

**MINUTES**  
**University Faculty Council**  
**University of Mary Washington**

**February 8, 2011**

**Members Present:** Ernest Ackermann (Chairperson), Andrew Dolby, Leigh Frackelton, Kimberley Kinsley, Mary Beth Mathews, Marie McAllister, Angela Pitts, Suzanne Sumner, Jo Tyler (Secretary); Provost Jay Harper, College of Arts and Sciences Dean Richard Finkelstein, College of Business Acting Dean Larry Penwell, College of Education Dean Mary Gendernalik-Cooper

**Members Absent:** President Richard Hurley, George Meadows

**Guests:** Associate Provost John Morello, Margaret Mi, Norah Hooper

1. Call to Order. The meeting was called to order by Chairperson Ernest Ackermann at 4:05 p.m. in the Red Room of the Woodard Campus Center.

2. Reading and Approval of Minutes. Members had received the minutes of the previous meeting of December 7, 2010, so a formal reading of the minutes was dispensed with. Ernest Ackermann called for additions or corrections. There being none, Marie McAllister moved that the minutes be approved as submitted, and Leigh Frackelton seconded the motion. The minutes were approved unanimously by voice vote.

3. President's Report. The Chair announced that the President was out of town and that the report would be deferred.

4. Provost's Report. A new policy regarding criminal background checks will go into effect for new faculty as of August 2011. Most universities in Virginia have similar policies. The costs associated with the new policy are covered in the Provost's budget. New faculty will receive conditional letters of appointment explaining that employment is contingent upon the background check. Job announcements will also have a similar statement. If the background check reveals a criminal record, the Provost in consultation with the department chair will make a determination.

A salary survey is being conducted to address salary compression and other issues relating to faculty salaries. A committee has been formed to ensure faculty involvement in the process. The survey involves comparisons with other similar schools and looks at several factors such as gender, rank, discipline, length of service, etc. Based on the results of the survey, a salary plan will be developed to correct inequities. Execution of the plan depends on having the funding to do so. The issue of salary compression is of special concern for the College of Business and its plans for AACSB accreditation. The COB is beginning to prepare for AACSB accreditation in part by hiring new faculty. The salary plan will address steps to be taken if new faculty are hired at salaries significantly higher than current faculty with similar qualifications. Larry Penwell mentioned that the COB has a rigorous post-tenure review process to meet AACSB requirements for faculty. The COB and the Provost's office will also look into additional ways of ensuring that

current faculty meet AACSB requirements and of providing funding to do so. In answer to a related question, the Provost explained that the salary survey being conducted does not address faculty development funding, but it is something that has been discussed by the Provost's Academic Council.

A pilot study is being conducted this Spring to determine the efficacy of having student course evaluations done online. This is being coordinated by a committee chaired by John St. Clair. The Provost explained that the paper-and-pencil version is costly and time-consuming, and that other universities that use online procedures save money and get results. The current evaluation form is being used in the pilot study. The Provost noted, however, that a bigger question is how to better evaluate courses themselves, since the current evaluation form is really an evaluation of faculty. He added that we do not have a means to assess course outcomes or whether the objectives of a course are being met. He suggested that eventually the faculty will have to come up with a better evaluation form with questions that address the different types of courses and different purposes for gathering the information. In answer to questions the Provost added that the committee is looking at ways of increasing participation with online procedures, and that in order to gather more results online, we can require students to "check in" and allow them to opt out of the process, but we can't require them to complete the evaluation form.

5. College of Business Dean's Report. The COB Curriculum Committee is finalizing its recommendations for curriculum changes, which will be coming to the UFC shortly. Mukesh Srivastava has been appointed Associate Dean to manage the graduate programs and begin revision of the M.B.A. curriculum.

6. College of Arts and Sciences Dean's Report. Dean Finkelstein is looking at ways to reconfigure the allocation of faculty development funds so that even if the total amount does not increase, there can be more money per person per trip. He would also like to see more summer research grant applications from faculty in the sciences. The CAS Curriculum Committee is working on a Leadership major in the B.L.S. program. It is an interdisciplinary major that will be coordinated with the COB. The Honors Program proposal is being finalized. It will go to the CAS Curriculum Committee, then to the CAS Faculty Senate, and then simultaneously to the UFC and the other colleges. Other groups in CAS are looking at the possibilities of establishing a major in African-American Studies or Africana, as well as a major in civil rights and social justice; these initiatives are not expected to bring much change to overall curriculum or admissions.

7. College of Education Dean's Report. The Chair announced that the COE Dean's report would be deferred.

8. Chairperson's Report. Ernest Ackermann reported that on February 7, there were forums on each campus for faculty to discuss the UFC's proposal for the University-wide committee structure, and some useful comments were received to be part of that discussion later on the agenda. At the President's Leadership Council meeting on January 19, the Chair suggested establishment of a service award for faculty to recognize multiples of five or ten years of service. A similar award funded by the state is already given to staff and administration. The proposed awards are expected to have minimal cost to the University. The Chair's report to the Board of Visitors meeting scheduled for February 15 is included as Attachment 1.

9. Curriculum Reports. The Chair announced that several curriculum proposals are being submitted to the UFC to approve in lieu of a curriculum committee. Larry Penwell explained that a proposal from the COB will increase the undergraduate business major to 45 credits by adding two electives. This change is within the maximum of 48 credits for a major, and also allows transfer students to complete the major in two years. Starting next year students can declare the new major, and the following year they would begin the new curriculum. Another set of COB curriculum changes involves the Master of Information Science degree. The offices of Admissions and Registrar are being kept apprised of these proposals. Ernest Ackermann pointed out that UFC members had received curriculum proposals from the COE as well, two of which were summarized by Jo Tyler and Norah Hooper. Jay Harper urged the UFC to ensure a role for the Provost in curriculum decisions. Ernest Ackermann pointed out that the proposed new University Curriculum Committee will include the Registrar, the Provost and the Dean of Admissions. As a member of the UFC, the Provost will receive an advance copy of this year's curriculum proposals before they are brought to the UFC for approval. John Morello asked to also be on the circulation list for curriculum proposals, and pointed out that curriculum changes should be approved by the UFC in March in order for them to be included in the 2011-2012 Academic Catalogs. A notice will be sent to the chairs of the curriculum committees in the colleges requesting proposals in time for the March 15th UFC meeting.

