THE CHRONICLE

1984-85 Academic Year

April 19th #15 of 1985

Published by the Office of the Vice President for Academic Affairs

Vonday April 22

Tuesday April 23

Degrees Committee - 2:30 pm - N204

Wednesday April 24

hursday April 25

L&NS Chairmen's Meeting - 2:30 P.M. - CC214

Piday
April 26

Admissions Committee - A305 - 2:00 pm

FACULTY MEETING - A105 - 3:00 pm

Daturday April 27 Nancy A. Ramseur Concert - 8:00 pm - CC Theatre - Anthony Di Bonaventura - Pianist

7.7.7.30 2.5

Sunday April 28

OFFICIAL ANNOUNCEMENTS

Agenda for the Sixth Meeting of the Instructional Faculty, 1984-1985

I. Approval of the minutes of the meeting of 3/29/85 (p. 7).

T	I.	Commi	ttee	Don	ant a
1	1.	COMMIT	LLEE	Kep	OLLS

Α.	Academic Status Commit	tee.								Dr.	Weiss
В.	Admissions Committee									Mr.	Butchko
C.	Curriculum Committee									Dr.	Sanderlin
D.	Degrees Committee									Dr.	Pau1
E	Eggs 1 tor Adriagons Commi	++								-	

- III.
- IV. Report of the Chairman of the ad hoc USES Review Committee Dr. Bauer
- V. Elections to fill committee vacancies and other offices for 1985-1987 or 1985-1986, as appropriate (see Nominations Committee report, p. 9, and present committee membership roster, p. 9). . . . Dr. Gailey
- VI. Consideration of recommendations from the Degrees Committee relative to student petitions (to be distributed under separate cover to all instructional faculty members on 4/24/85) Dr. Paul
- VII. Consideration of recommendations from the Curriculum Committee
- VIII. Announcements.
 - IX. Adjournment.

All members of the Instructional Faculty are requested to bring this edition of the Chronicle and the forthcoming report of the Degrees Committee with them to this meeting.

-- Vice President for Academic Affairs

Summer Addresses (Second Request)

I ask that all faculty (both instructional and administrative) in the Division of Academic Affairs please keep me apprised of any temporary addresses and their dates of applicability for the summer months. As each of you knows, it is sometimes very important for my office to be able to contact you in the summer, and that requires that accurate addresses be on file here. If you have moved within the past year, please make sure that we have your new address. If and when it becomes necessary to communicate in the summer we will make every reasonable effort to make contact; but in the final analysis, if you have not provided the College the means necessary to contact you, then the College cannot be responsible for the consequences of the resulting failure. If you believe there may be any problems in this regard with your own circumstances, please give me a call so that we can resolve them before summer is upon us.

-- Vice President for Academic Affairs

Contracts

It is my present expectation that employment contracts for faculty returning to CNC for the 1985-1986 academic year will be distributed prior to May 10, 1985. If for any reason the issuance of contracts is delayed, I will, prior to that date, apprise all returning faculty of the amount of the offer the College intends to make to them for 1985-1986. The methodology for determining the amounts of such offers will be essentially the same as was used last year.

-- Vice President for Academic Affairs

Administrative Actions on Instructional Faculty Recommendations

The recommendations of item V (student petitions) of the minutes (p.7) of the 3/29/85 meeting have been approved by this office. The recommendations of item VI (grievance procedures) have been forwarded to the President together with the recommendations of this office (p.18). The recommendation of item VII has been approved.

-- Vice President for Academic Affairs

* * * * *

Funds for Excellence

I am reproducing below the guidelines for the 86-88 biennium that have been received here recently on the above matter. I encourage each faculty member to read this document and reflect upon the potential of this program to benefit Christopher Newport College. At some time in the near future the Grants Coordinator, Mr. Wendell Barbour, will be calling a meeting of all who might be interested in shaping and contributing to a coordinated College response to this opportunity. Our goal is to have a preliminary proposal draft ready for the review of Council Staff by September 1, 1985. Please watch for Mr. Barbour's announcement in a later edition of this Chronicle. Inquiries and questions on this matter should be directed to him.

-- Vice President for Academic Affairs

GUIDELINES FOR SUBMISSION OF INSTITUTIONAL REQUESTS FOR FUNDS FOR EXCELLENCE 1986-88

The Funds for Excellence program is designed to support those activities which have for their purpose raising, significantly, the level of excellence in Virginia's public colleges and universities. Funds for this program are appropriated to the Council of Higher Education and are distributed by the Council on the basis of competitive proposals from the institutions.

The Funds for Excellence program was initiated in the 1980-82 biennium. To date, the council has made 69 awards totaling about \$6.6 million. Awards have been made for a wide variety of purposes: the purchase of computing, engineering, and scientific equipment; faculty and student computer training; cooperative programs with the public schools; the improvement of teaching; industrial and business training; curriculum revision; basic skills development; program evaluation; Afro-American studies; and scientific and medical training and research.

Funds for Excellence Awards in 1986-88

At its December 1984 meeting, the Council of Higher Education agreed to set aside a major portion of the appropriation for the Funds for Excellence program in the 1986-88 biennium to support undergraduate teaching and curriculum development in the liberal arts and sciences at Virginia's public colleges and universities. The Council thinks:

- . that successful participation in a technologically advanced society and an international economy requires both expert skills and the capacity to make mature judgments based on sound reasoning and clear values;
- . that the liberal arts and sciences -- those studies primarily concerned with developing general intellectual competencies, the capacity for informed judgment, aesthetic awareness, and values -- are worthy of study regardless of program major or career objective;
- . that the liberal arts and sciences offer students important opportunities to develop skills in writing, speaking, and critical analysis, and further, that they offer students opportunities to comprehend the dimensions of human experience throughout history; and
- . that liberal arts and sciences graduates can improve early career opportunities if they augment their majors with elective courses that develop technical or professional skills.

