

Longwood University

## Digital Commons @ Longwood University

---

Meeting Agendas and Minutes

Faculty Senate

---

1-25-2001

### Faculty Senate Minutes 2001.01.25

Longwood University

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

---

Minutes of the  
Faculty Senate Meeting  
Salon B, Dining Hall  
January 25, 2001

Dr. Robert May, Chair, called the meeting of the Longwood Faculty Senate to order at 3:35 P.M. The following members were present:

|                     |                       |                      |
|---------------------|-----------------------|----------------------|
| Dr. Chris Bjornsen  | Dr. Jackie Hall       | Dr. Dean Palmer      |
| Dr. Chuck Blauvelt  | Dr. Tony Hardin       | Dr. Darryl Poole     |
| Dr. Norman Bregman  | Mr. David Harnage     | Dr. Ellery Sedgwick  |
| Dr. Jená Burges     | Mr. Ronald Hill (SGA) | Dr. Betty Jo Simmons |
| Dr. Theresa Clark   | Dr. Frank Howe        | Dr. David Smith      |
| Dr. David Cordle    | Dr. Rená Koesler      | Mr. Ibrahim Stwodah  |
| Dr. Berkwood Farmer | Ms. Phyllis Mable     | Dr. Lee Tlou         |
| Dr. Mary Flanigan   | Dr. Claire B. McCoy   |                      |
| Dr. Joe Garcia      | Dr. Geoff Orth        |                      |

Absent were Dr. Charles Kinzer and Dr. Maurice Maxwell.

Also present were Ms. Alecia Knox, Dr. Nancy Krippel, Dr. Ed Smith, and the following observers: Dr. Mc Amoss, Dr. Bill Abrams, Dr. Bill Harbour, Dr. Gordon Ring, Ms. Susie Rood, and Dr. Bob Webber.

The minutes of the December 14, 2000, meeting of the Faculty Senate were approved as distributed.

Mr. Harnage reported on the Governor's budget proposals for Longwood College—really a reallocation of funds. While he would reinstate enrollment growth funding of a quarter of a million dollars and include \$125,000.00 for student assistance, the governor also recommended efficiency and management savings of \$61,000.00 for this year and \$192,000.00 for next (a reduction of about a quarter of a million dollars).

The governor included no money for faculty salary increases and proposed that the state contribution (currently 10.4 %) for those in an optional retirement program (ORP) in the future equal the state's contribution to VRS (currently 9.24 %). Faculty recruits on an ORP would have to be told that there is no certainty what the state's contributions would be beyond the coming year.

The proposed science building funding (including a request to supplement the appropriation for full funding), the proposed Jarman funding, and the maintenance reserve are all moved to funding by debt (bonds) so that the Governor captures the cash.

Longwood College has put in amendments, the first priority being one for a 3 ½ % faculty salary increase. Others address such matters as enrollment growth, cost escalation, ORP funding at the current rate, etc. There is also a capital projects list.

Mr. Harnage explained that the budget cycle has changed and that the budget will be submitted to the Board in June rather than at the spring meeting. The Board will then know what the General Assembly has done. He emphasized the need for Assembly members to hear from individual constituents so that they know voters are not indifferent to the issues under debate.

Mr. Harnage also requested the list of faculty representatives for the budget committee.

Dr. May next announced that Dr. Betty Jo Simmons has completed a third three-year term as faculty representative to the Longwood Foundation Board and is ineligible for reappointment. The Senate has been asked to submit a list of names from which the Board will choose a new faculty representative. The following eight names were listed: Dr. McRae Amoss, Dr. Calvin Boyer, Dr. Judy Johnson, Dr. Charles Kinzer, Dr. Wayne McWee, Dr. Ruth Meese, Dr. Bruce Montgomery, and Dr. Ellery Sedgwick. The Senate authorized the Executive Committee to ascertain willingness to serve and then forward a list to the Foundation Board.

Dr. May called on Dr. Flanigan to present the reports of the General Education Committee and the EPC. She first presented the EPC recommendations (copy attached to the official minutes) and said that the General Education Committee concurred with each of the recommendations of the EPC. She suggested that discussion of the General Education Proposal begin with the goals involving least change.

In a discussion of the preamble, Dr. Flanigan explained that it seemed logical that the general education program should support the basic mission of the College. In response to a question about a change in the number of hours, she pointed out that because of the incorporation into the general education program of the freshman seminar, the internship, and one of the degree requirement courses, all of which students currently take, the real increase in hours was only three. She added that it was, in fact, hard for the committee to keep the hours down to 41.

Goal 1: In response to a question about staffing for Goal 1, Dr. Krippel reported that only six sections of the seminar are now taught by other than full-time faculty and that those six have the appropriate credentials to teach. Seminar instructors also have regular training sessions. Another question underscored the need to indicate in the catalogue that students transferring with sophomore standing or above are exempt from the seminar requirement.

Goals 4, 6, 7, and 8: There were no questions or comments about these Goals.

Goal 5 elicited a concern for students with disabilities who often opted for the computer science alternative in the current Goal but then took a math course later. It may be that such students should continue that pattern.

Goal 9 led to a discussion of the approval process for the international experience. Approval would be granted through the international affairs office and the appropriate department, perhaps following broad guidelines established by the oversight committee.

Dr. Flanigan pointed out that in Goal 11 the physical activity course is gone but that the remaining two-credit course has an activity component in it.

Goal 12 provoked considerable discussion concerning whether departments, which may designate specific courses for this goal, may also double count this course as a major requirement. Such a possibility may exist for this upper level general education course although it is not a possibility for the lower level courses. Dr. May urged Senate members to think about this issue for next time and come up with appropriate wording clarifying the issue.

Dr. Farmer moved adjournment, and the meeting was adjourned at 5:40 P.M.

Susan H. May