10. Report of the Budget Advisory Committee. The committee met on November 29. The minutes of the meeting are provided as Attachment 2.

11. Report of the Distance and Blended Learning Committee. Ernest Ackermann announced that the following members have been nominated to serve on the committee: Chair John St. Clair, Norah Hooper (COE), Gail Brooks (COB), Ron Zaharsky (CAS), and at-large Alan Hefner and Carol Ann Creque. These nominees were approved by acclamation. The chair has circulated a call for proposals for faculty grants to be submitted by February 15.

12. Report of the Faculty Handbook Committee. The committee met on January 27 (see Attachment 3). John Morello explained that even though the UFC has not approved a final version of the Handbook, a draft version is being compiled to post on the Provost's website by next week so that all faculty can view it and have input before it is finalized. Ernest Ackermann pointed out that it will be on the UFC's April agenda, and if there are remaining objections after that, a special General Faculty Meeting can be called. John Morello pointed out that significant work still needs to be done on Section 2 in order for it to be ready for faculty review. Ernest Ackermann appointed Andrew Dolby, Leigh Frackelton and Jo Tyler to prepare a draft of Section 2 for that purpose.

13. Report of the University Oversight Committee on Faculty Evaluation Matters. Margaret Mi reported that the COB promotion and tenure document has been approved by the committee but that work is still being done on the CAS and COE documents. Mary Gendernalik-Cooper explained that the COE had responded to the Oversight Committee's first report, but that a second report was recently received which is being addressed by COE Faculty Affairs Committee, which meets on February 9. It was suggested that the COE Faculty Affairs Committee meet with members of the Oversight Committee to reach agreement. The UFC Chair

will ask the chair of the COE FAC to invite them. The COE FAC's recommendations will be voted on by the COE faculty at its meeting on February 18. The UFC Chair ruled that if any disagreements between the COE and the Oversight Committee remain after that point, they will be resolved by the UFC. Discussion ensued about the oversight process. Mary Gendernalik-Cooper asked if the goal was to look at what comes forward from the colleges in terms of what's in the best interest of the University or just in terms of how similar all the proposals are? Margaret Mi replied that the Oversight Committee was charged to ensure that the proposals were parallel, and that because the COE document is unique in many ways, the process has been piecemeal. Jay Harper explained that the promotion and tenure policies are expected to be substantially different in each college, as discussed previously in the UFC.

14. Motions Regarding the University Committee Structure. The members had received suggested handbook language about the membership and duties of the proposed University-level committees (Attachments 4-14). Formal motions were made and discussed as follows:

A. University Faculty Affairs Committee. Jo Tyler made a motion to approve the submitted language for the committee with one revision: delete subsection 6 regarding unsatisfactory performance reviews. The motion was seconded by Marie McAllister. After brief discussion, the motion was approved by a unanimous voice vote.

B. University Faculty Organization Committee. Andrew Dolby made a motion to approve the submitted language for the committee with one revision: change "advisory committees" in subsection 3 to "other advisory and special interest committees." The motion was seconded by Marie McAllister. Ernest Ackermann offered an amendment to add that this committee also be charged to monitor operation of a digital or electronic archive of all University-level committee reports. The amendment was seconded by Mary Beth Matthews and approved unanimously. The motion as amended was approved by a unanimous voice vote.

C. University Curriculum Committee. Angela Pitts made a motion to approve the submitted language. The motion was seconded by Marie McAllister. In discussion Mary Beth Matthews moved to amend the motion by deleting subsection 7 regarding study abroad programs. Suzanne Sumner seconded the motion to amend. The motion to amend was approved by a voice vote with Angela Pitts abstaining. Ernest Ackermann called for a vote on the proposal as amended, and it was approved by a unanimous voice vote.

D. University Budget Advisory Committee. Ernest Ackermann moved that the submitted language be approved, and the motion was seconded by Marie McAllister. In discussion, a question was raised about whether a representative of the Athletic Department should be an *ex officio* member. Marie McAllister offered an amendment that the members appointed by the UFOC consist of one from the Athletic Department and three at-large. The motion to amend was seconded by Mary Beth Matthews and approved unanimously. Further discussion addressed a suggestion that the committee be renamed as the "Budget and Finance Advisory Committee." The consensus was that the title of the committee not be changed. The motion to approve the committee, as amended, was approved by a unanimous voice vote.

E. University General Education Committee. Marie McAllister moved, and Leigh Frackelton seconded, that the submitted language be approved. There was no discussion and the motion was approved by a unanimous voice vote.

F. University Sabbaticals, Fellowships and Faculty Awards Committee. Suzanne Sumner moved that the submitted language be approved, and Marie McAllister seconded. During discussion, questions were raised about the committee's role in recommending sabbatical awards to the Provost, and particularly how the Deans' recommendations would be considered in the process. It was clarified that the Deans would recommend sabbaticals to the Provost and that the Provost would then send those recommendations to this committee to select from. This enables the Provost to get input from the faculty, especially in situations where there are more recommendations from the Deans than can receive sabbatical awards in a given year. Leigh Frackelton made a motion, seconded by Mary Beth Matthews, to call the question. The motion to call the question was approved by a unanimous voice vote. The original motion was approved by a show of hands, with six voting in favor and three against.