In the 1986-88 biennium, the Council will use the Funds for Excellence program to support projects which:

- 1. assess undergraduate achievement;
- 2. provide for the inclusion of the liberal arts and sciences in technical and professional degree programs, including teacher education programs;
- 3. develop technical and professional course sequences to be offered to students majoring in the liberal arts and sciences:
- 4. place greater emphasis upon mastery of both basic verbal and computational skills and higher order cognitive skills, and introduce procedures to assess skill development;
- 5. define more precisely the general education curriculum and requirments; and assign the institution's best teachers to the courses in that curriculum that introduce new students to higher education;
- 6. help faculty members to develop or adopt teaching methods which support planned curriculum changes; or
- 7. improve the quality of academic advising, including that which helps students relate curricula to career goals and aspirations.

Review of Proposals

Requests for funds will be reviewed by the Council, its staff, and where appropriated, by external referees. The purpose of these funds is to support activities demonstrating excellence or the potential for excellence. A convincing proposal should speak directly to that concern. An institution requesting funds for more than one activity or purpose must assign priorities to its requests.

Requests for funds (for one or two years of the 1986-88 biennium) should be submitted to the Director of the Council staff no later than February 10, 1986. Awards of Funds for Excellence will be made by the Council of Higher Education at its May 1986 meeting.

Information to be Included in Requests for Funds

Information normally provided in support of funding requests should be included in proposals for Funds for Excellence. This information should include the following:

- I. Activity Description a brief narrative of what actions will be taken to implement the proposed program.
- II. Goals a statement of purpose(s).
- III. Objectives statement of the objectives which would be addressed by funding specifically directed toward this activity.
- IV. Strategies the ways in which the goals and objectives will be achieved.
 - V. Performance Criteria the ways by which the success of the strategies identified in IV. above and the achievement of the objectives identified in III. will be assessed. Projects that do not include adequate specific performance criteria will not be funded.
- VI. Budget Request in standard budget format, list general funds required to implement this activity. If additional funds will be available from other sources, please include an explanation of the amount and nature of these funds. Examples would include federal, business or industry, local endowment, or allocated educational and

general funds currently targeted by the institution. The Council will not support additional staff with Funds for Excellence money. It will distribute funds to support the greatest possible number of proposals, and therefore will not fund excessively costly proposals.

Staff Consultation

The staff of the Council will review preliminary drafts of proposals, if requested, after September 1, 1985.

(April 1985)

NEWS & GENERAL INFORMATION

Retirement Party

Members of the Department of Biology, Chemistry and Environmental Science would like to invite the college faculty and staff to a retirement party for Dr. Aletha Markusen and Dr. Robert Edwards on Friday, 10 May from 15-1700 in the back of the Terrace. Please come, enjoy some munchies and chat with the latest Professors Emeriti.

-- Harold Cones, Chairman, Department of Biology, Chemistry and Environmental Science

1986-87 Fulbright Scholar Program

The Council for International Exchange of Scholars has just announced the availability of 300 grants to support scholarly research abroad and 700 grants for university lecturing abroad. Information and application request forms are available from me and are posted on the first floor of Wingfield Hall and adjacent to faculty mailboxes. The following application deadlines have been established:

June 15, 1985	Australia, New Zealand, Papua New Guinea, Fiji, India, Latin America and the Caribbean
September 15, 1985	Africa, Europe, and other countries in Asia
November 1, 1985	Junior Lectureships to France, Germany, Italy, and Spain
December 31, 1985	NATO Research Fellowships
February 1, 1986	Spain Research Fellowships; France and Germany Travel and Supplementary Awards

Awards are made for three months to one full academic year. There are openings in over 100 countries and multicountry research is possible in several regional programs.

-- Sanford Lopater, Fulbright Program Advisor 118A Wingfield Hall

ODU Biological Sciences Seminar

Dr. Norman Myers, Oxford, England, authority on world's environmental problems and author of The Sinking Ark and The Primary Source among other writings, will present a talk entitled: "OUR ENVIRONMENTAL OUTLOOK: GLOOM OR BOOM."

The talk will be in Room 100, Kaufman Hall (next to Webb Center) at 4:00 p.m., Tuesday, April 30, 1985.

There will be a wine and cheese reception in the Virginia Room of the Webb Center following the talk. All are invited to attend both the talk and the reception.

- Harold Cones

Virginia Academy of Science Meeting

From May 15-17 the Virginia Academy of Science will have its 63rd annual meeting at The College of William and Mary in Williamsburg. There will be programs in the following sections:

Aeronautical & Aerospace Sciences... Biology
Agricultural Sciences... Botany
Astronomy, Mathematics & Physics... Chemistry
Environmental Sciences... Education

Materials Science... Engineering Medical Sciences... Geology Microbiology..... Psychology

In addition there will be vendor displays and numerous social activities. Dr. James O'Brien (TCC), Vice Chair of the Psychology Section, requested that the lecture by Dr. Robert Hartshorn be announced and all interested persons be invited. For further information on the meeting, registration procedures, or joining VAS please contact Edward Weiss (7044).

