront of employment demand, offering more positions in this area than any other state.

- Currently there are no undergraduate programs in Virginia in the area of software cyber security.

- This program will build on the department's Bachelor of Science in Computer Science and undergraduate Information Security Certificate to build a new program—the first of its kind in Virginia—to prepare students to work in the emerging field of cyber security.

For proposal, see Appendix XI in Radford University Faculty Senate Motions 2015-2016: Appendix.

Passed April 28, 2016

15-16.36—Motion to Approve Accounting Certificate

Referred by: Curriculum Committee

Motion:

The Faculty Senate recommends the approval of a program leading to an Accounting Certificate.

Rationale:

- The proposed certificate meets the needs of students already possessing an undergraduate degree who would like to re-tool and/or be eligible to sit for the CPA exam.

- Only four schools in Virginia currently offer such a program.

- Given the number of career opportunities in accounting, there is a substantial potential market for such a program for people with undergraduate degrees in other fields.

For proposal, see Appendix XII in Radford University Faculty Senate Motions 2015-2016: Appendix.

Passed April 28, 2016

Return to Table of Contents.

Return to 15-16.35—Motion to Approve Bachelor of Science in Computer and Cyber Science.

Go to 15-16.37—Motion to Approve Doctor of Education, as Revised.

15-16.37—Motion to Approve Doctor of Education, as Revised

Referred by: Curriculum Committee

Motion:

The Faculty Senate recommends the approval of the revised proposal for a program leading to a Doctor of Education (Ed.D).

Rationale:

This is a revision of a previously approved program.

For proposal, see Appendix XIII in Radford University Faculty Senate Motions 2015-2016: Appendix.

<div align="right">Passed April 28, 2016</div>

15-16.38—Motion to Approve Changes in Courses Eligible for Credit under the Core Curriculum

Referred by: Curriculum Committee

Motion:

The Faculty Senate approves the following course deletions, additions, and amendments:

- The renumbering of PHIL 114 to PHIL 200, with an added line in Catalog Description
- The deletion of RUSS 100
- The creation of RUSS 101
- The creation of RUSS 102
- The renumbering of RUSS 200 to RUSS 201, with changes to Catalog and Course Descriptions
- The renumbering of RUSS 210 to RUSS 202, with changes to Catalog and Course Descriptions
- The change in prefix and renumbering of WMST 101 to WGST 200 and the change in title from Women in the World: Introduction to Women's Studies to Women in the World: Introduction to Women's and Gender Studies, with changes to Catalog and Course Descriptions.

Rationale:

From the Cover Sheet for PHIL 200 (formerly PHIL 114)

> The current PHRE program revision takes PHIL 114 out of the major's common core and moves it to the philosophy concentration Area A. There are no other courses in the major outside the common core at the 100 level. Raising PHIL 114 to PHIL 200 will bring the course into parity with other concentration area requirements.

For proposal, see Appendix XIV in Radford University Faculty Senate Motions 2015-2016: Appendix.

From the Cover Sheet for RUSS 100 (to be deleted in favor of RUSS 101 and RUSS 102)

> Currently, the Department of Foreign Languages and Literatures offers RUSS 100 for beginning students in just one semester. This course should be deleted because we are currently proposing to offer a first sequence of lower division level of Russian in two semesters (RUSS 101 and RUSS 102).

For proposal, see Appendix XV in Radford University Faculty Senate Motions 2015-2016: Appendix.

From the Cover Sheet for RUSS 101 (new course)

Currently, the Department of Foreign Languages and Literatures offers RUSS 100 for beginning students in just one semester. The intent of this proposal is to offer a first sequence of lower division level of Russian (RUSS 101 and RUSS 102) in two semesters. Students need more practice and contact hours to achieve a similar proficiency level than in more commonly taught languages.

For proposal, see Appendix XVI in Radford University Faculty Senate Motions 2015-2016: Appendix.

From the Cover Sheet for RUSS 102 (new course)

Currently, the Department of Foreign Languages and Literatures offers RUSS100 for beginning students in just one semester. The intent of this proposal is to offer a second course in lower level sequence in Russian (RUSS 102) after RUSS 101. The students need more practice and contact hours to achieve a similar proficiency level than in more commonly taught languages.

For proposal, see Appendix XVII in Radford University Faculty Senate Motions 2015-2016: Appendix.