G. University Student Affairs and Campus Life Advisory Committee. Mary Beth Matthews moved that the submitted language be approved, and Leigh Frackelton seconded. Mary Beth Matthews explained that because there is not currently such a committee, the details of its duties need to be determined, and so the committee should be charged in its first year with establishing the scope of its duties. There was no discussion and the motion passed on a unanimous voice vote.

H. University Academic Affairs Committee. Andrew Dolby made a motion to approve the submitted language with the addition of a subsection charging the committee to "Review general admissions policies for the University." The motion was seconded by Leigh Frackelton. In discussion, questions were raised about the need for the colleges to determine their admissions policies. It was clarified that the language of this motion would not prevent the individual Colleges from establishing their own admissions policies. The motion was approved by a voice vote. In further discussion, it was agreed that the following wording would be added, as needed, in the duties for each committee: "Perform other duties as assigned by the University Faculty Council."

I. University Faculty Appeals and Grievance Committee. Andrew Dolby moved that the submitted language be approved, and Leigh Frackelton seconded. There was no discussion and the motion passed on a unanimous voice vote.

J. University Academic Resources Committee. Kimberley Kinsley explained that in the work session we had debated whether this committee would be needed at the University level. Andrew Dolby made a motion that the committee be considered as one of the advisory and special interest committees, rather than as a standing committee, and that its name be changed to "University Academic Resources Advisory Committee." Mary Beth Matthews seconded the motion. Marie McAllister offered an amendment that an additional duty be added to require the committee to recommend to the UFC a list of future duties for the committee. The amendment was seconded by Angela Pitts and approved unanimously by a voice vote. The motion to approve the proposal as amended was approved by a unanimous voice vote.

K. Curriculum Advisory Committees. Ernest Ackermann moved, and Mary Beth Matthews seconded, that the wording for the following committees be approved under the category “Other University Advisory and Special Interest Committees” with a revision that the Teaching Center Advisory Committee membership be the same as the other committees:

- First Year Seminar Committee
- Speaking Intensive Committee
- Writing Intensive Committee
- Distance and Blended Learning Committee
- Teaching Center Advisory Committee
- James Farmer Multicultural Center Advisory Committee

Marie McAllister offered an amendment that subsection 5 under Teaching Center Advisory Committee regarding modeling of pedagogical practices be deleted. The amendment was seconded by Angela Pitts and approved unanimously by a voice vote. The motion on the committees was also approved unanimously by a voice vote.

15. College of Education Dean’s Report. This report was deferred from item 7 above. Mary Gendernalik-Cooper reported that in its meeting on January 21, the COE faculty voted as follows to approve its Promotion and Tenure policy document, as amended in response to the Oversight Committee’s recommendations of December 17: 15 voted in favor, 3 voted against, 1 abstained, and 1 did not vote.

16. University Faculty Handbook Language Regarding Teaching. There were two items of old business contained in the University Faculty Handbook Committee’s December report to the UFC. First, Ernest Ackermann recommended the following language be used in section 6.5.1.1: “List courses by semester, including summer courses if taught.” The current wording excludes summer courses. Jo Tyler moved that the recommended wording be used in the Handbook, and Andrew Dolby seconded the motion. The motion was approved by a unanimous voice vote. Second, Ernest Ackermann moved, and Angela Pitts seconded, that course designation abbreviations on FAARs include graduate-level course designations. After brief discussion, the motion failed on a voice vote.

Items of new business on the agenda were deferred, and the meeting was adjourned at 7:45 p.m.

Respectfully submitted:

Jo Tyler, Secretary

## Report to the Board of Visitors

Submitted by Ernest Ackermann  
Professor of Computer Science  
Chairperson of the University Faculty Council  
<http://ufc.umw.edu>  
Faculty Representative to the Board of Visitors  
February 3, 2011

Faculty in the Colleges continue to be busy working on matters related to curriculum, governance, and establishing and restructuring committees necessitated by the creation of the three Colleges. This is a heavy workload for all faculty, but we are making good progress in tasks. We have substantial curriculum proposals recently passed by the faculty in the College of Business and College of Education, and a good number of proposals to existing programs in the College of Arts and Sciences. The University Faculty Council (UFC) will note those changes at its meeting, February 8, 2011.

The faculty of each College have prepared specific criteria and procedures for promotion and tenure advisory committees, meeting their charges as mentioned in my report to you in November. These criteria and procedures have been reviewed by the University Oversight Committee for Faculty Evaluation Matters and its recommendations have been sent to the UFC for considerations at its February meeting. The UFC is “expected to ensure that the ... promotion/tenure procedures of each college (as approved by each college) adhere to the guidelines established in the University Faculty Handbook”, according to Section 2.3.2.6 of the University Faculty Handbook.

The UFC has developed a number of university level committees in order to fulfill its charge to “Oversee the development of university-level committees as needed to discharge the duties of the University Faculty Council and to exercise the authority delegated to the faculty at the university level under section 2.2.1.”, Section 2.3.2.6 of the University Faculty Handbook. For each committee the UFC has developed a rationale, the proposed membership, and a list of charges. The details are available by going to <http://ufc.umw.edu> and clicking on the tab labeled “Committees”. Those details have been distributed to all faculty, the committee structure has been presented at a meeting of the governing bodies of each College, and an open forum on each campus will be held on February 7, 2011. The Handbook requires that the university-level committees be approved by “majority votes of the faculties of each college”. Those votes are being scheduled for the near future.

The development of the next version of the University Faculty Handbook continues to be on track. The UFC will hold a special meeting on April 5, 2011 to vote on a final version. Before that vote, the UFC and the committee developing the Handbook plan to offer open forums to invite faculty comment. Draft versions of the Handbook along with key dates are available at “Development of the August 2011 University Faculty Handbook,” [http://www.umw.edu/provost/faculty\\_handbook/univfachbkaug2011/default.php](http://www.umw.edu/provost/faculty_handbook/univfachbkaug2011/default.php). The UFC

naturally invites comments from members of the Board of Visitors.