The Psychology Section of the Virginia Academy of Science announces a special lecture. . .

Robert L. Hartshorn, Ed.D.

Still Concrete After All these Years --Piagetian Research on Thinking Patterns of Adult Students

> Thursday, May 16, 1985 1:45-2:45 (lecture and discussion)

The College of William and Mary In Virginia
Millington Hall
Room 119

As educators we labor to present material so that our students can understand it. Yet, there are times when we feel we've lost them, or they complain that we are talking over their heads. Dr. Hartshorn is a chemistry professor who, like others in the physical and behavioral sciences, has sought answers to such problems in Piaget's theory of the development of human cognitive processes. Some of the research findings and their implications for teaching are startling. Dr. Hartshorn will discuss research on graduate and undergraduate university students, community college students, and high school students; and implications for teaching strategies.

The members of the Psychology Section of the Virginia Academy of Science cordially invite you to attend and participate.

ASTD Meeting

The Southeastern Virginia Chapter of the American Society for training and development will hold its regular monthly meeting on April 24 from 6:30 p.m. to 9 p.m. at the OMNI in Norfolk. The program, which is open to the public, will be the first of a five-part series focusing on a "Top Down Management" approach to training. The April 24 session is entitled "Training--A Total Package: Supervisors, Middle Managers, and Executives" and will be presented by Norman Fisher and Terry Fredrick from the Consolidated Civilian Personnel Office at the Norfolk Naval Supply Center.

Cost for the April 24 program is \$16 if reservations are made by April 23 and \$18 if made after that date or at the door. For reservations or information, contact Eileen Werber at 441-4505 (Southside) or Norma Brown at 599-7153 (Peninsula). Please note that member or guest cancellations on the day of the meeting as well as no-shows will be billed in accordance with our cancellation policy.

> -- Norma Brown, Assistant Director Continuing Education, CNC

Holocaust Memorial Schedule of Events

Tuesday, April 23, 11 a.m. - 2 p.m.

Movie: TRIUMPH OF THE WILL Introduced by the Staff of War Memorial Museum

Place: Smith Library-Media Dept.

2:30 - 5:30 p.m.

Movies: NIGHT AND FOG

NUREMBERG TRIALS

Introduced by the Staff of

War Memorial Museum

Place: Admin. Bldg. Rm. 105

Wednesday, April 24, 2 - 5 p.m.

Movies: NIGHT AND FOG

NUREMBERG TRIALS

Introduced by the Staff of

War Memorial Museum

Place: Smith Library-Media Dept.

7 - 9 p.m.

Lecture: SURVIVING: PERSONAL

VIEWS OF SURVIVING THE

HOLOCAUST

Introduced by Ruth Fekete

Speakers: Stefan Grunwald, Esther

Goldman and Szaja Lida

Place: Admin. Bldg. Rm. 105

Thursday, April 25, 12 - 3 p.m.

Movies: CASABLANCA

LAMBETH WALK WHY WE FIGHT

Introduced by Theodora Bostick

Smith Library-Media Dept.

 $7 - 9 \, \text{p.m.}$

Lecture: HOLOCAUST

Speakers: John Quarstein, Curator,

War Memorial Museum "CONCENTRATION CAMPS"

Mario Mazzarella, Assoc. Prof., CNC History Dept.

"THE EUROPEAN HOLOCAUST"

Hugh Treacy, Bibliographic Instruction/Online Services,

CNC Smith Library "PRESENT DANGERS"

Sue Massie, Education Coord., War Memorial Museum

"HOLOCAUST: HOW CAN IT HAPPEN?"

Douglas Gordon attended the Council of Colleges of Arts and Sciences Seminar on Faculty Development and Evaluation, held ib Atlanta, April 11 and 12.

Albert E. Avery recently attended the Northeast American Institute of Decision Sciences for the joint purposes of professional development and faculty recruitment. The meeting was held in New York City, N.Y., on March 28-29, 1985. Professor Avery was elected to the Board of Directors, in charge of arrangements for the March, 1986 meeting at Williamsburg, Va.

Chief Capehart will be attending Annual Field Training with Virginia Air National Guard, April 14-17, 1985. All Campus Police business should be directed to Sergeant Thibeault

James M. Morris of the History Department was the guest of Mr. Edward J. Campbell, President of Newport News Shipbuilding, and his executive staff at a luncheon on April 16 when he discussed the implications of his research on the shippard as revealed in his recent Dean's Colloquia paper.

Rita C. Hubbard has accepted an invitation to membership on the Editorial Board of COMMUNI-CATION QUARTERLY in the role of Associate Editor for the three year period of 1985-87. The journal, published by the Eastern Communication Association of SCA, has a national readership.

Dr. Robert L. Causey, Professor of Computer Science, has been appointed to an ASEE Summer Faculty Fellowship at NASA Langley Research Center for 1985. These research programs are supervised by the American Society for Engineering Education (ASEE), funded by NASA and awarded on a competitive basis.

COMMITTEE INFORMATION & FACULTY BUSINESS

Minutes of the CNC Faculty Meeting of March 29, 1985

The meeting was called to order at 3:05 p.m. by Dr. Summerville, the presiding officer.

