

**BOARD OF VISITORS**  
**Academic Affairs Committee Meeting**  
December 7, 2007

**MINUTES**

Mr. Wade W. Perry, Jr., Chairperson, called the meeting to order at 8 a.m. Roll call indicated that the following Committee members were in attendance and that a quorum was present.

Committee Members Present:

Mr. Wade W. Perry, Jr.  
Mrs. Renitalynette Anderson  
Dr. Lauren R. Tucker

Other Board Members Present:

Mr. Bobby Vassar  
Ms. Virginia M. Board  
Mr. Willie Brown  
Mr. Gary T. McCollum

Members of NSU Staff Present:

Dr. Carolyn W. Meyers, President  
Dr. Elsie M. Barnes, Vice President for Academic Affairs  
Dr. Adebisi Oladipupo, Vice President for Research and Technology  
Mr. Ralph Johnson, Vice President for Finance and Business  
Mrs. Terricita Sass, Associate Vice President for Enrollment Management  
Dr. Clarence Coleman, Associate Vice President for Academic Affairs  
Dr. Dorothy L. R. Jones, Associate Vice President for Academic Affairs  
Dr. Curtiss Wall, Professor of Mathematics and President of Faculty Senate  
Dr. Joseph Hall, Professor of Chemistry and Elected President of Faculty Sent  
Ms. Pamela Boston, General Counsel and Special Assistant Attorney General  
Ms. Sharon Hoggard, Acting Executive Director for Communications and Marketing

1. CALL TO ORDER

Mr. Wade W. Perry, Jr., chairperson, asked for approval of the minutes from the August 31, 2007. The minutes of the August 31, 2007, meeting were approved.

2. INFORMATION ITEMS

Dr. Barnes shared with the Committee the following information items:

- **Ratio: Full-time Students to FTE Faculty.** The preliminary data show the ratio for Fall Semester 2007 to be consistent for AY 2006-2007, which is 17:1.
- **Full-time vs. Part-time Faculty.** The preliminary data show 273 full-time faculty and 103 part-time faculty.
- **SCHEV and NCAT Host Course Redesign Conference.** A team of faculty and administrators from the University attended the Course Redesign Conference hosted by State Council of Higher Education for Virginia (SCHEV) and the National Center for Academic Transformation (NCAT). The goals of course redesign include improving student learning, increasing efficiency, and reducing the cost of instruction.
- **December Commencement Speaker.** The speaker is **Lorraine Miller**, 35th Clerk of the House of Representatives. Ms. Miller is the first African American and third woman to serve as an officer of the United States House of Representatives. She served as Senior Advisor and Director of Intergovernmental Relations to Speaker Nancy Pelosi and has nearly two decades of experience working for the House.

3. DISCUSSION ITEMS

Dr. Barnes reminded the Committee that she would continue to update them on the status of the SACS Reaffirmation Process until the decision notification was received.

- **SACS Timeline and QEP Update:** She shared the SACS Timeline and QEP theme once again with the Committee.

February 2007	Compliance Certification Draft Report due
April 24, 2007	SACS Staff Advisory Visit
Summer 2007	QEP Final Draft
September 2007	Compliance Certification Final Report due
Fall 2007	Off-site Review
January 2008	Focused Report (if needed)
February 2008	QEP due
March 25-27, 2008	On-Site Review
December 2008	SACS Decision
2013	QEP Progress Report due

The QEP theme is “Creating Coherent Pathways to Develop Critical Thinking Skills in Students.” Proposals were accepted until October 21, 2005. The selected QEP Title is “IMPACT: IMProving Academics through Critical Thinking.”

Dr. Barnes emphasized three key points: faculty, staff, students, alumni, and all university stakeholders were invited to participate in the process to develop a Quality Enhancement Plan (QEP); the importance of the Board’s knowledge about the QEP process, and eight relevant questions about the QEP process as printed in the SACS Resource Manual.

