

Longwood University

## Digital Commons @ Longwood University

---

Meeting Agendas and Minutes

Faculty Senate

---

3-9-2000

### Faculty Senate Minutes 2000.03.09

Longwood University

Follow this and additional works at: [https://digitalcommons.longwood.edu/facultysenate\\_meetings](https://digitalcommons.longwood.edu/facultysenate_meetings)

---

**Speech and Theatre**

Delete SPCH 311, 312 Studies Abroad

**Psychology - Information Only**

Currently Psyc 650 was a 3 hour requirement for MS in Community and College Counseling. Licensure requirements are now the equivalent of 9 credits; students may now enroll (re-enroll) for up to 9 credit.

**Physics**

Course change - credit hours

Physics 496 - Research Projects in Physics - change credits from 2, 3, 4 to 1, 2, 3, 4

-----  
**Minutes of the  
Faculty Senate Meeting  
Salon B, New Dining Hall  
March 9, 2000, 3:30 p.m.**

Dr. Bob May, Chair, called the meeting of the Longwood Faculty Senate to order. The following members were present:

Dr. Mc Amoss  
Dr. Pam Arkin  
Mr. Mark Baldrige  
Dr. Chris Bjornsen  
Dr. Norman Bregman  
Dr. Bill Burger  
Dr. Craig Challender  
Dr. Theresa Clark  
Dr. David Cordle  
Dr. Berkwood Farmer  
Dr. Joe Garcia  
Dr. Frank Howe  
Dr. Charles Kinzer (for P. Lust)  
Dr. Rena Koesler  
Dr. Maurice Maxwell  
Dr. Sharon Menegoni  
Dr. Jeffery Peden  
Dr. Ellery Sedgwick  
Dr. Dave Smith  
Dr. Ibrahim Stwodah  
Dr. Gordon Van Ness

Drs. Mitch Adrian, Mary Flanigan, Mr. Rick Hurley, Ms. Phyllis Mable and Mr. Rob Havey were absent.

Dr. May asked for corrections and additions to the minutes of the February 10, 2000, Faculty

Senate Meeting. The minutes were then approved as distributed.

Dr. May then called on Dr. Maxwell. On behalf of EPC, Dr. Maxwell moved the following for approval by Faculty Senate:

**Accounting Finance and Economics: Program Changes -**

- New concentration in Economic - Public Policy Concentration - No new courses associated with this
- Delete concentration in Economics - Technical Analysis concentration

**Music: Program Changes:**

- New Concentration: Piano Pedagogy, 78 crs in major, 120 for degree

**Psychology: New General Ed Course:**

- PSYC 101 Intro to Psychology (3cr)

**Remove from Gen Ed and store:**

- PSYC 131 -Intro to Psych: Foundations for Social Interaction
- PSYC 132 -Intro to Psych: Foundations for Behavior Change

**New program:** School Library Media - licensure only

Designed for students with a teaching certificate who want to add an endorsement for Library Media preK-12.

**Required Courses:**

- ENGL 581 - Young Adult Literature (3cr)
- ENGL 585 - Children's Literature (3cr)
- LISC 503 - Media Selection and Evaluation (3cr)
- LISC 548 - Production of Media for Instruction (3cr)
- LISC 560 - Informational Sources and Services (3cr)
- LISC 580 - Technical Processing of Materials (3cr)
- LISC 660 - Collaborative Instructional Processes (3cr)
- LISC 670 - Contemporary Library Media Center Operation and Practice (3cr)
- LICS 690 - Clinical Experience in Library Media Services (3cr)

The motion was then voted on, and carried.

Again, on behalf of the EPC, Dr. Maxwell moved for approval of the following:

**Longwood Seminar**

LSEM 100, Longwood Seminar - change to a letter-graded course rather than a pass/fail; grade will be used in calculating the GPA and if a student repeats seminar it will count as one of the five course repeats.

Much discussion occurred. Dr. Peden moved an amendment to the motion, seconded by Mr. Baldrige, that the phrase "and if a student repeats seminar it will count as one of the five

course repeats" be stricken. The motion to amend was defeated. The original motion was then voted on, and carried.

Dr. May then called on Dr. Howe to discuss the recommendations from the P&T Committee. Dr. Howe, on behalf of the Committee on Promotion and Tenure Policies and Procedures presented three motions, one by one, for consideration by the Faculty Senate.