- I. The minutes of the February 8, 1985 CNC Faculty Meeting were approved, as recorded in the Chronicle (#11 of March 22, 1985, pp. 6-7).
- Ia. President Anderson spoke briefly on the recent funding decision made by the State Legislature with regard to the evening MBA program which will be offered at CNC.
- II. Committee Reports

A. Academic Status - No report.

- B. Admissions Professor Butchko reported that this committee met and discussed the concern of the Admissions Office regarding the admittance of students from non-accredited secondary schools. The committee will inform the faculty of any possible need to consider policy changes pending the receipt of current statistical data and future projections.
- C. Curriculum No report.

D. Degrees - No report.

- E. Faculty Advisory No report.
- F. Nominations No report.
- III. Dr. Lopater spoke for the SACS Institutional Self-Study Committee. His report indicated that a rather lengthy questionnaire would be sent to the Faculty soon. This document is of the utmost importance and every member of the Faculty must respond completely and promptly.
- IV. Dr. Sacks reported for the Faculty Grievance Committee. He indicated that a griev-

ance has been received and that a series of important questions have arisen. To date these questions have been unsolved. A recommendation for changes in the Faculty Handbook, section VII-B-10 will be presented later in this agenda. It is believed that these changes will help resolve the aforementioned difficulties.

- V. The three student petitions, as recorded in the Chronicle (#11 of March 22, 1985, p. 7), were approved.
- VI. The recommendation from the Grievance Committee as recorded in the Chronicle (#11 of March 22, 1985, pp. 8-9) was approved.
- VII. The <u>Candidates for Degrees</u>, as listed in the <u>Chronicle</u> (#11 of March 22, 1985, pp. 9-12), were approved, subject to their successful completion of all applicable requirements.

VIII. Announcements

- 1) Dr. Morris reminded the Faculty of the presentation by Amitai Etzioni on April 12.
- 2) Dr. Gordon called for a brief meeting of the FAC, immediately after this session.
- 3) Dr. Paul reminded the Faculty of the Humanities Conference to be held at CNC on April 11, 12 and 13.
- 4) Dr. Hoaglund reminded the Faculty to plan to attend the Conference on Critical Thinking on April 11, 12 and 13.

Dr. Hornback encouraged the Faculty to attend the benefit basketball game scheduled for Friday, March 29, at 7:30 pm.

Dr. Powell reminded the Faculty to come to the luncheon on "Writing Across the Curriculum," scheduled for Monday, April 1, 1985.

IX. This meeting was adjourned at 3:25 pm.

Respectfully submitted,
Chris Scheiderer, Secretary to the Faculty
Chris Scheiderer,

* * * * *

Curriculum Committee

The Curriculum Committee unanimously recommends to the Faculty of CNC the approval of the following courses:

Physics 314. Digital Electronics and Microprocessors, I (3-3-0)
Prerequisite: CPSC 220 or 230 and Physics 202 or consent of instructor

Digital electronics principles. Microprocessor architectures and instruction sets. Assemblers and other development aids. Microcomputer system organization, memories, input-output techniques, interrupt handling, external interfacing. Data acquisition and control with A/D and D/A devices. Hands on experience with a specific microcomputer. Emphasis is on microprocessors as tools for data acquisition and control.

LSPE 130. Hiking and Backpacking (2-0-3)

A study of knowledge, values, and skills incorporated within satisfying hiking and back-packing experiences. Emphasis is on equipment selection, clothing, shelter, food selection and preparation, safety, trip planning, navigation and travel techniques, hiking and camping techniques, integrity in wilderness use, and experiential outdoor adventure.

ACCT 485. Advanced Auditing (3-3-0)
Prerequisites: CPSC 210 or 220, BUSN 331, ACCT 405

The application of computer techniques to auditing and statistical sampling.

-- Steve Sanderlin, Chairman, Curriculum Committee

* * * * *

Report of the Nominations Committee

The Nominations Committee will present the following nominees at the 4/26/85 faculty meeting for the positions indicated.

		TERM		
	COMMITTEE	EXPIRES	5	NOMINEE
1.	FAC	86.		J. Healey
2.	FAC	87		J. Morris
3.	Degrees	87		M. Booker
4.	Academic Status	87		J. Jenkins
5.	Academic Status	87		E. Weiss
6.	Admissions	87		E. Jones
7.	Faculty Hearing	87		V. Maniyar
8.	Faculty Hearing	87		B. MacLeod
9.	Faculty Grievance	87		A. King (must be from B&E)
10.	Faculty Grievance	87		L. Sacks (must be from L&NS)
11.	Faculty Grievance	87		A. Millar
12.	Nominations	87		D. Bankes
13.	Nominations	87		B. MacLeod
14.	Vice Chairman of the Faculty	86		J. Pugh
15.	Secretary to the Faculty	86		M. Stark
16.	Asst. Secretary to the Faculty	86		J. Dawson

-- Stavroula Kostaki-Gailey - Chairman, Nominations Committee

* * * *

VPAA - 4/17/85

TOP DA

CHRISTOPHER NEWPORT COLLEGE

ACADEMIC & FACULTY AFFAIRS COMMITTEES

(1985 - 1986)

						TERM
	COMMITTEE	MEMBER	DEPT	SCHOOL	ELECTED BY	EXPIRES
1. F	ACULTY ADVISORY	Colonna	ECON	BEE	IF* BAE	-85 (87)
C	COMMITTEE	Doane (v.c.)	POLS	SSEPS	-IF* 554P5	-85 (87)
		Hoaglund Pugh	PHIL BACH	LENS	TE* Lans	-85 87
		2 Lopater (secy)	PSYC	SSEPS	IF	85 87
		Avery	M&M	BEE	BEE	86
	1	Gordon (chmm)	ENGL	LENS	LENS	86
	v -	Friedman	EDUC	SSEPS	SSEPS	86
		1 Edwards, R.	BGCH	LENS	IF	86
	Y	Summerville	VPAA		XO	