Several faculty participated in Virginia Higher Education Advocacy Day, an event hosted by VCU faculty and sponsored by the Virginia Conference of the American Association of University Professors (AAUP) and the Faculty Senates of Virginia, on January 13, 2011. We visited with members of the Legislature, concentrating on delegates and senators who represent areas that include UMW, and distributed three position papers on higher education reform, non-discrimination for sexual orientation, and the proposed pay cut with uneven raise in pay recommended by the Governor to provide additional support to the Virginia Retirement System. Our legislators were interested to learn about how higher education would be impacted by the Governor's Blue Ribbon Commission recommendations and how faculty would be impacted by cuts to funding the different retirement plans. We also urged support for UMW and its programs. The Colonel Michael S. Harris Award for exemplary service in support of higher education was presented by the AAUP to Senator Edd Houck of Spotsylvania.

A consultant representing the firm that is conducting the comprehensive study of UMW faculty and administrative salaries met with faculty committees in each of the Colleges, the UFC, and attended several open forums. A faculty member from each College has been appointed to the steering committee for this effort. The presentations were interesting and welcome. The UFC hopes to be fully engaged in dealing with the recommendations and plans produced by the consulting firm. We also hope that the situation of a continued lack of increases in base salaries and the very small number of sabbatical leaves may be addressed soon.

There are many, many other items that can be reported but I feel that economy of space is a good choice. The faculty in all Colleges continue to publish articles and books, present their work at conferences, develop conferences in the areas of their specialties, and receive grants and awards. For an up-to-date list see the **Professional Notes** section of **Eagle Eye**, <http://eagleeye.umw.edu/category/professional-notes/>.

Please feel free to contact heads of the governing bodies of each College for details about curriculum changes and faculty activities,

- College of Arts and Sciences – Suzanne Sumner, [ssumner@umw.edu](mailto:ssumner@umw.edu)
- College of Business – Louis Martinette, [lmartine@umw.edu](mailto:lmartine@umw.edu)
- College of Education – Norah Hooper, [nhooper@umw.edu](mailto:nhooper@umw.edu)

I will be happy to provide, to the best of my ability, details on any programs or activities.

**University of Mary Washington**  
**Budget Advisory Committee 2010-11**  
**November 29, 2010**  
**George Washington Hall – Room 106**  
**7:30 to 9:00 a.m.**

**Present:** Messplay, Romero, Pearce, Harper, Asper, Tweedy, Gordon, Pratt-Fartro, Greenlaw, O'Donnell.

I. Approve Meeting Minutes of October 18, 2010 (Attachment A)

The minutes were approved unanimously.

II. Update on Tuition and Fee Discussions with BOV (Attachment B)

Mr. Messplay reviewed the November presentation to the Board of Visitors and visits by university personnel with key constituencies on campus and in Richmond to discuss future tuition increases. In response to the Board's September request, the updated tuition and fee charge presentation was projected out three years. Various rate plans, including differential tuition, through 2013-14 as presented to the Board were discussed. Predictability of future increases was discussed with general sentiment favoring certainty. Mr. Harper suggested that families generally are in favor of certainty. Ms. Pratt-Fartro seconded that notion. Mr. O'Donnell inquired about whether there was sufficient discussion of the world of a funding cliff in the absence of offsetting tuition increases and/or increased state revenues. He also inquired about whether projections anticipated a shrinking federal budget. Mr. Messplay explained that a rollback in Pell grants would adversely effect students and Mr. Pearce noted that there would be demographic implications for the institution.

III. Faculty Feedback on Tuition and Fee Increases (Attachment C)

Mr. Romero discussed the results of the faculty survey on tuition and fee increases, the methodology involved in collection, and the general conclusion that a majority of faculty understand the need

for a tuition increase. There was discussion of the comparison between UMW and Christopher Newport University. Mr. Gordon noted that the athletic program is having difficulty competing with CNU for student athletes. Mr. Romero raised the issue of the general perception that the College of Business will necessitate a shift in resources from Arts and Sciences and sought further discussion of projections either to clarify or put persistent rumors to rest. Ms. Asper explained that no new positions had been created in the College of Business, a point which Mr. Harper affirmed. After some discussion, it was decided that Mr. Romero will formulate possible parameters for a longitudinal report of comparative costs between the colleges. Mr. Greenlaw explained that there is a great desire on the part of faculty to participate in budgeting decisions and though information is publicly available, faculty do not always have and/or understand how to access such information.

IV. Process for Collecting Faculty Input on Budget Priorities

Mr. Gordon suggested that the current method of vice presidential submission of budget priorities is the most manageable way of providing input into budget priorities. Mr. Romero suggested that it was his desire to create avenues for further faculty input in the discussion. Mr. Romero also expressed his desire to have the budget advisory committee focus on the strategic plan relative to budgeting.

V. Schedule of Future Committee Meetings

Mr. Romero will contact us in the new year to arrange the meeting schedule.

VI. Other Matters

There being no other business, the meeting adjourned at 9:02 am.