1. Has the institution identified and provided a clear and concise description of a significant issue(s) directly related to student learning?
  2. What are the goals of the QEP and how do they relate to student learning?
  3. What are the intended benefits of the QEP to the institution and to the student?
  4. What resources (personnel, financial, physical, academic, etc.) are necessary for the successful implementation of the QEP?
  5. How will the progress of the QEP be monitored? (timelines, administration and oversight of its implementation by qualified individuals, etc.)
  6. What are the evaluation strategies identified by the institution that will determine the success of the institution’s QEP? How will the evaluation findings be used to improve student learning?
  7. How has the QEP been integrated into the institution’s ongoing planning and evaluation processes?
  8. How has the institution demonstrated that a cross section of its community has been involved in the development of the QEP?
- **Changes in Commission Practice.** Effective January 1, 2008, the following standards and requirements will be reviewed by the On-Site Review Committee regardless of the Off-Site Committee’s determination of compliance:
    - 2.8 Faculty
    - 2.10 Student Support Service
    - 3.2.8 Qualified Administrative and Academic Officers
    - 3.3.1 Institutional Effectiveness
    - 3.4.3 Admission Policies
    - 3.4.11 Academic Program Coordination
    - 3.10.3 Financial Aid Audits
    - 3.11.3 Physical Facilities
    - 4.1 Student Achievement
    - 4.2 Program Curriculum
    - 4.3 Publication of Policies
    - 4.4 Program Length
    - 4.5 Student Complaints
    - 4.6 Recruitment Materials
    - 4.7 Title IV Program Responsibilities

- **Off-Site Committee.** The Off-Site Committee Report was received in November, which indicated that additional documentation is needed for the following:
  - 2.11.1 Financial Resources
  - 3.2.1 CEO Evaluation/Selection
  - 3.2.10 Administrative Staff Evaluations
  - 3.5.4 Terminal Degrees of Faculty
  - 3.7.1 Faculty Competence
  - 3.7.2 Faculty Evaluation
  - 3.10.5 Control of Sponsored Research/External Funds
  - 4.1 Student Achievement
  - 4.5 Student Complaints

Additionally, the University received the following additional observation, which is optional:

The Committee acknowledges the fine work of the institution to prepare its compliance report and supporting documents in a manner that was easily accessible to the Off-Site Committee. The Committee expresses its appreciation to Norfolk State University for its presentation of the report, easy access to web links, and availability of printed materials.

Dr. Barnes shared with the Committee that, overall, the University should be able to address any concerns and provide the required additional documentation/justification for the nine items listed above without any difficulty.

#### **4. FACULTY SENATE REPORT**

Dr. Curtiss Wall, professor of Mathematics and Faculty Senate President, informed the Committee that his term as president was ending; introduced the elected president, Dr. Joseph Hall; and presented the following report:

Faculty Senate Report to the Board of Visitors

7 Dec. 2007

1. Presentation to the Board of Dr. Joseph Hall President elect of the Norfolk State University Faculty Senate
2. I became President at a very stressful time for the University. Many faculty members believed that the Senate leadership was not proactively supporting faculty, especially in Board meetings and cabinet sessions. Moreover, faculty members were concerned about the disposition of the proposed faculty Handbook that was the subject of much debate. Proposals for post tenure review and the

procedures for evaluation and tenure were especially worrisome. I was elected with the hope that I could remedy this situation, which I believe I did. While the efforts are ongoing, faculty rights at NSU are stronger because of my efforts and those of Dr. Meyers' administration. Because of our recent accomplishments over the past two years, faculty are beginning to speak out I would like to thank Dr. Meyers for her efforts on our behalf.

3. I would like to acknowledge Dr. Meyers efforts in resolving many of the conflicts in these areas. I am sincerely appreciative of her efforts to negotiate a handbook that was fair to all parties and her ability to understand the faculty point of view.
4. Since then the working groups that were agreed upon by D. Meyers and the Senate and implemented last year, represented an excellent step forward. Furthermore, the retention committee and the SPARC committee represent substantial efforts to solve critical problems. I applaud the efforts to involve faculty in these initiatives
5. In the future, I hope that the Senate will make an effort to make the tenure and promotion procedures more transparent. We should provide a thorough mid-course evaluation of tenure track candidates. Certain policies such as the election of department chairs need to be clarified and tightened up.
6. Her unprecedented efforts to provide access to the senate officers opened lines of communication that never before existed.
7. Dr. Meyers has our heartfelt "Thank you" for her efforts on our behalf.
8. I would like to thank the Board for taking the time to listen to me, and I am grateful for your patience.

Dr. Meyers thanked Dr. Wall for his contributions to the University as the Faculty Senate President.

## **5. OTHER BUSINESS**

Ms. Perry queried the Committee for additional business. There was no additional business. The meeting adjourned at 9 a.m.

Respectfully submitted,

---

Elsie M. Barnes, Vice President for  
Academic Affairs

---

Wade W. Perry, Jr., Chairperson