

Longwood University

Digital Commons @ Longwood University

Meeting Agendas and Minutes

Faculty Senate

10-12-1995

Faculty Senate Minutes 1995.10.12

Longwood University

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

**Minutes
Faculty Senate Meeting
October 12, 1995**

Dr. William Harbour, Chair, called the meeting of the Longwood College Faculty Senate to order at 12:45 p.m. in the Amelia Room, Lankford. The following members were present:

Mr. Mark Baldridge	Dr. Robert Gibbons	Dr. Charles Ross
Dr. Lee Bidwell	Mr. Richard Hurley	Dr. Robert Sawyer
Dr. Pat Barber	Dr. Judith Johnson	Dr. Ellery Sedgwick
Dr. David Carkenord	Dr. Patricia Lust	Dr. Pat Shank
Ms. Linda Cranston	Dr. Susan May	Dr. Betty Jo Simmons
President William Dorrill	Ms. Kristine Palmer	Dr. Robert Wu
Dr. Berkwood Farmer	Mr. Rob Postel	Dr. Douglas Young
Dr. Mary Flanigan	Dr. Darryl Poole	

The following members were absent:

Dr. William Frank	Ms. Phyllis Mable	Dr. Jeffery Peden
-------------------	-------------------	-------------------

The minutes of the September 7 and 22 meetings were approved as distributed.

Dr. Harbour then asked Dr. Bidwell to discuss the resolution she was bringing forth on the timing of midterm grade estimates. Dr. Lee Bidwell brought the following resolution (written by Drs. Bidwell and Munson) before the Senate for consideration. Dr. Shank seconded the motion and the resolution carried.

PROPOSAL FOR FACULTY SENATE RESOLUTION

The stated objective of grade estimates is to provide "an important warning of academic risk to students and advisors" (1995-96 Longwood College Catalog, p. 440. The current grade estimate policy, which requires that grade estimates be submitted "by noon on Monday of the fifth full week of classes" (1995-96 Longwood College Catalog, p. 44), is inadequate for meeting the stated objective. Faculty are unable to adequately assess students' academic progress in a course by the fifth full week of classes.

Ideally, grade estimates should be based on an assessment of students' performance on a writing assignment, project, classroom presentation, or examination. It is unreasonable to expect students to have completed an extensive writing assignment or project by the end of the fourth week of classes. Furthermore, examinations that are administered during the fourth week of classes (so that they can be graded by the beginning of the fifth week) cannot cover much course material. During the first week of the semester, class time generally is not very productive; class rosters have not been finalized and students often have trouble obtaining the required materials for the course for various reasons. An examination administered during the fourth week of classes essentially covers two and one-half weeks of lecture and reading material and is not an adequate indicator of students' performance.

As a consequence of the practical difficulties of administering exams and collecting projects by the fourth week of class, many faculty are forced to resort to "impressionistic" means of evaluating student performance. Some faculty base grade estimates on one or two quizzes; others use class attendance and participation as the basis for grade estimates; and still others simply ignore the grade estimate request. The problem is NOT that the faculty are uncooperative or insensitive to the need for giving students and advisors early warning about academic problems; the problem IS that the current grade estimate policy is impractical and insufficient for identifying students in academic danger.

Therefore the following resolution is offered:

RESOLVED: *Grade estimates shall be due no earlier than 12 noon on Monday of the sixth full week of classes. Page 44 of the current college catalog shall be revised accordingly.*

The proposed resolution allows faculty more time to assess students' performance and still gives students adequate warning about academic difficulties before the withdrawal deadline of "noon on Friday of the seventh full week of classes" (1995-96 Longwood College Catalog, p. 42).

Dr. Harbour then asked Dr. Sedgwick and Ms. Palmer to bring forward the request for approval of the flowcharts for the graduate courses. Dr. Sedgwick moved for the adoption. The flowcharts were adopted for use providing the Recording Secretary of the Faculty Senate adds the arrow to Flowchart C:G from Vice President for Academic Affairs to Academic Affairs Committee (copy attached).

Dr. Harbour then distributed forms to the Elected Members of the Faculty Senate from Sue Saunders (copy attached). The forms were to be used to assist the development of the three interview panels which would be interviewing the final presidential candidates when they come to campus. The Senators were asked to fill out the form and return to Dr. Harbour by the end of the meeting. Dr. Harbour then outlined the review process for the presidential search to date. The Faculty Review Committee completed its work and reported its analysis of the candidates to the Board Search Committee. Originally, that report was to be in written form. However, in a meeting between the Faculty Executive Committee and the Board Executive Committee the Board decided that the Faculty Review Committee should make its report directly in a meeting with the Board Search Committee. The Faculty Review Committee did meet with the Board Search Committee. The analysis of the Faculty Review Committee was very similar to the analysis of the candidates done by the consultant. The Board Search Committee received a written report from the Faculty Review Committee and heard the members of that committee give their views on the strengths and weaknesses of various candidates. The Board Search Committee and Faculty Review Committee worked together and achieved consensus on the candidates who would be invited to interviews in Richmond. In late November and/or early December, the final candidates will come to campus for interviews.

Dr. Harbour then turned the meeting over to Dr. Poole to discuss the revised mission statement (10/4/95 copy attached). Mr. Postel, the student representative serving on the Faculty Senate, distributed the mission statement which was written by a group of students (10/11/95 copy attached). Dr. Poole then stated that the previous comments he received were forwarded to Dr. Saunders and largely included in the revised statement. After much discussion and debate, the following amendments were made. Dr. Betty Jo Simmons recommended that "nurturing" in the second paragraph be changed to "supported". Mr. Postel asked that in the next sentence "supportive, yet" and "individual" be deleted. The amendments were approved. The last sentence in the last paragraph was brought forward as an amendment by Ms. Cranston, Ms. Palmer and Dr. Shank. The amendment read: "The College emphasizes teacher education and other professional preparation programs. Additionally the College offers assistance to the region by providing economic development, human services and educational programs." The amendment carried. The mission statement, as amended, carried (copy as approved by Faculty Senate attached).

Dr. Harbour then asked President Dorrill to report on the August 28 meeting with the Governor's staff, Department of Planning and Budget, and Secretary of Education Sgro. Dr. Dorrill stated that the agenda for the meeting was to update on restructuring activities, identify critical issues for the next biennium which did and did not require funding, identifying where we are and where we wish to go. Dr. Dorrill emphasized to the group that Longwood has a unique role since: we are the only public four-year institution in this region; we have a distinctive tradition and history; and our size. Dr. Dorrill further stated that several priorities on the list included raising faculty salaries closer to the sixtieth percentile of our benchmark group, allocating more of our budget to institutional support thereby devoting less to physical plant, strengthening faculty development to incorporate instructional technology into our teaching, and enhancing library access and distance learning. He also discussed our capital outlay priorities.

The meeting adjourned at 2:15 p.m.