**UNIVERSITY FACULTY HANDBOOK ADVISORY COMMITTEE**Summary of Fourth Meeting Held on January 27, 2011; status report of the *Handbook* draft

---

1. In the meeting on January 27, the Committee dealt with these items:

- A. Summarized remaining tasks that need to be completed in order for the draft of the *Faculty Handbook* to be ready for subsequent actions and decisions.
1. Section 2 language regarding University committees needs to be finalized, including any general “overview” language describing the general authority of committees, how elections occur, etc.
  2. Final review and approval of CoAS, CoB, and CoE promotion and tenure procedures and criteria is needed; the oversight committee is going back and forth with CoB and CoE on a few items, and some of the CoAS proposed changes have yet to be reviewed by the oversight group.
  3. A description of the CoB and CoE committee structure and college-level governance is needed (as appendices); these documents will come from the colleges.
  4. The CoAS appendix on committees and governance needs to be reviewed, in light of all the committees that have “migrated” (or are about to migrate) to the university level; the CoAS Faculty President was asked for input and guidance.
- B. Reviewed several sections of the *Handbook* where changes in wording had been suggested, and reported on the reactions from the Provost’s Academic Affairs Council about which of those suggested changes the Provost endorsed and those not support. See page two of this report for the review.
- C. Assigned sections of the *Handbook* to various Committee members for a final review and proofreading. The list of assignments is below. Edits of these sections are due on February 11, 2011.

Section 1 – Dale Wright	Section 5 – Alan Heffner
Section 2 – Jo Tyler	Section 6 – Nina Mikhalevsky
Section 3 – George Greene	Section 7 – Morello
Section 4 – Betsy Lewis	Section 8 – Beverly Epps

2. The Committee discussed the timetable for getting the draft *Handbook* approved; **the Committee was of the opinion that general open forums to discuss the *Handbook* were not needed and would not be useful.** Instead, when the draft is released to the faculty, each college will be encouraged to discuss it as a part of their college-level discussions and business meetings (invitations to do this will go to each college’s faculty president/convenor).

3. The current drafts of various sections of the *Handbook* are posted at:  
[http://www.umw.edu/provost/faculty\\_handbook/univfachbkaug2011/default.php](http://www.umw.edu/provost/faculty_handbook/univfachbkaug2011/default.php)

4. A summary document identifying all major changes to the *Handbook* will be posted at the above website as a way of helping readers quickly note what’s changed. (This document is in process at the moment).

Report Prepared on February 1, 2011 by:



## REVIEW BY ACADEMIC AFFAIRS COUNCIL OF ASSORTED *HANDBOOK* CHANGES

1. **Section 4 (new approaches on financial exigency, dismissal for cause, violations of university policy, etc.).** All was acceptable EXCEPT the provisions requiring compensation in cases where someone is dismissed before the end of their contract term. The compensation provisions were deleted from the draft.
2. **Language added to §3.1.3** (RTA appointments, allowing the Provost to make an exception to numerical limits through 2016) was acceptable
3. **§3.9.3 Statement of Principles Regarding Salaries for Newly Hired Faculty** This language stays in the *Handbook* as is for now. Academic Affairs Council suggests that the UFC take this up in the future.
4. **Suggested wording for §5.4.2 Teaching Load** was acceptable.
4. **Suggested wording for §5.4.4 Classroom Teaching** was acceptable.
5. Regarding the new statement in **§5.4.7 (Office Hours)**, the Provost's Academic Affairs Council stated that the language in the current *Handbook* shall remain as is. (The change had proposed to delete the specified minimum number of office hours to be posted each week.)
6. The revised statement in **§5.6.2 Outside Employment and Consulting** was acceptable.
7. Regarding the **§6.5 GUIDELINES FOR COMPLETING THE FAAR**, all suggested changes were fine. (Changes are underlined.)

### 6.5.1 Teaching

.1 List courses by semester, including summer session courses for faculty on twelve-month contracts (faculty on nine-month contracts may include summer courses). List course number, course name, and enrollment (class size after drop-add period). Indicate, using the following abbreviations if you wish, whether any of these conditions holds:

**N New**—you are teaching the class for the first time.

**SR Significantly Revised**—most of the material and/or method is new.

**R Revised**—some of the material and/or method is new.

**U Updated** — made current with recent work

**G** — Graduate course (elective)

**GR** — Graduate course (required)

**RM** — Required for majors

**GE** — General education course

**WI** — Writing intensive course

**SI** — Speaking intensive course

8. This statement, prepared by the Office of Human Resources, will be added to **§3.12.4 (Conflict of Interest)** at their request:

Any member of the staff holding academic rank who desires to undertake public office which will require his absence from the University for any substantial period of time shall inform the President of his intention to seek such office before publicly announcing for it. Subsequently, should such member become elected to such office, he shall ask the President to recommend that the Board of Visitors grant him a leave of absence from the University, without salary, for a period of time mutually agreed upon by the President and himself.

## **Faculty Affairs Committee**

### **Rationale:**

The primary purpose for having a University-level committee on faculty affairs is to ensure that the policies within each College are consistent with the broader policies of the University. Each College must have written policies, standards and procedures for faculty evaluation, promotion, tenure, and other matters of concern to faculty that reflect the standards of its disciplines and its own considered aspirations. Differences among disciplines are appropriate, indeed inevitable, but each set of standards must be justified against an articulated mission, must establish procedures that assure their fair and reasoned application, and must be consistent with the policies and procedures of the University. The University Faculty Affairs Committee will be charged with reviewing the policies, standards and procedures of the Colleges in matters of concern to the faculty to assure their fairness and consistency with University policies. Such matters include, but are not limited to, evaluation, promotion, tenure, faculty welfare, workload distribution, compensation and benefits, faculty rights and responsibilities, professional conduct, and academic leave. The University Faculty Affairs Committee will also have the ability to recommend to the University Faculty Council University-wide policies relating to these matters and to the operations of the committee itself. In carrying out these activities, the Faculty Affairs Committee shall consult with appropriate University administrators and with the University Faculty Council.

**Membership.** The committee consists of six full-time faculty members with a minimum of three years' affiliation with the University at the commencement of service: one representative from each College and three at-large members. Members representing CAS, COE, and COB shall be tenured or tenure-track. One at-large member shall be from the renewable term or adjunct faculty ranks as described in §3.3 and 3.5 of this Handbook. Members are nominated and elected for staggered 3-year terms according to the rules specified in §2.4.2 of this Handbook. Terms shall begin the fall semester after the election.

