

Minutes of the CAS ad-hoc Committee on Governance
March 28, 2013
Submitted by Charles Sharpless

Present: Charlie Sharpless, Colin Rafferty, Brian Rizzo, Andrea Livi Smith
Absent: Leigh Frackleton, George Meadows

Meeting called to order at 4:05 pm

The meeting began with a review of the responses from the various CAS committees to our request of Jan. 28th (see previous minutes) for input about their role and function in the current governance model. Responses were received from the following committees: Bachelor of Liberal Studies; Curriculum; Promotion & Tenure; Faculty and Academic Affairs; Faculty Development and Grants; Museum Studies. Not reporting were the Campus Academic Resources Committee and the Faculty Organization Committee, which has previously shared quite detailed opinions about its role and function with the CAS senate in prior meetings.

The decision was made for C. Sharpless to prepare a brief statement summarizing the issues identified by the various committees. That statement is attached to this report along with the original communications from the committees themselves.

The committee requests that the Senate review the following reports and our committee's charge (below) with the goal of advising our committee as to the next steps it would like to see in this process.

Meeting adjourned at 4:45 pm.

For the Senate's reference, our committee's charge is:

To investigate and propose governance structures that could overcome the shortcomings of our current model of faculty governance, including duplicative work done by college and university level committees, confusing curricular development procedures and guidelines, and a large service burden placed on the faculty to staff committees.

CAS ad-hoc Committee on Governance
Summary of CAS Committee Responses to the Request of January 28th, 2013

Original Request to Committees:

“... do you have any issues with the description of your charge as specified in the Faculty Handbook, especially in light of the interplay between college- and university-level governance? Also, please consider whether some of your work could be done at the university level, or if it already is, please reflect on the efficiency of this arrangement”

Summary Statement

Six committees out of eight responded to our request (no response from Campus Academic Resources and Faculty Organization). Of those six, three (Faculty & Academic Affairs, Promotion & Tenure, and Museum Studies) indicated that they believed their committee was probably housed at the wrong level and, given proper attention to structural and procedural details, would favor being replaced by a University-level committee. Each committee had different reasons for their opinions, which are attached below.

Two committees, Faculty Development & Grants and Curriculum, explicitly stated that they believe they are housed appropriately. Furthermore, the BLS Committee also holds this opinion, although it was not stated explicitly in their report (personal communication with Ben LaBreche). FD&G identified no issues with their charge or function. BLS had a few minor concerns with their charge. In the case of the Curriculum Committee, however, there appear to be serious issues concerning policies, procedures, and the nature of the relationship between the College-level curriculum committees and the University-level curriculum committee. The ad-hoc Governance Committee reviewed the CAS Curriculum Committee's charge (Faculty Handbook, Appendix F.9.2) and has some concerns. The charge itself appears outdated in the context of a University structure. In particular, the initial charge (F.9.2.1), which gives the Curriculum Committee the responsibility of recommending to the Senate policies and procedures for myriad curricular changes may need to be revised to take into account the influence that the other Colleges' curriculum approval processes now have on CAS curriculum development procedures. At a minimum, the Senate should consider taking a strong advisory role in helping the Curriculum Committee sort out the problems it has faced over the past year or two.

Bachelor of Liberal Studies Committee (Ben LaBreche, Chair)

We generally think that the description of the BLS Committee in the Faculty Handbook (included below) accurately describes the current activities of the BLS Committee, though it is worth observing that points .2 and .1 are our most frequent concerns.

We would add a new .6: “Review problems in recruitment, enrollment, and retention, and propose solutions”

We would change “learning contracts” in .2 to read “degree plans”

The committee could function with only 4 members if appointments were made that (1) laddered ingoing and outgoing members and (2) represented a broad gamut of CAS departments and programs.

F.9.7 Bachelor of Liberal Studies Committee The committee consists of six faculty members appointed by the FOC and as an ex officio member, the Assistant Dean for the Bachelor of Liberal Studies (BLS) Program. Appointed faculty members serve three-year staggered terms, beginning with the fall semester following their appointment. The committee’s duties are to:

- .1 Evaluate BLS admissions policies and performance standards on an ongoing basis, formulating recommendations to the Faculty Senate.
- .2 Review and approve BLS learning contracts with recommendations to the student and BLS Assistant Dean.
- .3 Periodically review the mentor and portfolio processes and recommend any changes in procedures to the BLS Assistant Dean or to the Faculty Senate if a policy change is requested.
- .4 Review the academic requirements of the BLS program to insure that they meet the standards of the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools.
- .5 Periodically compare the BLS program with other continuing education programs to insure continuing high standards of performance.

Curriculum Committee (Brad Hansen, Chair)

Three issues arose this year regarding the committee’s charge and college- and university-level governance.