## **I. Tenure Review**

Proposed change: (additions are *italicized and underlined*)

FPPM

Page 145 g., h., i. - Delete these sections

Page 52 6

Current wording:

A faculty member with prior teaching experience at an accredited institution may be granted a reduced probationary period as a written condition of initial appointment upon the recommendation of the Department Chair and department tenure committee and with the approval of the Dean. A minimum of one academic year must be served at Longwood College before tenure may be initiated. The recommendations shall be transmitted to the Vice President for Academic Affairs, the President, and the Board of Visitors for approval.

6. Replace current wording with the following:

*The sixth year tenure review is a one-time process. Once initiated, there is no withdrawal from this process. At the time a faculty member is hired, he/she may seek up to three years credit toward tenure based upon prior tenure track teaching, scholarship and service. Such credit may be granted by the Vice President for Academic Affairs upon the recommendation of the Department Chair and the department tenure committee, and with the approval of the Dean. Credit towards tenure shall be written into the faculty member's initial contract and will be irrevocable. A faculty member who requests and receives credit towards tenure may not rescind this request at a later date. The recommendation shall be transmitted to the President and the Board of Visitors for approval.*

7. Delete "Except in the above instance" start the sentence with "All initial appointments..."

Page 68 - P.TENURE - #5

Current wording:

5. The probationary period for tenure shall be six years. Procedures for tenure consideration specified in Appendix D occur during the probationary faculty member's sixth

year of employment, with tenure normally awarded to successful candidates at the beginning of their seventh year of full time employment. Only years under a full time contract shall satisfy this requirement; periods of academic leave or part time employment shall not count.

Proposed change (additions are *italicized and underlined*)

*5. Tenure review is based on a significant period of full time teaching, scholarship and service. Tenure review is a one-time process. Once initiated, there is no withdrawal from this process. The probationary period for tenure shall be six years. Procedures for tenure consideration specified in Appendix D occur during the probationary faculty member's sixth year of employment, with tenure normally awarded to successful candidates at the beginning of their seventh year of full time employment. Only years under a full time contract shall satisfy this requirement; periods of academic leave or part time employment shall not count. At the time a faculty member is hired, he/she may seek up to three years credit toward tenure based upon prior tenure track teaching, scholarship and service. Such credit may be granted by the Vice President for Academic Affairs upon the recommendation of the Department Chair and the department tenure committee, and with the approval of the Dean. Credit towards tenure shall be written into the faculty member's initial contract and will be irrevocable. A faculty member who requests and receives credit towards tenure may not rescind this request at a later date.*

Dr. Maxwell moved to amend the proposed changes on Page 52, 6. and Page 68, 5. by striking "Once initiated, there is no withdrawal from this process." and replacing the sentence with "A candidate may withdraw but may not reenter the process." Item Page 52, 6. would then read (with similar wording on Page 68,5.): The sixth year tenure review is a one-time process. A candidate may withdraw but may not reenter the process. At the time a faculty member is hired, he/she may seek up to three years credit .....

The amendment was voted on, and carried.

Dr. Peden moved, seconded by Mr. Baldrige, to strike "Credit towards tenure shall be written into the faculty member's initial contract and will be irrevocable. A faculty member who requests and receives credit towards tenure may not rescind this request at a later date." Replace with "Credit towards tenure shall be written into a faculty member's initial contract, but the faculty member may request reconsideration of the number of year's credit granted. Such a request must be made in writing to the Department Chair, Dean, and Vice President for Academic Affairs, and must be made within one year of initial hiring."

Item Page 52, 6. would then read:

The sixth year tenure review is a one-time process. A candidate may withdraw but may not reenter the process. At the time a faculty member is hired, he/she may seek up to three years credit toward tenure based upon prior tenure track teaching, scholarship and service. Such credit may be granted by the Vice President for Academic Affairs upon the recommendation of the Department Chair and the department tenure committee, and with the approval of the

Dean. Credit towards tenure shall be written into a faculty member's initial contract, but the faculty member may request reconsideration of the number of year's credit granted. Such a request must be made in writing to the Department Chair, Dean, and Vice President for Academic Affairs, and must be made within one year of initial hiring. The recommendation shall be transmitted to the President and the Board of Visitors for approval.

The amendment was then voted on and defeated.

Dr. Peden then offered another amendment, seconded by Mr. Baldrige, to strike "Credit towards tenure shall be written into the faculty member's initial contract and will be irrevocable. A faculty member who requests and receives credit towards tenure may not rescind this request at a later date." Replace with "A faculty member who has credit towards tenure may have this credit waived by giving written notice to the Department Chair, Dean, and Vice President for Academic Affairs at any time before the tenure review process is initiated. In such a case, all credit towards tenure will be cancelled and the faculty member's tenure review year will be his or her sixth year of full time teaching at Longwood.