**Duties.** The committee's duties are to:

- .1 Serve as the liaison between the Colleges and the University Faculty Council on matters relating to faculty affairs;
- .2 Ensure that criteria and procedures for evaluation, promotion and tenure of each College (as approved by each College) adhere to the guidelines established in the University Faculty Handbook;
- .3 Study and recommend changes in University-level promotion and tenure policies and procedures to the University Faculty Council;
- .4 Study and recommend changes in University-level policy and procedures on faculty evaluation and merit pay to the University Faculty Council;
- .5 Study and recommend to the University Faculty Council action concerning University-level policies on faculty welfare and formulate and present to the University Faculty Council recommendations concerning workload distribution, academic leave, compensation, and employee benefits;
- .6 Conduct faculty unsatisfactory performance reviews in accordance with Faculty Handbook §6.9.3 if warranted.
- .7 Other actions as assigned by the University Faculty Council.

## University Faculty Organization Committee

Rationale for the

University Faculty Organization Committee

The primary function of the University Faculty Organization Committee is to coordinate the faculty governance system at the University level and to ensure fair and appropriate representation of faculty on University-level committees. This committee is not directly involved in the governance procedures within the Colleges. One of its main functions is to coordinate elections of at-large members of University-level committees. Members of University-level committees who represent the different colleges will be selected according to procedures established in each college.

Handbook Language for the

University Faculty Organization Committee

**Membership.** The committee consists of five faculty members. The colleges select one member each, and the other two members are elected from the faculty at-large. The at-large members are nominated and elected according to the procedures in section XXX of this Handbook. Members shall serve staggered 3-year terms beginning the fall semester after the election.

**Duties.** The committee reports to the University Faculty Council. Its duties are to:

- .1 Coordinate elections of at-large members to University-level committees;
- .2 Oversee appointments to University-level committees. The committee shall ensure appropriate representation of each college;
- .3 Consult with administrators and program directors regarding formation of University-level advisory committees **and other University-level special or ad hoc committees** and make appropriate recommendations to the University Faculty Council;
- .4 Periodically review the University-level system of faculty governance and make recommendations to the University Faculty Council for revision as needed to ensure fairness and efficiency;
- .5 Periodically review the systems of faculty governance in each College to ensure that they function in accordance with section 2.4.2 of this Handbook;
- .6 Review and recommend for University Faculty Council action proposals for new faculty committees (standing or ad hoc) and for any changes in the University-level committee structure;
- .7 monitor operation of a digital or electronic archive of all University-level committee reports; and**
- .8 Perform other duties as assigned by the University Faculty Council.**

***Proposed Faculty Handbook Language*****Revised 12/6/10****[Section #] University Curriculum Committee**

The Committee consists of the Chairs of the CAS, COB, and COE Curriculum Committees (or their equivalents), and one member of the University Faculty Council. Non-voting, *ex officio* members shall include the Provost (or the Provost's representative) and the Registrar (or the Registrar's representative).

The Committee's duties include:

- .1 Working closely with the administration, the Provost, and the Board of Visitors to ensure that the undergraduate and graduate programs and courses offered by the institution meet demonstrable needs and institutional standards, reflect the mission of the University, are designed effectively, and may be feasibly implemented.
- .2 Determining University policies and procedures for curriculum development and implementation.
- .3 Providing clear direction for the college-level curriculum committees as to which curricular actions require University-level oversight and which do not, so as to prevent course and/or program duplication.
- .4 Reviewing curricular proposals and initiatives from college governing bodies and from special committees constituted to work on specific curricular issues.
- .5 Evaluating, approving, or rejecting proposals for changes in the relationship between programs or departments (for example, dissolution, division, or mergers).
- .6 Working with the Assistant Provost for Institutional Analysis and Effectiveness to ensure that curriculum changes take into account assessment findings.
- .7 Communicating to the University community through appropriate means all curricular changes.
- .8 Other duties as assigned by the UFC.

**New suggested wording for Budget Advisory Committee**

Ernie Ackermann (ernie)

Sent: Tuesday, February 08, 2011 7:00 AM

To: Andrew Dolby (adolby); Angie Pitts (apitts2); ernest ackermann [ernestackermann@gmail.com]; Ernie Ackermann (ernie); George Meadows (gmeadows); Jay Harper (jharper); Jo Tyler (jtyler); Kimberley Kinsley (kkinsley); Larry Penwell (lpenwell); Leigh Frackelton (rfrackel); Marie McAllister (mmcallis); Mary Beth Mathews (mmathews); Mary Gendernalik-Cooper (mgendern); Richard Finkelstein (rfinkels); Rick Hurley (rhurley); Suzanne Sumner (ssumner)

Cc: Joe Romero (jromero)

---

Rename to: Budget and Finance Advisory Committee

The committee consists of seven faculty members, one from the College of Arts & Sciences, one from the College of Business, one from the College of Education, as determined by each college, and four at-large appointed by the University Faculty Organization Committee. Members serve three-year staggered terms, beginning with the fall semester following their appointment. The committee's duties are to:

.1 Work in an advisory fashion with the Provost and Chief Academic Officer (CAO); the Executive Vice President, and Chief Financial Officer (EVP/CFO); and the Vice President for Advancement and University Relations; and the Chief Executive Officer and President of the UMW Foundation on short- and long-term university budget priorities, broadly conceived, including planning, the operating budget and capital improvements, fund raising, and development. The recommendations for priorities will be communicated to the President via the CFO or the CAO.

.2 Indicate the committee's priorities for the present budgeting year through an annual review process and summarizes their priorities on future budgets to the CFO, CAO, and the UFC in a report due no later than mid-November.

