

Longwood University

Digital Commons @ Longwood University

Meeting Agendas and Minutes

Faculty Senate

9-22-1995

Faculty Senate Minutes 1995.09.22

Longwood University

Follow this and additional works at: https://digitalcommons.longwood.edu/facultysenate_meetings

**Minutes
Special Called Meeting
Faculty Senate Meeting
September 22, 1995**

Dr. William Harbour, Chair, called the special called meeting of the Longwood College Faculty Senate to order at 3:30 p.m. in the Prince Edward Room, Ruffner. The following members were present:

Dr. Pat Barber	Mr. Richard Hurley	Dr. Jeffery Peden
Dr. David Carkenord	Dr. Judith Johnson	Dr. Darryl Poole
Ms. Linda Cranston	Dr. Patricia Lust	Dr. Ellery Sedgwick
President William Dorrill	Ms. Phyllis Mable	Dr. Pat Shank
Dr. Berkwood Farmer	Dr. Susan May	Dr. Robert Wu
Dr. William Frank	Ms. Kristine Palmer	Dr. Douglas Young

The following members were absent:

Dr. Lee Bidwell	Dr. Robert Gibbons	Dr. Robert Sawyer
Mr. Mark Baldrige	Mr. Rob Postel	Dr. Betty Jo Simmons
Dr. Mary Flanigan	Dr. Charles Ross	

Dr. Harbour announced that the purpose of the special called meeting was to get faculty reaction on the Restructuring Progress Report (copy of the memo to Faculty Senate from Dr. Poole with matrix attached to official minutes). Dr. Harbour then turned the meeting over to Dr. Poole.

Dr. Poole began with a brief summary of what will be sent to the State Council of Higher Education. The report will be in three sections: a narrative summary, a commitment-by-commitment summary, and any supporting documents for SCHEV to use in understanding our needs. The commitment-by-commitment format was adopted by SCHEV. The commitments to which we have to respond were entered in the matrix by SCHEV based on items in our original report. The initiatives are on the left-hand side of the matrix and our responses to each initiative are on the right-hand side of the matrix. We have also entered extensions to original initiatives at the end of the matrix. There are two additions as required by SCHEV but no new initiatives beyond those.

Dr. Poole also stated that the Finance Committee of the Board of Visitors will meet to review the report. He then asked for faculty reaction and input.

Mr. Hurley reiterated that there are no new initiatives but rather items to come into compliance with SCHEV's requirements.

Dr. Harbour then asked what is being done to come into compliance regarding the additions. Dr. Poole stated that he met with Dr. Barber, Chair of the Faculty Senate Committee on Promotion and Tenure Policies and Procedures; the Committee will work on and make recommendations for Senate approval this year; the policy will go into effect next academic year (as made necessary by the Addition "Modify annual performance review policy to include weightings for teaching, research, and service"). Dr. Barber said that the Faculty Senate Committee on Promotion and Tenure Policies and Procedures met once. There is no one weighting scheme agreed on since flexibility within divisions in the school is necessary. By the end of December, the committee will report back to Faculty Senate.

Dr. Peden asked for SCHEV's definition of service. SCHEV did not define service. Longwood's definition is found in the FPPM. Dr. Frank said it was a general agreement that service to the institution, not just public service, is a part of our definition and that the department chair discusses service with the faculty member during the annual review process. Dr. Barber stated that the committee will clarify this definition. Dr. Johnson was concerned since a subcommittee of Academic Affairs Committee had been appointed to work on the same issue as the Senate Committee on

Promotion and Tenure Policies and Procedures. Dr. Poole clarified that the subcommittee of AAC was to promote discussion at a meeting to get the deans and chairs sentiment on the item, not to act as a proposal-making group. Ms. McKenzie agreed to send the HERI results to Dr. Barber for use by the Committee. Dr. Frank stated that the two groups would work together since one member is on both the AAC and the P&T Committee.

Dr. Harbour said that the Faculty Senate should look carefully at the second addition, program review. Dr. Sedgwick stated that the faculty, through the Faculty Senate Educational Policy Committee, should help establish a set of criteria for program review. The alternative would be for the Academic Affairs Committee to work on the criteria for program review. Dr. Poole stated that he was inclined to work through Academic Affairs Committee since the timeline was short but asked that a decision on process be withheld pending further review of possibilities. Dr. Poole stated that Ms. McKenzie is gathering existing models for program evaluation and we should agree on a process this semester and conduct reviews next semester, reporting by June 1996 in response to the Addition "College will develop evaluation standards for programs and determine their centrality to the mission and their quality. There was further discussion as to the role of the Educational Policy Committee and the Academic Affairs Committee in this area. After discussion, Dr. Poole stated that his office would research and bring back a report to the Executive Committee of Faculty Senate.

Responding to a question from Dr. Harbour, Dr. Poole said the major items to handle now are: program review and laying the groundwork for the 1996-1997 general education review.

Related to page 5, 2A, "Continue to minimize expenditures in institutional support which currently stand at about 14.9 percent of educational and general expenditures. Keep institutional support costs below the average of peer institutions," Dr. Saunders agreed to share the Oklahoma study Mr. Brown prepared with the Faculty Senate Committee on Promotion and Tenure Policies and Procedures.

Dr. May stated that the Committee to Study Workload has not yet met but will meet soon. Dr. May has met with Dr. Dorrill, Dr. Poole, and Mr. Brown to prepare for the committee meeting.

Dr. Harbour observed that some faculty were glad to see that the report called for a reduction in the number of administrators. Dr. Sedgwick said that the Faculty Senate Finance Committee was working with Mr. Hurley to develop a common base to count the number of administrative and faculty positions over time and that there would be a study of our administrative costs compared to our benchmark institutions. Mr. Hurley will share information on the reporting of positions' breakdown with the Faculty Senate Committee on Finance and Planning.

Dr. Shank asked about faculty involvement in restructuring mentioned on page 2 of the matrix. Dr. Poole noted that a draft summary was sent to Faculty Senate members with a cover note asking members to share with faculty.

Dr. Harbour then asked the Senate's advice on distribution means for the Faculty Senate minutes, agenda, etc. Dr. Peden suggested that we move to network disposition as soon as the system allows. Dr. Harbour then announced that the minutes would be sent in hard copy and electronically for the rest of the year.

The meeting adjourned at 4:35 p.m.