Item Page 52, 6. would then read:

The sixth year tenure review is a one-time process. A candidate may withdraw but may not reenter the process. At the time a faculty member is hired, he/she may seek up to three years credit toward tenure based upon prior tenure track teaching, scholarship and service. Such credit may be granted by the Vice President for Academic Affairs upon the recommendation of the Department Chair and the department tenure committee, and with the approval of the Dean. A faculty member who has credit towards tenure may have this credit waived by giving written notice to the Department Chair, Dean, and Vice President for Academic Affairs at any time before the tenure review process is initiated. In such a case, all credit towards tenure will be cancelled and the faculty member's tenure review year will be his or her sixth year of full time teaching at Longwood. The recommendation shall be transmitted to the President and the Board of Visitors for approval.

The amendment was then voted on and defeated.

The main motion, as amended, was voted on, and carried. Other areas of the section will be revised to meet the updated wording.

## **II. Departmental Primacy Re Promotion and Tenure**

Proposed changes:

Pg. 141

6. a

Current wording:

The Dean shall recognize the primacy of the review process at the departmental level.

Proposed Change: (additions are *italicized and underlined*)

The Dean shall recognize the primacy of the review process at the department level.  
*Understanding that those in the review process, who work most closely with the candidate are in the best position to render an accurate judgement of the candidate's credentials and performance, the Dean will give serious consideration to the departmental review while conducting his/her own professional evaluation of the candidate*

Page 142

7. a

Current wording:

The Vice President shall recognize the primacy of the review process at the departmental level.

Proposed change:

The Vice President shall recognize the primacy of the review process at the departmental level.  
*Understanding that those in the review process, who work most closely with the candidate are in the best position to render an accurate judgement of the candidate's credentials and performance, the Vice President will give serious consideration to the departmental review while conducting his/her own professional evaluation of the candidate*

Page 147

6. a

Current wording:

The Dean shall recognize the primacy of the review process at the departmental level.

Proposed change:

The Dean shall recognize the primacy of the review process at the department level.  
*Understanding that those in the review process, who work most closely with the candidate are in the best position to render an accurate judgement of the candidate's credentials and performance, the Dean will give serious consideration to the departmental review while conducting his/her own professional evaluation of the candidate*

Page 148

7. a

Current wording:

The Vice President shall recognize the primacy of the review process at the departmental level.

Proposed change:

The Vice President shall recognize the primacy of the review process at the departmental level.

*Understanding that those in the review process, who work most closely with the candidate are in the best position to render an accurate judgement of the candidate's credentials and performance, the Vice President will give serious consideration to the departmental review while conducting his/her own professional evaluation of the candidate*

Dr. Van Ness moved to amend the motion presented by using the original (1/27/00) motion in all four places. The amendment would read:

Pg. 141 6 a.

The Dean shall recognize the primacy of the review process at the department level. Understanding that those in the review process, who work most closely with the candidate are in the best position to render an accurate judgement of the candidate's performance, the Dean will normally differ with a department-level decision only if there is evidence of fraud, bias, or blatant unfairness in the process, or if the standards applied by the department clearly fail to meet School or institutional standards.

Pg. 142 7 a.

The Vice President shall recognize the primacy of the review process at the departmental level. Understanding that those in the review process who work most closely with the candidate are in the best position to render an accurate judgement of the candidate's credentials and performance, the Vice President will normally overturn a department-level decision only if there is evidence of fraud, bias, or blatant unfairness in the process, or if the standards applied by the department clearly fail to meet School or institutional standards.

Pg. 147 6. a.

The Dean shall recognize the primacy of the review process at the department level. Understanding that those in the review process, who work most closely with the candidate are in the best position to render an accurate judgement of the candidate's credentials and performance, the Dean will normally differ with a department-level decision only if there is evidence of fraud, bias, or blatant unfairness in the process, or if the standards applied by the department clearly fail to meet School or institutional standards.

Pg. 148 7. a.

The Vice President shall recognize the primacy of the review process at the departmental level. Understanding that those in the review process, who work most closely with the candidate are in the best position to render an accurate judgement of the candidate's credentials and performance, the Vice President will normally overturn a department-level decision only if there is evidence of fraud, bias, or blatant unfairness in the process, or if the standards applied by the department clearly fail to meet School or institutional standards.



Dr. Peden seconded the motion. Dr. Munson offered a friendly amendment. Drs. Van Ness and Peden accepted the friendly amendment. The friendly amendment reads:  
Pg. 141 6.a.

