

Archivos

CNC CHRONICLE

1982-83

#33 of 1982
December 10

2:00 - Curriculum Committee - A449

MON.

December 13

10:00 - President/VP's

1st Year Faculty - Completion
of dossier

1:00 - VP/Deans

TUE.

December 14

WED.

December 15

2:00 - Administrative Review Committee

THU.

December 16

2:30 - Task Force, Policies Affecting Faculty - A305

FRI.

December 17

SAT.

December 18

SUN.

December 19

Published weekly by the
Vice President for
Academic Affairs

OFFICIAL ANNOUNCEMENTS

Executive Orders

This office has recently received a series of executive orders detailing the functional responsibilities of the Governor's cabinet secretaries. These orders may be reviewed in my office.

-- Vice President for Financial
Affairs

* * * * *

Delegated Authority

This office has received the "Guide for General Appropriations Act and Code of Virginia Sections Referencing the Governor." In many cases in which Virginia law assigns authority to the Governor, delegation has occurred. This guide provides an index to these delegations. It is available in the Office of the VPFA.

-- Vice President for Financial
Affairs

NEWS & GENERAL INFORMATION

Menu for Week of December 13-17 (Exam Week Cafeteria Hours 7:30am - 1 pm)

Monday, Dec. 13:	Quiche	Thurs. Dec. 16:	Lasagna	Club Sand.
	Boiled Potatoes		Garlic Bread	Apple
	Green Beans		Apple Crunch	Crunch
				\$2.15
Tuesday, Dec. 14:	Roast Beef	Fri. Dec. 17:	Turkey w/Dressing	
	Mashed Potatoes		Butter Beans	
	Corn		Soup	
			Clam Chowder	\$2.15
Wed., Dec. 15:	Lasagna			
	Garlic Bread			
	Salad			

FACULTY/STAFF NEWS

An article by Dr. Clyde Brockett entitled "A Comparison of the Five Monochords of Guido of Arezzo" appears in the latest issue of Current Musicology. A note in this article acknowledges the enthusiasm of students in monochord construction in a class in Humanities and Music which Dr. Brockett taught in fall, 1980, for Christopher Newport College and Old Dominion University jointly.

COMMITTEE INFORMATION & FACULTY BUSINESS

Curriculum Committee

MINUTES CURRICULUM COMMITTEE 11/22/82

PRESENT: Professors G. Hammer (Chair), R. Hubbard, J. Jenkins, V. Maniyar, C. Mathews, T. Morgan, L. Olson, Student K. Van Timmeren and (ex officio) Dean Durel

ABSENT: Students M. Shires and A. Baker

- 1) Vice-President Summerville discussed upcoming formation of a special committee to address the report of the 1979 Curriculum Review for the

80's and 90's. This committee would review and update the 1979 report, including recommendations on distribution requirements and make recommendations for eventual faculty action. The reformed committee's potential work was discussed at some length with many concerns aired by curriculum committee members and Vice-President Summerville. Curriculum Committee will be kept informed.

- 2) Dean Durel raised several issues for our agenda including:
 - A. list of course changes reflected in catalog for committee review (see 11/11/82 memo)
 - B. Pass/Fail option (see item #5, these minutes). Refer to 11/17/82 memo to Committee.
 - C. Review of new program standings (see 11/11/82 memo) i.e., music, computer, BSN, etc.
 - D. Request for guidance re new course proposals for Honors Courses. The committee requested that the 19 points be submitted for all of these courses.
- 3) Minutes of 11/15/82 meeting were approved on a motion by Mathews, second Morgan.
- 4) PRC response draft was distributed and will be discussed on 11/29/82.
- 5) A sub-committee was appointed to gather information and make preliminary recommendations on the Pass/Fail issue. The sub-committee is to report by mid-term of Spring '83. Members are: Mathews (Chair), Hubbard, Van Timmeren and Maniyar.
- 6) Adjournment.

Respectfully submitted,

Cheryl M Mathews

Cheryl M. Mathews
Secretary

MINUTES
CURRICULUM COMMITTEE
11/29/82

PRESENT: Professor G. Hammer (Chair), T. Morgan, L. Olson, C. Mathews, R. Hubbard, J. Jenkins, Students K. Van Timmeren, M. Shires and (ex officio) Dean Durel

ABSENT: A. Baker

- 1) A discussion of our response to PRC criteria and operation was held. The sub-committee received several suggestions and will be joined by R. Hubbard for re-writing work. Thier report will be circulated prior to the next meeting in January '83.
- 2) Curriculum Policies as proposed for the new Handbook were discussed.

Concerns were noted and will be forwarded to the Handbook Committee by G. Hammar, Chief concerns revolve around authority on curriculum decisions and criteria (especially order and definitions of said criteria) for reorganization and discontinuance of programs.

- 3) Members are requested to submit Spring schedules to Gary as soon as possible to determine meeting time next semester.
- 4) Adjournment on a motion by Morgan, second by Mathews.