2.	CURRICULUM COMMITTEE (Members may not serve concur- rently on either the De- grees Committee or the Faculty Review Commit- tee.)	Sanderlin (chmn) We Park Olson (v.e.)	-LSPE-HIST	B&E SS&PS SS&PS L&NS B&E L&NS B&E LLBNS SS&PS LLBR	TF* B&E TF* SS & PS TF* SS & PS TF* L & NS B & E L & NS SA SA SA SA XO	85 87 85 86 85 87 86 (86) 85 86 85 86 85 86
3.	DEGREES COMMITTEE (Members may not serve concurrently on either the Curriculum Committee or the Faculty Review Committee.)	Booker (v.c.) Weber Persky Paul (chmn) Williams Grobel Fellowes Hornback Netter (secy) Summerville	ECON- MATH ENGL POLS ACCT EDUC REGR VPAA	B&E L&NS L&NS SS&PS B&E SS&PS	IF IF IF IF SEE SSEPS XO(NV)	85 87 85 87 86 86 85 87 86
4.	ACADEMIC STATUS COMMITTEE	4 Jenkins (v.e.) Reppen 5 Weiss (chmm) Casey, S. Squires Vawter Netter Summerville	EDUC MCLL B&CH M&M PSYC ACCT REGR VPAA	SSGPS- LENS- LENS- BEE SSEPS BEE	IF IF* LANS IF B&E SS&PS IF XO (NV) XO	85- 87 85- (87) 85- 87 86 86 86
5.	ADMISSIONS COMMITTEE	Butchke (chmm) More Casey Jones Mollick Cummings Herrmann McLoughland Summerville	MEM MEM MCLL BECH LSPE PSYC DEAN VPAA	SS&PS B&E L&NS L&NS SS&PS SS&PS ADMN	IF SSOPS IF LENS IF XO(NV) XO	85 87 85 (87) 85 87 86 86 86
6.	ACADEMIC HEARING BOARD	Herrmann Cohen St. Onge Tross, Stove Florentine, Heidi Cemilere, Terry Mollick (chmn)	Psych M&M MCLL STDT STDT STDT B&CH	SS&PS B &E L &NS L &NS	SS&PS B&E L&NS SA SA VPAA APPT (Acad Hng Ex)	-85 (87) 86 86 85 86 85 86 85 86
7.	HONORS COUNCIL (Terms begin February 1 and end January 31.)	Lopater Bostick J. Webb (chmm) Guthrie Boyd Paul (chmm) McLoughland Summerville	PSYC HIST PHYS MCLL M&M ENGL ADMN VPAA STOT	SS & PS SS & PS L & NS L & NS B & E L & NS	IF* IF** VPAA APPT L&NS VPAA APPT* VPAA APPT XO(NV) XO(NV) VPAA APPT	86 86 87 87 87 \$6

8.	FACULTY REVIEW	Coker (chm) Edwards, R. Bankes	M&M B&CH	B & E L & N S	B&E L&NS	86 85 87
	COMMITTEE	Mazzarella (seey)	HIST	SS&PS	SSEPS	86
	(Members must be	Shaver	ACCT	B&E	VPAA APPT	85 87
	tenured, and may	St. Onge (v.c.)	MCLL	LENS	VPAA APPT	86
	not serve con-	Doerries	PSYC	SSEPS	VPAA APPT	85 87
	currently on					
	either Curricu-					
	lum or Degrees.)					
9.	FACULTY	7 Maniyar	-ECON-	-BGE	IF	85 87
	HEARING	8 -Weiss	-B&CH	LENS	IF	85 87
	COMMITTEE	Hornback	EDUC	SSEPS	IF	86
		Boyd	M&M	ВЕЕ	B&E	85 (87)
		Fellowes (chmn)	ACCT	BEE	B&E	86
		Game	CPSC	LENS	LENS	-85 -(87)
		Teschner	PHIL	L'ENS	LENS	86
		J. Petruchyk	A&C	SSEPS	SS & PS SS & PS	85 (87)
		J. Hubbard	LSPE	SSEPS	55 GP 5	00
10.	FACULTY	9 -Colonna-	-ECON-	Der	TD	
	GRIEVANCE	Casey, S.	M&M	B&E B&E	IF	-85 87
		10 Sacks (chmn)	BGCH	LENS	IF IF	86
		Avioli	MATH	LENS	IF	85 87
		Il Kernodle (v.c.)	SOSW	SS&PS	IF	86 85 87
		Bauer	PSYC	SSEPS	IF	86
		Saunders, R.	HIST -	SS&PS ==	IF	86
11.	NOMINATIONS	2 Bankes	D C CII	LCNC		
		3 -MacLood	B&CH ENGL	-LENS	IF	85 87
		Miller	POLS	L&NS SS&PS	IF IF	85 87
		Rowell (v.c.)	ACCT	BEE	BEE	86
		Gailey (chmm)	MATH	LENS	LENS	85 (87) 86
		Bostick	HIST	SSEPS	SSEPS	86
		Summerville	VPAA		XO	
12.	LIBRARY	. Avery	MCM	DCF		
	ADVISORY	-Scholl	M&M -ACCT-	B & E B & E	VPAA APPT	86
	COMMITTEE	Dooley	PSYC	SS &PS	VPAA APPT VPAA APPT	85-87
	Y	Morgan (chmn)	HIST	SSEPS	VPAA APPT VPAA APPT	86 85 87
		Mollick	В & СН	LENS	VPAA APPT	86
		St. Onge	-MCLL	L ENS	VPAA APPT	-85 -87
		-McDonald, Greg-	STDT		SA	-85-86
		-Woods, Jesse-	STDT		SA	-85-86
		Barbour	DIR	LIBR	XO	
13.	DEAN WM.	Booker	-ECON-	BEE	VPAA APPT	-85- 87
	PARKS COL-	Boyd	M&M	BEE	VPAA APPT	86
	LOQUIUM	Friedman.	-EDUC-	SSEPS	VPAA APPT	-85 87
	COMMITTEE	Morris (chmm)	HIST	SSEPS	VPAA APPT	86
		Squires	PSYC	SSEPS ·	VPAA APPT	86
		-Paul	ENGL	LENS	VPAA APPT	-85
		Pugh	ВЕСН	LENS	VPAA APPT	86
14.	REVIEW	Lopator (chmn)	-PSYC	CCEDC	VDA A ADDO	05 55
	BOARD FOR	-Mathews	SOCL	SS&PS SS&PS	VPAA APPT VPAA APPT	85 87
	PROTECTION	-Markusen-	BGCH	LENS	VPAA APPT	85 87 86
	OF HUMAN	Riley	ACCT	BEE	VPAA APPT	86
	SUBJECTS	Barbour	GRANTS		XO(NV)	