The first issue was how to deal with proposals for new programs that include new courses from other colleges. Before there were multiple colleges, the committee could consider a new program and new courses as a package. That is not possible when another college has authority over the new course proposals. Consequently, the

members of the CAS CC can't know whether the new course will be approved, rejected, or approved after revision. The members of the committee stated in the October minutes that they believed that new courses should be approved by the relevant college curriculum committee before the proposal for the new program is considered. The committee would thus have a reasonable assurance that the course will be offered, but there would not be the lengthy delay in consideration of the new program caused by requiring that new courses complete the entire approval process. There is, however, no University level policy regarding such proposals.

The second issue was the increased difficulty in assessing the impact of curriculum changes on staffing and resources. In the past, proposals generally involved changes within a department such as adding or deleting a course. In which case, it was relatively easy to assess the impact of the change. This year the committee dealt with numerous new programs. In some cases (the new masters degree and the BSN) it was difficult to assess the impact because of the scale of the proposals. In other cases, new programs were proposed that include assurances that adjunct support would be provided by the Dean. Clearly, given that there are limited funds for adjuncts, committing adjuncts to a new program has to reduce the availability of adjuncts to established programs. In other words, there are costs to the new program, but those costs are hidden. The faculty needs to address the extent to which they expect to see such reallocations of resources within the college or the university explicitly addressed in future proposals.

The third issue is scheduling, because proposals have to pass through a four step sequence, it is important that meetings be carefully scheduled. In order to review minutes and distribute them to the next level, meetings should be spaced about two weeks apart with college curriculum first, then college senate, then university curriculum, then UFC.

As for the duplication of effort, we doubt that the work of the committee could be duplicated at the University level. The CAS CC considers numerous special majors as well as a large number of curriculum changes. The CAS CC includes six faculty members from CAS, providing a range of expertise regarding the proposals they receive. The current UCC includes one person from each college. The duplication of effort falls only on the chairs of each college committee, who also serve on the UCC. In addition, the focus of the UCC is on the university level impact of curriculum changes.

Faculty & Academic Affairs Committee (Alan Griffith, Chair)

We've had several conversations about the usefulness of the CAS FAAC. We have concluded, as a committee, that our work is mostly duplicative of work done by the UFC

FAC and other committees. I'll paste statement from our meeting minutes that support this and then I'll paste our recent email conversations about this. The email conversations will show that all of the current committee are agreed with this position. Plus, you will find a few of our ideas about how to deal with CAS specific issues that might come up.

FAAC Minutes

October 22, 2012

Present: Debra Steckler, Keith Mellinger, Alan Griffith, Joe Dreiss, and Rob Barr.

- Discussion of FAAC's function
 - o The committee considered a single agenda item, which concerned the continued utility of FAAC in light of the new University governance structure.
 - o Members discussed the range of issues that fall under the FAAC's purview, concluding that the majority of them would be more appropriately treated at the University level. One example concerned the new policy on summer school salary: while the policy's problems might relate to faculty "welfare," they are not specific to CAS and thus would be best treated at the University level.
 - o The committee discussed the possibility of disbanding, in which case the CAS Senate could appoint ad hoc committees to discuss any welfare and academic issues should they arise.
 - o Nevertheless, the committee decided not to take that step this year. Instead, it will meet when and only when specific concerns require the committee's attention.

The meeting adjourned at 5:00pm.

Submitted by Rob Barr, FAAC Secretary.

Email thread –

My original question to the committee, March 1, 2013

Hello CAS FAAC committee members,

Apparently this one slipped through my fingers. Charlie sent me the email at the bottom of this email yesterday (original request removed for brevity, CMS). But, we have had some extended conversations about possibly dissolving the CAS FAAC. I wonder if we can answer Charlie's question over email without convening a meeting.

First, I propose we attempt to form a response through email conversations as an extension of what we've talked about in the past. If anyone disagrees with this, we will have a meeting. If our email conversations become too complex, we will have a meeting.

If email conversations fail, I will be working during spring break. If all of us will be working during spring break, I will send a Doodle poll for next week. If anyone of us cannot make a meeting next week, I propose discussion over beer on Friday, March 8 at 5 pm. If anyone of us cannot make that, I will send a Doodle poll for week of Mar 11.

Now for the conversation:

It is my recollection that most, if not all of us, agreed that the work of the CAS FAAC is duplicated by UFC committees. This has resulted in little to no business during Fall 2012 and we decided to cease regularly scheduled meetings because of our lack of business. We also discussed the idea that we cede all business to UFC committees and that upon the rare occasion that something CAS specific came up that the CAS Senate could form an ad hoc committee.

If we ALL agree to this, I will forward this to Charlie. Else we will try to set up a meeting.
Alan

Response 1

Alan,

I agree that the work is largely duplicated and that then we spend a lot of time trying to figure out what we can do/what our jobs are/etc.

I am concerned by all the ways that faculty feel like they can't do anything and I wonder if it would help empower faculty to rethink our faculty governance structure. I fear that we'll end up undermining CAS faculty, however, if we don't make sure that university committees reflect the centrality of CAS to the university, even if that hurts feelings at other colleges....