Respectfully submitted,

Cheryl M Mathews

Cheryl M. Mathews
Secretary

* * * * *

Faculty Advisory Committee

1. At the meeting of F.A.C. with President Anderson and Dr. Summerville, major topics discussed included retraining, the curriculum review process, the process for academic reorganization and disability insurance.
2. All faculty are encouraged to send suggestions and comments to F.A.C. relative to issues currently under discussion by the Committee. These include academic reorganization, retraining, policy on faculty development grants, policy on faculty privileges (p. 43-44 of pink Handbook), and the role of department chairmen or on any other item of concern.
3. The faculty liaison representatives to the committees of the Board of Visitors will meet with these committees on December 16 and attend the full meeting of the Board in the afternoon. A report will be published in the Chronicle.
4. An information item entitled, "Faculty Governance in the 1980's" is included in the written agenda of the Board of Visitors for the December 16 meeting. This was prepared by the F.A.C. and is sent through President Anderson to the Committee on Academic Affairs by E. Daly, one of the faculty liaison representatives to that committee.

Faculty Governance in the 1980's

Institutions of higher education are different from business, governmental, industrial and even public elementary and secondary educational organizations in several outstanding ways. One of these vagaries is the historical tradition of faculty governance in higher education. In essence, faculty governance, particularly in the last two decades, means the participation of faculties in making decisions relative to institutional issues. Faculty participation in institutional decision-making is advisory; faculty governance is not decision-making per se or faculty rule.

Major areas of decision-making where procedures for faculty participation are usually defined are academic policies, such as curriculum; degree requirements and academic standards; personnel policies and decisions, such as selection, promotion, tenure; and appeal/grievance procedures; budgeting; and short and long-range institutional planning.

The process of faculty governance involves the Faculty acting through its committees or as a whole to consider an issue, define alternative courses of action, analyze the merits of these alternatives and recommend a policy or course of action to a person or group who possesses the authority to make the decision.

In order to make such participation worthy, faculty governance agencies need to have access to information which is relevant to institutional decision-making. Such participation is usually proactive rather than reactive as it takes place prior to the administrative decision-making.

Most desirably, when the decision maker rejects or modifies the faculty recommendation, reasons for this different course of action are shared with the Faculty. In many instances, the original recommendation of the Faculty is made available to the governing board who will make the ultimate decisions.

Throughout the academic world, effective faculty governance tends to be present when the following conditions exist:

- The constitution and functions of the faculty committee and agencies are defined clearly by the Faculty in the By-Laws of the Faculty. The By-Laws of the Faculty are altered, suspended or revoked only by concerted action of the Faculty and Administration. In the establishment of the structure for faculty governance, the Faculty does have decision-making authority.
- Faculty representatives to faculty committees are selected by peer election or appointed by some Faculty-designated agency.
- Through the governance system, the Faculty makes recommendations concerning the full range of decisions affecting the operation of the institution.
- In the operational procedures of the college, structure is provided which requires decision-makers to consult with faculty representatives. A participative management style provides for this type of input by relevant internal constituencies.

Currently, several trends present in the milieu of higher education tend to militate against high levels of faculty involvement in decision-making. Indeed, the same forces lessen to a perceptible degree the ability of campus-based administrators to be unencumbered in their decision making. These inhibiting forces include:

- The increased control of state and federal agencies as expressed through such social legislation as affirmative action, equal opportunity, and educational grants to students is significant.
- The autonomy of institutions has been reduced by the increased influence and control of state governing and coordinating boards and state and professional accreditation agencies.
- The economics of higher education cause decision-makers to manage funds which are scarce and often subject to reversion. Academic decisions are influenced by over-riding fiscal rather than educational concerns.
- In our society today, education has a low priority as reflected in its funding by the state and status in the political arena. Increasingly, major decisions about educational institutions are being made in this alien political arena. Many of these decisions were formerly made on campus.

From the institutional perspective, a pragmatic reason for involving faculty was revealed by the results of a ten-year study released in November 1982 by the Institute of Higher Education at Teacher's College, Columbia University. This study found that involvement in planning and governance by faculty members had the greatest positive effect of several factors on faculty morale, on faculty commitment to the purposes of the college, and on faculty support of the administration.

Since it is well documented by other research that the morale of any work force tends to be significantly related to effectiveness and productivity in any kind of organization, attention to the needs of faculty to participate in decision-making is a hallmark of effective administration.

It is noteworthy that these contemporary findings support a study completed in 1967 by the American Association for Higher Education, entitled "Faculty Participation in Academic Governance." The central conclusion of that study was, "the main sources of discontent are the faculty's desire to participate in the determination of those policies that affect its professional status and performance and in the establishment of complex state-wide systems of higher education that have decreased local control over important campus issues."

The prosperity, quality and even the existence of academic institutions is and will be determined largely by the quality of the decisions which are made in the present and the future. The collective wisdom of a committed Faculty as expressed through the mechanisms of faculty governance offer the promise of increasing the quality of these decisions. It is germane to note that the advice available at no cost to a college from faculty members is often paid for by external agencies in the form of consulting fees to the same professors.

Of what relevance is the concept of faculty governance to Christopher Newport College? In a collaborative process with the Administration, Student Body and Board of Visitors of this College, a stronger partnership could develop which would serve this institution as all here strive to serve the Student Body by offering educational programs of excellence.

This internal alliance could be a strong restricting factor on state governing boards and agencies as they seek to expand further their pervasive influence on public institutions of higher education. To the degree that the internal constituencies of Christopher Newport College coordinate and hammer out decisions in open forums, each group contributes to the power and influence of the whole. Faculty governance, in the form of faculty participation in institutional decision-making, is one potent force for assuring that Christopher Newport College will meet the significant challenges of the present and future.