LINCOLN UNIVERSITY

FACULTY MEETING MINUTES

Tuesday, November 5, 2002

The meeting opened at 4:06 p.m.

I. REPORT FROM THE STUDENT GOVERNMENT ASSOCIATION

There was no student government report.

II. REPORT FROM THE PRESIDENT

President Nelson congratulated the eight faculty members who were selected for Who’s Who Among American Teachers:

- Ali Barimani, Mathematics/Computer Science
- Jeffrey Chapp, Fine Arts
- Linda Childs Leatherbury, Economics/Business Administration
- Lennell Dade, Psychology
- B. Marshall Henderson, Biology
- Jeffrey Hoogeveen, English
- Levi Nwachuku, History
- Judith Thomas, Dean of Social Sciences & Behavioral Studies /Education

Update—Barnes Controversy
The judge will make a determination in December, after receiving petition papers that must be filed by November 18, as to who has standing and who can intervene. The judge has indicated in a public pronouncement that he expects a trial date in June.

President Nelson said Lincoln University has gotten press coverage concerning the Barnes controversy in the New York Times and that he will be meeting with the editorial boards of the Philadelphia Inquirer and the Chronicle of Higher Education. He further stated that he has received calls from the London Times concerning this matter. It is his intention to take this opportunity to promote the positive aspects of Lincoln University.

Economic Climate
Lincoln’s endowment has decreased as has been the case in many colleges and universities; however, Lincoln is working to meet the current economic challenges.

Some faculty members expressed concern that agenda items are not put on the agenda for discussion at faculty meetings. President Nelson said, “We try to put agenda items on the agenda
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that relate to the business aspect of the faculty. …” It was suggested that it be made clear that the Vice President’s memo asking the faculty for agenda items is restricted only to those matters concerning the University committees. After some discussion, President Nelson said that the faculty meeting is designed to conduct the business of University committees and that they try not to put issues on the agenda for open discussion that do not lead to action by the faculty. He further stated that if special meetings are needed to discuss issues not pertaining to University committees, we need to schedule additional meetings.

There was concern about not receiving the minutes and the agenda on the Friday before the faculty meeting as had been the procedure in the past in order to give faculty ample time to read the minutes. President Nelson said that agenda items are received late and, therefore, the agenda and minutes are sent out late.

III. ACTION ITEMS

A. Approval of Minutes From October 8, 2002 Meeting

It was moved and seconded to accept the October 8, 2002 Minutes.

The motion to accept the October 8, 2002 Minutes carried.

B. Recommendation from the Writing Committee

The Writing Committee developed their proposal (distributed at the meeting) in response to a directive determined by the faculty at the April 2, 2002, from the seven recommendations submitted. The recommendation stated the following:

Establish alternative assessments such as a departmental exit exam portfolio. Each department will be required to develop a writing assessment plan that will include testing, evaluation, and follow-up procedures. The Writing Committee will monitor the progress of these plans.

The Writing Committee asked for a discussion about the recommendation. Its request initiated the following dialog:

There was some discussion about the decision reached by the faculty to initiate the Departmental Writing Assessment Plan. President Nelson reminded that faculty that this was the faculty’s decision based on the vote taken at the April 2, 2002 Faculty Meeting. Faculty members mentioned that not everyone voted in favor of this plan.

Questions Voiced
1. How will the Writing Committee contribute to the departments’ development of the assessments?
2. Does the writing assessment process affect declaring a major?
3. Do all departments need to concern themselves with writing skills when there is a department to evaluate these skills?
4. Since these writing assessment plans will be developed in several different departments, will there be some basic standard that all students must meet?
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5. Might it be a good idea to have each of the three schools set up standards for their respective school?
6. Is the writing assessment just for majors in the discipline?
7. Are we guaranteed that there will be training for faculty members?
8. Should each department design the Writing Assessment Plan based on the style of writing that majors would encounter in that discipline?
9. Should there be a University policy that there be a specific number of writing exams required in each department to aid in keeping writing skills current?
10. Isn’t it the job of the English department to perfect students’ writing skills?
11. Do all faculty have expertise to evaluate writing?
12. What will be the rules this semester concerning the WPE?
13. Should the Writing Assessment Plan contain general writing as well as specialized writing?
14. Shouldn’t the Writing Assessment reflect the writing style of the discipline?
15. What will be the writing committee’s involvement with the process?
16. Should the Writing Committee eliminate Nos. 2, 3, and 4 of the General Guidelines distributed at the meeting?
17. Are there funds available for outside resources to assist in the development of the Writing Assessment Plan?