15.	TEACHER PREPARATION COUNCIL	Jenkins (chmn) Durel Powell LaVerriere Vought Pugh MacLeod D. King Avioli Herrmann J. Hubbard R. Hubbard	EDUC DEAN DEAN ADMN C&CS B&CH ENGL MCLL MATH PSYC LSPE A&C	SS & PS SS & PS L & NS L & NS L & NS L & NS L & NS SS & PS SS & PS SS & PS	XO XO XO VPAA APPT	 85 87 86 85 87 86 85 87 86 85 87 86 85 87 86 85 87
		Killam Hornback Buoncristiani	POLS EDUC PHYS	SS&PS SS&PS L&NS	VPAA APPT VPAA APPT VPAA APPT	86 86 86 TERM
	COMMITTEE	MEMBER	DEPT	SCHOOL	ELECTED BY	EXPIRES
16.	CONTINUING EDUCATION COMMITTEE	Braganza Coker Booker Stark McCubbin Kernodle Hornback (chmn) McLoughland	DIR -M&M ECON -ENGL -CPSC -SOSW -EDUC -DEAN	C.ED B&E B&E L&NS L&NS S&PS SS&PS ADMN	XO VPAA APPT	85 87 86 85 87 86 85 87 86 85 87
17.	PROGRAM REVIEW COMMITTEE	Bartlet (chmn) Doerries Fellowes G. Webb Hines Chambers	MATH- PSYC -ACCT- PHYS -A&G- ENGL	LENS SSEPS BEE LENS SSEPS LENS	VPAA APPT VPAA APPT VPAA APPT VPAA APPT VPAA APPT VPAA APPT	85 87 86 85 87 86 85 87 86
18.	BASIC EDUCATION COUNCIL	Booker Casey, S. Gorden Gailey (chmn) Butchko Hornback Weber McLoughland	ECON- M&M ENGL MATH SOCL EDUC MATH ADMN * * * *	B & E B & E L & N S L & N S S S & P S S S & P S - L & N S	DEAN-LENS APPT XO	85 87 86 85 87 86 85 87 86 85 87

MEMORANDUM:

TO: The Faculty

FROM: F. S. Bauer, Chairman, Uniform Student Evaluation Survey Review Committee.

RE: Final opportunity for input.

The USES Review Committee has formulated its draft report to the President and the Vice President for Academic Affairs containing recommendations for changes in the present survey instrument and the procedures followed in the evaluation. This draft is attached along with a prototype of the single sheet evaluation form that is recommended in

The committee solicits your comments on this draft. Please forward your written comments to me by Friday, April 26. The committee will complete its work and submit its recommendations to the administation before the close of the term.

"ES Committee Report

1

REPORT OF THE UNIFORM STUDENT EVALUATION REVIEW COMMITTEE

Background

In December 1983 President Anderson and Vice-President Summerville appointed a committee to review the current Uniform Student Evaluation Survey (USES) form and charged this committee with recommending changes to the instrument, the evaluation procedure and the reports of the results.

This committee has met during the last three academic semesters and has carefully reviewed all aspects of the current evaluation procedure. The committee also called for comments from the academic community concerning the current USES form and administration procedure. On the basis of these considerations several general observations and criticisms were framed by the committee:

- 1. The present form is quite long, and since it must be administered in all courses in each semester some students must complete the form as many as six times in the last two weeks of any given semester.
- 2. Administration of the current instrument is unnecessarily complicated.
- 3. The current instrument is defective in several significant respects:
 - . it is unclear what behavior is being measured by some questions.
- . the validity and reliability of the instrument is difficult or impossible to establish.
 - . the demographic questions appear to meet no current need.
 - . the response scale changes within the instrument.
- . The existence of an "overall performance" question (#13) does not encourage (and may discourage) careful attention to the other responses and may therefore cause inappropriate quantitative value to be assigned to what is, at best, a symptomatic indication of instructor performance.
- 4. Lack of proper supervision during evaluation is a source of concern for large lecture sections of introductory courses.