Melina (Patterson)

Response 2

Hi all. Alan is right in his recollection--at least that's the gist in the minutes from the October 2012 meeting (they're attached). Personally, I don't see any reason to change that position at this point, and am fine if we convey this sentiment to Charlie.

Rob (Barr)

Response 3

I agree with what Alan said and what Rob confirmed from the minutes. Thanks all, happy break.

Keith E. Mellinger

Response 4

Hi Alan

I agree with the minutes and what is reiterated below.

Deb (Steckler)

Response 5

I am of the mind that we don't need to exist as a committee as:

1) Our work is already done by university level committee.

2) The university level committee is doing a good enough job.
Joe (Dreiss)

Faculty Development & Grants Committee (Joella Killian, Chair)

Can you identify any issues with the description of your charge as specified in the Faculty Handbook, especially in light of the interplay between college- and university-level governance?

The Committee's charge, as outlined in the 2012-13 Faculty Handbook, Appendix F, is to:

- 1) Study and recommend to the Faculty Senate policies concerning faculty development.
 - 2) Recommend to the Dean which faculty development grant proposals from CAS should be funded.
 - 3) Advise the Dean of any concerns with application procedures and evaluation criteria for faculty development grants.
- The committee has no issues with the description of our charge; it is appropriate and concise.

Can you identify whether some or all of your work could be done at the university level or whether you consider it best that it be done at either the college or university level?

- The Committee agrees that the review of grant applications is best done at the college level; faculty within each college know best the mission of the college and the nature and caliber of work expected in their respective college.
- Given that the results of our work affect CAS faculty members, that our primary task is carried out in consultation with the Associate Dean, and that the results of our deliberations are reported solely to the CAS Dean, we feel our work is done best at the college level.

If some of your committee's work is already duplicated at the university level, what are your opinions about the efficiency of this arrangement?

- This Committee's work isn't duplicated at the university level. If it were, there might be some call for an integrated committee like the one in charge of assessing first-year seminars, but in the absence of such a structure, our current arrangement appears to be the most efficient for evaluating research proposals from members of the CAS faculty.

Museum Studies (Lianne Houghtalin, Chair)

The Museum Studies Committee isn't in the CAS Faculty Handbook as a standing

committee. We are listed, however, on the CAS Dean's web page along with the stg. committees. We do seem to be a permanent advisory committee, mostly because students undertaking a museum studies minor have to receive approval for the required museum internship for it to count towards the museum studies minor. The host dept. for the museum studies minor (currently History and American Studies) rotates amongst the various depts. that offer courses counting towards the minor, but (1) the chair of the host dept. may not know much about the minor and (2) the committee, when planning the minor, didn't want the burden of advising the minor students to fall on the chair of the host dept. Consequently, students planning to declare a minor go to one of the committee members to fill out a checksheet, then take the checksheet to the chair of the host dept. so s/he can enter the minor declaration online. This is explained at the Museum Studies web site, here <http://cas.umw.edu/museumstudies/>

Answers to your questions:

The Museum Studies Committee should probably be a university-level standing advisory committee, rather than a CAS committee, because we have an Edu. faculty member currently on the committee; we are hoping to include an Edu. course next year in the offerings that count towards the museum studies minor; and we would like to work with Business to include a Bus. faculty member on the committee and Bus. courses in the minor.

Our duties/charges are

-to approve courses and policies for the museum studies minor in general -to approve specific internships and certain ("with approval") courses for the museum studies minor on a student-by-student (or internship-by-internship) basis -to have committee members act as advisors to students pursuing the minor -to promote the minor (via a web site, presence and brochures at events meant to recruit students to Mary Washington, etc.) - to facilitate the tasks of the chair of the (rotating) host dept. for the minor. (The chair of the host dept. relies on the committee for policies and student advising. The chair of the Museum Studies Committee sends the committee's approvals for courses and internships to the Registrar's Office with a cc to the chair of the host dept. Likewise, members of the committee meet with students planning to declare a museum studies minor over a checksheet for the minor, which the student then takes to the chair of the host dept. so that s/he can enter the student's minor declaration online.)

Promotion and Tenure (Kevin McCluskey, Chair)

The CAS P&T committee recommends a discussion of the merits of moving to a single university P&T committee to ensure that every member of the faculty, regardless of college, is being evaluated by the same foundational criteria. We believe that the

existing P&T structure potentially can work with all colleges: As a baseline, every candidate regardless of college must meet the same criteria in Teaching, Service, and Professional recognition as happens now. If colleges need additional criteria for P&T (such as that required by an accrediting agency) then that would be additional criteria evaluated by the committee only for members applying from that college. We believe that this would affect workload and service challenges by reducing P&T committees from three to one. A single committee would also facilitate greater communication and understanding between faculty across colleges.