1. The proposal does not allow the University to detect writing deficiencies early so that measures can be taken to correct those deficiencies in a timely fashion.
2. One of problems with the existing WPE was the lack of manpower to administer the WPE.
3. There was discussion of No. 4 of the General Guidelines pertaining to wording and the number of writing samples required.

Comments Voiced
1. Foreign Language professors face the same problems as professors of English.
2. Consistent and sustained writing practice is necessary throughout a student’s tenure at the University.
3. Students in all majors need certain general writing skills.
4. There is a need for development and assessment of extemporaneous writing skills.
5. President Nelson instructed the faculty to identify the needs to administer the Writing Assessment.
6. The Writing Committee will function in an advisory capacity when called upon by the academic department.
7. The faculty must decide the level of involvement.
8. Dr. Venerable reminded the faculty that each department and its students are being assessed and that these assessments would aid in determining if each department Writing Assessment Plan is successful.
9. Lincoln has faculty members who are able to assist in the development of the Departmental Writing Assessment Plans.
10. It was suggested that Lincoln have a Writing Workshop in January with experts to assist the faculty in each of the schools.
11. Dr. Venerable stated that the Writing Assessment Plan is not complete and that the faculty is asked to vote on the concept with the understanding that the Writing Committee will work with the departments, and the Academic Affairs office will aid in facilitating the process.
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It was moved and seconded to accept the Writing Committee’s Writing Assessment Plan Proposal with the inclusion of friendly amendments.

The motion carried to accept the Writing Assessment Plan Proposal.

III. DISCUSSION ITEMS

A. Update from the Promotion, Tenure & Severance Committee

The Committee asked what the faculty wished to see as the percentage distribution of Teaching, Research, and Service? The dialog is listed below:

Concerns
1. Persons doing research are at a disadvantage since research is 30 only percent.
2. Isn’t service a very important component at Lincoln?

Questions
1. Isn’t research a part of any university professor’s job?
2. Should research be considered a separate entity or is research a part of teaching?
3. Isn’t Lincoln considered a teaching University?
4. Does every professor have to fit the same template or should we take a look at how that professor functions within his or her respective department with other professors in meeting department goals?
5. Why not have a range of percentages rather than fixed points?
6. How do we assess those professors who are applying for promotion right now?
7. In terms of research and service, how will the percentages be determined?
8. How will the points to calculate the percentages be computed?
9. Last year all new faculty had to submit a three-year plan; what is being done with those plans?

Statements:
1. Research keeps a professor up to date. It is impossible to teach without research; however, at Lincoln the teaching load (4 to 5 classes) is too heavy and classes are too large to complete research and write on a regular basis. Lincoln must create an atmosphere conducive to writing and research.
2. “Outstanding” should be eliminated from the rating scale.
3. “Meets Expectations” should be “Meets Minimum Expectations.”
4. Faculty members need to attend more professional meetings to keep abreast of their respective disciplines.
5. We must keep in mind that this move affects those trying to move from Assistant to Associate Professor, and most of the talking has been done by those professors who have already passed that stage. We need to keep in mind the burden being placed on those who are expected to meet these requirements.
6. We need facilities to complete research.
7. There are too many levels on the scale.
8. If a professor meets the expectations of the listed category, that professor should be promoted.
9. We need to look at the amount of time spent on tasks in each of the three categories.
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10. Those faculty members who have commented or want to make comments on the promotion plan should write a position paper and present it at the hearing.

11. Dr. Venerable stated that the Board is looking for percentages, as do most universities.

12. Middle States Update
13. Committee Reports are due on November 14. Send them electronically to Dr. Stine or Dr. Kwame.
14. Steering Committee will meet on November 21

IV. ANNOUNCEMENTS

- Please return teaching methods Surveys
- There is Convocation on Wednesday, November 6, in the Memorial Chapel at 4 p.m.
- Second draft of Departmental Reports are due to the Assessment Committee

The meeting was adjourned at 6:10 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Michael Davis
Faculty Secretary