From the Cover Sheet for RUSS 201 (formerly RUSS 200)

Currently, the Department of Foreign Languages and Literatures offers RUSS 200 as the first sequence of intermediate level. After establishing RUSS101 and RUSS102, it is necessary to:

1) rename RUSS 200 as RUSS 201;
2) indicate RUSS 102 as a prerequisite for RUSS 201;
3) make minor changes to the description of course, goals, and assessment measures.

For proposal, see Appendix XVIII in Radford University Faculty Senate Motions 2015-2016: Appendix.

From the Cover Sheet for RUSS 202 (formerly RUSS 210)

Currently, the Department of Foreign Languages and Literatures offers RUSS 210 as the second intermediate level. After renaming RUSS 200, RUSS 201, it is necessary to

1) rename RUSS 210, RUSS 202;
2) indicate RUSS 201 as a prerequisite for RUSS 202;
3) indicate minor changes to both detailed course content and other course information.

For proposal, see Appendix XIX in Radford University Faculty Senate Motions 2015-2016: Appendix.

From the Cover Sheet for WGST 200. Women in the World: Introduction to Women's and Gender Studies (formerly WMST 101. Women in the World: Introduction to Women's Studies)

Rationale for Change in Course Title: In keeping with the practice in the majority of Women's Studies Program, we propose to change the title of the beginning course from Introduction to Women's Studies to Introduction to Women's and Gender Studies. The title change reflects the most current scholarship and pedagogical best practices in Women's and Gender Studies programs. It will identify more accurately what the course currently encompasses because the required readings for the course are routinely updated to reflect the most recent developments in the field of Women's and Gender Studies.

Rationale for Change in Course Number: The proposed higher course number reflects more accurately the amount of required reading and writing as well as the level of expectations for the course. Students sometimes comment that the amount of required reading and writing is more than they expected in a 100-level course. The introductory course for the interdisciplinary minor in both Appalachian Studies and Peace Studies is numbered 200; we would like our numbering to be in line with theirs.

Rationale for Change in Brief Catalog Description of WMST 101:
The brief catalog description of the Minor in Women's Studies (proposed change to Women's and Gender Studies) has been revised to reflect the most current scholarship in Women's and Gender Studies--specifically intersectional feminist theory and scholarship. The most current work in the field focuses on the intersections among gender, race, class, ethnicity, physical ability, age, sexuality, and global location in the lives of women. This change in the catalog description will reflect more accurately current practice in the WMST Minor and WMST 101 as well. The required readings in WMST 101 are routinely updated to reflect the increasingly intersectional and global emphasis of the most current Women's and Gender Studies scholarship.

For proposal, see Appendix XX in Radford University Faculty Senate Motions 2015-2016: Appendix.

<div align="right">Passed April 21, 2016</div>

15-16.39—Motion to Establish a Long-Term Compensation Policy or Goal

Referred by: Resource Allocation Committee

Motion:

The Faculty Senate recommends that Radford University establish a long term compensation policy or goal (the President, Vice President of Business Affairs, Provost, and Senate can agree on a model that could be used as the basis for a policy) and provide enough faculty dedicated to instruction to maintain reasonable class sizes before allocating resources to other priorities.

Rationale:

- National trends support taking such a step.

- The Regional ranking of Radford University supports taking such a step.

- Radford University's percentile ranking in comparison with peer institutions supports taking such a step.

For proposal, see Appendix XXI in Radford University Faculty Senate Motions 2015-2016: Appendix.

Passed April 28, 2016

15-16.40—Motion *re* Promotional Pay Raises

Referred by: Resource Allocation Committee

Motion:

The Faculty Senate recommends that the current promotional pay raise offered by Radford University be increased by another $1000 for Instructors being promoted to Assistant Professor rank, by $2000 for Assistant Professors being promoted to Associate Professor rank and by $3000 for Associate Professors being promoted to Full Professor rank

Rationale:

This is to ensure that Radford University remains competitive after a recent survey of universities within the Commonwealth of Virginia.

See data in Appendix XXI in Radford University Faculty Senate Motions 2015-2016: Appendix.

<div align="right">Passed April 28, 2016</div>

15-16.41—Motion to Increase the Travel-Reimbursement Limit

Referred by: Resource Allocation Committee

Motion:

The Faculty Senate recommends that the travel reimbursement limit for professional travel be raised from the current $900 limit to $1500 limit for T & R Faculty starting with the 2016-17 AY.