These findings were the impetus for the recommendations that follow, which are divided into three areas of consideration: the instrument; the procedure for administering the instrument; and the utilization of the information obtained.

THE INSTRUMENT

The committee reviewed the current instrument from several perspectives including those of clarity, content and purpose. In addition the VPAA made various statistical analyses available to the

present instrument representing nearly 4000 courses evaluated.

The statistical analyses were based on the correlations of the responses to each item to the response to the summative item (question 13). These data showed that there was an high internal reliability of prediction by certain questions (which vary from department to department) and the ratings on question 13. Indeed this reliability was so high that only a few key items were necessary to consider in forming predictive multiple regression equations which consistently accounted for over 90 percent of the variance. However, the committee recognizes that such post hoc statistical analyses cannot establish or measure the validity of an instrument. In this case the validity, or how well the instrument actually measures teaching effectiveness, is unknown. Although there is obviously some "face validity" associated with the type of questions asked, the testing literature suggests caution in assuming that an insrument of this type is systematically valid.

The committee, employing the aforementioned statistical data, set about to reduce the number of questions in the instument while clearly isolating the behaviors that are to be rated and hopefully wording the questions to probe that given behavior and only that behavior.

Recommendations

The following list of questions should make up the instrument. Student responses to these questions should be on a five point scale (notice the similarity to the letter grading scale) with the following values:

- 5 agree strongly
- 4 agree
- 3 neutral
- 2 disagree
- 1 disagree strongly

There will also be a NA (not applicable) box available for each question.

The following ten questions should make up the total survey.

- 1. The course is consistent with the catalog description.
- 2. The instructor's grading policy was specified within the first two weeks of the course.
 - 3. Useful feedback on student performance was provided.
 - 4. The instructor was reasonably available for providing help.
 - 5. Class time was used effectively.
- 6. The instructor seems to have command of the subject matter of the course.
- 7. The instructor's presentations helped in the understanding of course material.
- 8. The instructor demonstrated interest in and enthusiasm for the subject matter of the course.
- 9. The instructor was intellectually motivating and stimulated learning.
 - 10. The instructor appeared to be well prepared.

Note that there is no overall performance question included. The majority of the Committee feels that since the primary purpose of these evaluations has shifted from formal feedback to the instuctor for the

purpose of improvement of teaching to one of providing a measure of teaching performance for evaluative purposes, the inclusion of a "bottom line" question may, for at least some evaluators, preclude the careful examination of the primary questions. There are also statistical reasons why the summative question should not appear, but the most important argument is that it can (and probably often does) substitute for careful examination of the primary data.

THE PROCEDURE

The committee considered a number of problems with the current process of administering the USES form. The committee's recommendations follow and are annotated where necessary.

Recommendations

1. The committee recommends that the revised USES form be composed and duplicated on a single sheet with the Scan-tron response area on that sheet. Evaluators will receive and turn in the single sheet, hence streamlining the logistical preparations for administering the survey.

These single sheet question/response forms should include an area for the encoding of the class and instructor ID number, and sufficient area for written comments. Upon completion by the student, the whole sheet will be submitted.

- 2. To avoid some difficulties with the logisites of returning the forms to the computer center, an envelope containing the surveys, and an instruction sheet should be prepared in advance for each course and delivered to the instructor at least two weeks before the end of classes. Printed on each such envelope will be the proctor's authentication form and the course/instructor code number.
- 3. If an instructor is concerned about order in the classroom during the time that he or she is out of the room while evaluations are being conducted, the instructor may arrange for another member of the facutly to proctor the evaluation. If there is no apparent need for a faculty proctor a student from the class may be appointed as proctor. After overseeing the evaluation, the proctor places all of the evaluations into the envelope, completes the proctor's certification form printed on the envelope, and transports the sealed envelope to a designated office where the proctor is given a receipt for the envelope. The receipt is returned to the instructor, and the receiving office also sends a copy of the receipt to the appropriate Dean's office.
- 4. The committee has some concern about the number of times within a two week period that some students will be asked to use the evaluation form. However, rather than recommend some elaborate plan for determining which faculty members will be evaluated when and how often, the committee recommends that all instructors continue to be evaluated in every semester. The shorter and less complicated form of the instrument recommended above should in many ways provide relief from some of the concerns addressed above.

FEEDBACK TO THE INSTRUCTOR

It is generally regarded that the report form that currently summarizes the results of the USES survey for a given class has some shortcomings. The present report focuses on arithmetic means, which are statistical measures of centrality of the responses. While comparison of the given class mean on an item to the Departmental and College mean yields some useful information, one major question that cannot be answered by the information presented regards the statistical significance of the various means. Since statistically reliable differences in means are seldom intuitive, some measure of the dispersion of the scores around the reported means is necessary. The current forms yield only a breakdown of the various response categories and hence the range, which is a primitive but marginally useful measure of dispersion. Information on the dispersion of the Department and College reference groups is not available.

Counter to the need for comparing means statistically, is the concern that the validity of the instrument is so suspect that detailed statistical analyses of the data that result from the measurement process is essentially useless. Strong arguments are made supporting this position by many measurement experts, and should lead to a cautious approach toward the use of the USES data in critical comparisons of teaching effectiveness.

Recommendations

The committee recommends the addition of the appropriate standard deviations to the current report form of USES results. This addition should allow an instructor to better understand his or her means relative to the Department and College means on a given item.