.3 Communicate the committee's recommendations to the UFC in a report no later than mid-March and the results of the President's decisions to the UFC in a report as soon as possible.

.4 In times of financial exigency, the Budget Advisory Committee assists the President, Provost, and Vice Presidents in developing principles and setting priorities for budget reductions.

(I received these yesterday but was tied up with forums, and attending events.)

--

Ernest Ackermann, Professor of Computer Science  
University of Mary Washington

We must, indeed, all hang together or, most assuredly, we shall all hang separately.

Benjamin Franklin

## General Education Committee

### Rationale:

Because the general education requirements are fundamental to the mission of the University, the committee charged with overseeing and assessing those requirements should be at the university level, not housed in any one college, and should include representatives from all three colleges.

Initially this committee will need to develop procedures on how courses can be recommended for general education approval, such as ensuring that proposed courses have already received the support of the department and chair and/or dean, and have been accepted by the University Curriculum Committee. In the longer term, this committee will be responsible for the regular review of general education courses as well as the review of new ones.

### PROPOSED HANDBOOK LANGUAGE:

**# General Education Committee** The committee consists of five Faculty members, one chosen from each of the colleges plus two at large appointed by the University Faculty Organization Committee; and, as non-voting members, representatives from the Office of the Provost, the Office of the Registrar, the Office of Academic Services, and the Office of Institutional Analysis and Effectiveness. The committee's duties are to:

- .1 Maintain the philosophy, for all undergraduate degrees, of the general education curriculum as a fundamental component of a liberal arts education.
- .2 Establish procedures and criteria for the approval, deletion, and alteration of courses fulfilling the requirements of the general education curriculum.
- ~~.3 Review and approve or reject proposals for courses to be designated general education courses, once those courses have been approved by the University Curriculum Committee.~~
- .4 Review and evaluate general education courses on a scheduled and on-going basis to ensure that courses continue to fulfill the relevant general education course criteria, making suggestions for course revisions or removal from the general education curriculum as appropriate.
- .5 Perform any and all additional duties pertaining to this committee at the request of the University Faculty Council or the committee chair.
- .6 Make information available regarding the procedures and deadlines for proposing courses to the general education committee.

[Note: toward the end of our discussion of this language, it was suggested that this committee needs to define the general education curriculum, not just review individual courses. Because this has never before been the purview of this committee—special committees have been

responsible for each significant redefinition of the university's general education requirements—such language has not been added to this draft.]

**Draft 1-18-11****[section?] Sabbaticals, Fellowships, and Faculty Awards Committee**

The committee consists of 5 faculty members with one representative selected from each college and two elected at-large, and the Associate Provost for Academic Affairs as an *ex officio* member without voting privileges. The committee's duties are to:

.1 Recommend to the Provost which sabbatical applications (as set forward from the deans) and which Jepson Fellowship proposals should be presented to the Board of Visitors for their approval and subsequent funding;

.2 Recommend to the Provost the faculty members who should receive the Grellet C. Simpson Award, the Outstanding Young Faculty Award, and the Topher Bill Service Award;

.3 Recommend to the Provost which faculty members should be selected as UMW's nominees for the SCHEV Outstanding Faculty Award; and

.4 Study and recommend to the University Faculty Council and the Provost, as appropriate, changes in policies, application procedures, and evaluation criteria to be applied concerning university-wide faculty development grants, sabbaticals, Jepson Fellowships, and UMW faculty awards.

**Recommended changes to the Handbook:**

**3.13.5.1 Application Procedures for Sabbatical Leaves** A written application for sabbatical leave, together with a letter of acknowledgment from the department chair, must be submitted to the dean by the second Monday in September of the academic year prior to the academic year for which the leave is requested. The application must include a proposal for a project to be undertaken during the sabbatical period. Requirements for sabbatical proposals are made available by the start of the fall semester each year. The Dean will submit the viable sabbatical proposals simultaneously to the Provost and to the Sabbaticals, Fellowships, and Faculty Awards Committee by the first Friday in October.

### **3.13.5.2 Announcements of Sabbatical Leaves**

Recommendations from the deans Sabbaticals, Fellowships, and Faculty Awards Committee regarding sabbatical leaves are due to the Provost by the last day in October. The Provost reviews these recommendations, and announces ~~(no later than October 30)~~ which sabbatical recommendations will be taken by the Board of Visitors for final action at its next meeting, generally in November or December. While it is the hope and intention that all eligible applicants with appropriate proposals will be able to receive sabbatical leaves every seven years, financial and staffing constraints limit the actual number of leaves granted.-

**4.6.3 Jepson Fellowships** A generous gift to the University from Alice Andrews Jepson '64 and Robert Jepson, her husband, enabled the creation of the Jepson Fellows Program. This initiative is designed to enhance the University's ability to recruit and retain the highest quality junior faculty members and to support them in their quest for promotion and tenure. The Fellowship award is for one full academic year, and the recipient will have his or her teaching load reduced by one half during the time of the Fellowship. The number of Fellowships awarded in any year is dependent upon the quality of the applications received and the amount of funds available from the proceeds of the gift (these vary depending on the investment performance and the Foundation's spending policies). Jepson Fellows are awarded following an application and review process. To be eligible, the person must be at the rank of Assistant Professor or Associate Professor and must have completed at least three years at the University by the time the Fellowship would begin. Complete application details and requirements are distributed annually the Provost's Office.