Those in the review process who work most closely with the candidate are in the best position to render an accurate judgement of the candidate's credentials and performance. The Dean, therefore, shall normally follow the department recommendation in making his/her own evaluation, except in those instances where the department has failed to observe institutional guidelines, criteria, and procedures as outlined in the FPPM.

Pg. 142 7.a.

Those in the review process who work most closely with the candidate are in the best position to render an accurate judgement of the candidate's credentials and performance. The Vice President, therefore, shall normally follow the department recommendation in making his/her own evaluation, except in those instances where the department has failed to observe institutional guidelines, criteria, and procedures as outlined in the FPPM.

Pg. 147 6.a.

Those in the review process who work most closely with the candidate are in the best position to render an accurate judgement of the candidate's credentials and performance. The Dean, therefore, shall normally follow the department recommendation in making his/her own evaluation, except in those instances where the department has failed to observe institutional guidelines, criteria, and procedures as outlined in the FPPM.

Pg. 148 7.a.

Those in the review process who work most closely with the candidate are in the best position to render an accurate judgement of the candidate's credentials and performance. The Vice President, therefore, shall normally follow the department recommendation in making his/her own evaluation, except in those instances where the department has failed to observe institutional guidelines, criteria, and procedures as outlined in the FPPM.

The motion, as amended, was then voted on, and carried.

The main motion, as amended, was then discussed. The vote was taken and carried.

The last of the three motions from the Committee on Promotion and Tenure will be taken up at the next Faculty Senate Meeting.

The meeting adjourned at 5:05 p.m.

Submitted for Approval  
by Nancy Scruggs, Secretary

-----  
*General Education Committee*

*Overview of Responsibilities of the Committee*

The General Education Committee is responsible for monitoring, overseeing, and synthesizing information about the success of the Longwood College General Education program in conveying content knowledge to, and developing the cognitive abilities of, Longwood College students and graduates. Where these are found wanting, they are also charged with recommending changes. The committee will consolidate and evaluate information about the performance of the General Education program's curricular and co-curricular elements with the aid of appropriate administrative offices (e.g., Assessment, Longwood Seminar, Student Affairs). The Committee will issue biennial reports on the state of General Education and will, when necessary, make specific recommendations for change to the Educational Policy Committee for curricular action or to appropriate parties for changes in co-curricular elements.

*Membership of the Committee*

The committee will be a standing committee of the Faculty Senate. The committee will be composed of four members of the full-time faculty, nominated by the Faculty Senate Executive Committee and approved by the Faculty Senate. Two faculty will be from the School of Liberal Arts and Sciences, and one each from the Schools of Education and Human Services and Business and Economics. Faculty members will serve 3-year terms and the terms of service will be staggered. Members may be reappointed. Non-voting ex-officio members of the Committee shall be

- The Dean of Student
- The Director of Assessment
- The Director of Longwood Seminar
- The Vice President for Academic Affairs or designee
- Chair of the Faculty Senate or designee

*Structure and General Operation of the Committee*

The Faculty Senate will appoint a faculty member as chair of the committee from among the committee's members. The chair will serve for a period of two years and will be an ex-officio member of the Educational Policies Committee. Should votes of the committee be necessary, any tie vote will be broken by a vote of the Faculty Senate President (or designee). The Committee Chair will receive a reduction of teaching load equivalent to 1/2 of the "normal" teaching load in the school of the faculty member's appointment (e.g., a 2 course or 6-hour reduction per semester for the 2000 standard load of 12 hours and 4 courses). Reduction in load for other committee members should be requested by the committee on an "as needed" basis to carry out intensive projects.

*Specific Responsibilities of the Committee (including, but not limited to)*

- Organize and oversee the Longwood College Advanced Seminar

- Coordinate and participate in the design of General Education assessment efforts
- Review assessment results for General Education (e.g., goals, courses)
- Recommend changes in the General Education Curriculum
- Assessment of co-curricular general education activities
- Develop and update an ongoing plan for faculty development in General Education
- Review organizational and extra-organizational efforts to communicate general education to constituencies (e.g., registrar's and admissions office communications)
- Oversee and recommend changes in the OVERALL General Education process
- Submit biennially a report citing any issues and making recommendations for General education in the areas of
  - Curriculum
  - Co-curricular activities
  - Assessment of General Education both Substantive and Structural
  - Faculty development for General Education
  - Student awareness of General Education program and purpose

Nancy E. Scruggs  
Administrative Assistant to the  
Vice President for Academic Affairs  
Longwood College  
Farmville, VA 23909  
Phone: 804.395.2010 or 804.395.2015  
Fax: 804.395.2506

**"Open your arms to change, but don't let go of your values."**