ADDITIONAL CONSIDERATIONS

It is generally believed by the committee that the proposed changes to the USES form, procedure, and feedback instrument will enhance the reliability of the evaluation process. However the major role of the improved instrument will remain only diagnostic, indicating likely areas of significant success or failure in instruction. The use of this instrument should be followed and complemented by other, more substantive, evaluative procedures such as class visitation, review of teaching methods and materials, and formal and informal discussions regarding teaching processes and methods.

Finally, the committee finds the very name Uniform Student Evaluation Survey open to misunderstanding, since this name can be interpreted to suggest that the survey is about the evaluation of students, not evaluation by students. Hence the following and final recommendation.

Recommendation

The committee recommends that the name of the survey be changed to Instruction Evaluation Survey.

TOPHER TO

CHRISTOPHER NEWPORT COLLEGE

INSTRUCTION EVALUATION SURVEY

PART I	
Please	encode the course ID
number	in the response grid
to the	right. This number will
be pro	vided by the proctor.
. Use	a # 2 pencil.
.Era	se completely to change.
.Fil:	l block completely

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	0 .
1ST DIGIT										
2ST DIGIT						=				
3RD DIGIT										
4TH DIGIT										
5TH DIGIT										
6TH DIGIT		F	=		1		-	-		
7TH DIGIT						=	-		-	
8TH DIGIT										
9TH DIGITI										
10TH DIGIT										

PART II
Using the response scale given below, rate the course
and instructor on each of the ten items
and record your response in the response grid
at the right of each item.

A - agree strongly
B - agree
C - neutral
D - disagree
F - disagree strongly

NA - item not applicable

	A	В	C	D	F	NA	
1. The course is consistent with the catalog description.							
The instructor's grading policy was specified within the first two weeks of the course.							
3. Useful feedback on student performance was provided.							
4. The instructor was reasonably available for providing help.							
5. Class time was used effectively.							
6. The instructor seems to have command of the subject matter of the course.							
 The instructor's presentations helped in the understanding of course material. 							
8. The instructor demonstrated interest in and enthusiasm for the subject matter of the course.							
 The instructor was intellectually motivating and stimulated learning. 							
10. The instructor appeared to be well prepared.			-	-	7 1		

Please use the back of this sheet for any written comments that you wish to make concerning the instructor or the course. All comments will be transcribed into the computer in order to assure that your

April 1, 1985

Memorandum

To: President Anderson

From: Vice President for Academic Affairs

Subject: Faculty Grievance Procedures

I call your attention to pages 8 and 9 of the CNC <u>Chronicle</u> of 3/22/85 (copies attached), which contain certain proposals from the Chairman of the Faculty Grievance Committee (FGC) that were presented to the Instructional Faculty at its meeting of 3/29/85. The Instructional Faculty acted on these proposals and recommended to this office that they be adopted as written. My own recommendations on these matters follow; they use the same labeling scheme as is found on the attached pages of the Chronicle.

- a. I recommend that this change not be made. The grievance procedures should provide an internal means of redress for loss improperly incurred; they should not become a device for preempting action that one fears might take place. Moreover, the test as to whether or not belief exists in the mind of the would-be grievant is nebulous and nearly impossible to apply.
- b.2) I agree with the recommendation to add the second sentence; I disagree with the recommendation to add the <u>first</u>. Addition of the first sentence clouds the question of when the informal processes have ended, thereby clouding the question of when the important deadline in c.1) has passed.
- c.1) I endorse the first four proposed changes. I believe it is unwise, however, to change "five working days following notification of failure of the grievance" to read "five days during which the College is in session following notification of denial of the appeal " The intent here is to count all days except weekends and official college holidays. The proposed change could easily be construed to mean that only those days on which (fall or spring semester?) classes are being conducted count toward the deadline, contrary to intent. While "five working days" could (and perhaps should) be made more precise, the proposed change has, in my judgment, the opposite effect. Finally, I believe that the addition of "reasonable" to modify "precision" is unnecessary. "Precision" is what is sought here, and there is no implied requirement in the present phraseology for "unreasonable precision."
- c.2) I believe the proposed change is unwise, for the same reasons articulated in c.1).
- c.3) I have no objection to the changes proposed here.
- c.5) I have no objection to the changes proposed here.
- c.6) I believe that the proposed change is unwise and that no need for it has been demonstrated. The 30-day limitation has the (demonstrable) effect of assuring prompt consideration; providing the option for extensions of two weeks (and, perhaps, indefinitely longer) constitutes an invitation to delay. That is in the interest of neither the grievant nor the College. The proposed language also deletes any reference as to what course of events follows from failure to meet the deadline, which causes it to invite not only delay but also uncertainty in the event of default.
- c.7) I agree that this paragraph does not refer to faculty <u>participation</u> in the grievance process, but I disagree that it is mislocated. Its present location is intended to provide naturally sequential information to a grievant, and in that sense it is desirable to have it where it is. I do recommend, however, that the first sentence be changed to be identical with the first sentence in section II-B-3-j-2).
- c.8) I disagree with this recommendation. The second sentence is necessary to avoid perpetual (and/or indefinitely-delayed) grievances by the same party over the same issue. As

such, it is a necessary and proper part of the rules governing a workable and credible grievance process.

Please call on me if more needs to be said on these recommendations.

Richard M. Summerville

Enclosure - 1

cc: Chairman, Handbook Committee
CNC Chronicle
Reading File