Rationale:

The $900 limit cap for professional travel reimbursement has been around for more than seven years. Although hotel accommodation prices slipped during the great recession of 2008 and the subsequent year, hotel price index shows an increase since. This is also true of conference registration costs, costs of air travel, fuel prices, car rentals, parking and meals. Information obtained from Ms. Lisa Ridpath for a random sample of 30 professors (6 from each College on campus) show that just within two years between 2010-11 and 2012-13 reimbursement for travel expenses slipped from 87.9 percent of the total to 84.3 percent of total expenses incurred. Professional contributions from faculty are expected in order to gain tenure, promotion and merit pay at Radford University.   The professional contributions of faculty in research also enhance quality of instruction at Radford and maintain the bar for professional accreditations.

Passed April 28, 2016

15-16.42—Resolution in Honor of President Penelope W. Kyle

Referred by: Faculty Senate Executive Council

Resolution in Honor of President Penelope W. Kyle

WHEREAS President Kyle has served Radford University for over a decade,

WHEREAS, as a result of President Kyle's leadership and advocacy, the University has significantly enhanced the quality of its academic facilities,

WHEREAS under President Kyle's leadership the University has increased the number of academic programs, including the initiation of programs leading to doctoral degrees,

WHEREAS during President Kyle's leadership the University's academic classification has been upgraded,

WHEREAS during President Kyle's leadership efforts were made to reallocate internal resources in order to improve faculty salaries,

NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED

that on behalf of the Teaching and Research Faculty of Radford University, the Faculty Senate expresses its appreciation for President Kyle's service to Radford University and expresses its hope that her future endeavors will be equally productive and valued.

Passed April 21, 2016

15-16.43—Motion to Approve Changes to ECON 205

Referred by: Faculty Senate Executive Council

Motion:

The Faculty Senate approves the changes to ECON 205 specified in the proposal submitted by the Department of Economics.

Rationale:

The changes reflect best practices in the discipline.

For proposal, see Appendix XXII in Radford University Faculty Senate Motions 2015-2016: Appendix.

Passed April 28, 2016

Return to Table of Contents.

Return to 15-16.42—Resolution in Honor of President Penelope W. Kyle.

Go to 15-16.44—Resolution in Honor of Departing Members of the Board of Visitors

Resolution in Honor of Departing Members

of the Board of Visitors

WHEREAS, the members of the Board of Visitors give unselfishly of their time and expertise in furtherance of Radford University, its students, faculty, staff, and alumni; and

WHEREAS, the members of the Board of Visitors have advocated for resources for the University; and

WHEREAS, the members of the Board of Visitors have supported capital improvements for the University; and

WHEREAS, the members of the Board of Visitors have listened to and worked with the faculty with regard to the selection of a new president for the University; and

WHEREAS, the Faculty Senate would like to take this opportunity to express its sincere and heartfelt gratitude for the many hours of tireless service and unselfish leadership provided by the Board of Visitors on behalf of Radford University, its students, faculty, staff, and alumni; now

Therefore, BE IT RESOLVED that the members of the Faculty Senate record their sincere appreciation to the departing members of the Board of Visitors for their valuable contributions to the University; 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 departing member of the Board of Visitors.

_____
Dr. Jerry M. Kopf
President of the Faculty Senate
April 28, 2016

15-16.45—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.

Roann Barris
James Collier
Andrew Foy
Jerry Kopf
Mary LaLone
Monica Pazmino-Cevallos
Sandra Schneider
Andrea Stanaland
Paige Tan
Paul Thomas
Amy VanKirk
Jimmy Ray Ward

_____
Dr. Jerry M. Kopf
President of the Faculty Senate
April 28, 2016

Resolution in Honor of

Dr. Roann Barris for Her Service

to the Faculty Senate

WHEREAS, Dr. Roann Barris has represented her department in the Faculty Senate for over a decade; and

WHEREAS, Dr. Barris has served with distinction as secretary of the Faculty Issues Committee; and

WHEREAS, Dr. Barris has served with distinction as chair of the Faculty Issues Committee; and

WHEREAS, Dr. Barris has given unselfishly of her time to serve on the Faculty Senate Executive Council; 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. Barris 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. Barris.

_____
Dr. Jerry M. Kopf
President of the Faculty Senate
April 28, 2016

Return to Table of Contents.

Resolution in Honor of

Dr. Jerry Kopf for His Service

as President of the Faculty Senate of Radford University

WHEREAS, Dr. Jerry Kopf has served with distinction as the President of the Faculty Senate from January 2014 through April 2016; and

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

WHEREAS, Dr. Kopf 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. Kopf 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. Kopf.

Passed April 28, 2016