**Remove all of**

### **~~7.1.2 Procedure for Determining Distinguished Professor Nominees~~**

*Note: Charge the Sabbaticals, Fellowships, and Faculty Awards Committee to reword the last sentence of **3.13.5.2** to remove the expectation that sabbaticals are awarded every 7 years. The current wording is*

*“While it is the hope and intention that all eligible applicants with appropriate proposals will be able to receive sabbatical leaves every seven years, financial and staffing constraints limit the actual number of leaves granted.”*

**Revised Draft for Student Affairs Committee*****University Student Affairs and Campus Life Advisory Committee***

For the Academic Year 2011-2012, this committee shall be composed of the following members: one faculty member from each of the three colleges (CAS, COB, and COE), one member of the University Faculty Council, and two students (one each from the Fredericksburg and Stafford campuses). The Vice President for Student Affairs shall serve as an ex officio member of the committee.

**Responsibilities:**

Draft and submit to the UFC for approval a list of the Committee's future responsibilities and duties that pertain to campus life and student affairs, as well as a timetable for meetings and a mechanism for disseminating information on Committee decisions to the University community and large.

**Rationale for the Committee itself:**

This committee will provide a place for a university-level discussion of extra-curricular matters pertaining to both the undergraduate and graduate student populations of the University. While these matters may seem outside the concern of the faculty, they demand attention as they are central to the well-being of students and are related to the educational process as a whole.

**Rationale for the membership of the Committee:**

The proposal includes representatives from each of the three colleges, as well as one UFC member. These four faculty members, along with ~~one or~~ two students, will work with a variety of individuals whose work encompasses the various Student Life offices.

## University Academic Affairs Committee

**Rationale:** To maintain consistency and prevent confusion among students, faculty, and staff, the University's academic programs should be governed by a shared set of policies and procedures. While some academic policies may be needed to meet the particular demands of each college, most of the policies that currently set the parameters of UMW's degree programs should be applied at the university level. First, many students' degree programs incorporate courses offered by more than one college. For example, 1) all degree-seeking undergraduate students must complete the general education curriculum, 2) B.A./B.S. students enrolled in the CoE must major in disciplines offered by CAS to gain particular teaching endorsements, and 3) some special majors will likely continue to span multiple colleges. If each college's academic policies and procedures were to differ substantively and be governed separately, they would be difficult to apply consistently across all students' degree programs.

Second, uniform policies pertaining to grading, academic probation and suspension, repeating courses, and transfer credit (transfer *policy* only) would help to ensure that University of Mary Washington degrees remain consistent academic products. It would also help to guarantee that all students, both graduate and undergraduate, are treated fairly and equitably.

Third, because students take courses offered by multiple colleges, faculty from all three colleges should be involved in shaping university academic policy and services. A single committee would be the most efficient means to facilitate coordination among colleges so that policy conflicts which might encumber students' academic progress can be averted. It would also be the most efficient means by which faculty can help promote delivery of effective academic support services for all university students.

To formulate and oversee the academic policies and procedures governing UMW's degree programs, a University Academic Affairs Committee (UAAC) should therefore be established. This committee would deal exclusively with matters of academic *policy and services*. If a college determines that it must implement an academic policy or service unique to its particular mission and which would not impact other colleges, then that college would not necessarily need to seek approval from the UAAC.

### Proposed Faculty Handbook Description:

**2.5.1 University Academic Affairs Committee** The committee includes five faculty members appointed by the UFOC for staggered 3-year terms: one representative from each College and two at-large; two students appointed by the President of the University; and the University Registrar, the Dean of Academic Services, and the Provost (or their respective representatives) as *ex officio* members. The committee's duties are to:

- .1** Evaluate academic policies, procedures, and standards on an ongoing basis, formulating recommendations as necessary to maintain policy consistency among colleges, fair and equitable treatment of all students, and the overall academic integrity of the University.
- .2** Study and recommend actions concerning all matters of academic policy including, but not limited to, the policies governing academic standards, grading, course registration, transfer credit, and international academic affairs.
- .3** Recommend changes in the academic policies to the University Faculty Council.
- .4** Evaluate and recommend actions concerning all university academic services including, but not limited to, academic advising and retention programs, disabilities resources, and international student services.

## **University Faculty Appeal and Grievance Committee**

The committee consists of five tenured members of the Faculty, one from each College plus two elected at-large. All members must have attained the rank of Associate Professor or above with tenure. Members serve staggered three-year terms, with two persons elected each year except in the third year, when one shall be elected. The committee elects a chair from its membership. Members are nominated and elected according to the rules spelled out in [section #] of this *Handbook*. Members may not simultaneously serve on the University Faculty Council or on the Faculty Affairs, Budget, or Sabbaticals, Fellowships, and Faculty Awards committees. Members may simultaneously serve as department chairs or on College committees whose decisions might be appealed to this committee, but must recuse themselves in any case that might present a conflict of interest.

This committee meets only when it has an appeal or grievance to consider. It reports to the University Faculty Council in the form of an annual summary of actions taken that year and procedural issues that need to be addressed.

The committee's duties are to:

- .1 hear evidence and consider procedures followed for faculty appeals of dismissal or termination prior to the end of term specified in the current contract or of a tenured appointment, including terminations for cause, financial exigency, or discontinuance of a program;
- .2 hear evidence regarding and make recommendations concerning faculty grievances as defined in section 4.9. This committee will not hear grievances that are dealt with by their own specific policies and procedures, including an appeal process, as outlined elsewhere in the Handbook, even if such grievances satisfy the definition in section 4.9.1. These include [list of grievances dealt with by their own specific policies and procedures]. Also see 4.9.3 for what are considered non-grievable actions.
- .3 hear evidence, consider procedures followed, and make recommendations in those cases where appeal to this committee has been specified in the Faculty Handbook (e.g. denial of requests for medical leave, leave without pay, etc.)
- .4 serve as the academic freedom committee in cases involving faculty members, as specified in Appendix C.3.

### **Related handbook changes:**

> Sections C.2 and C.3 must be rewritten to make clear that this committee handles academic freedom appeals involving faculty. (In cases involving students, those sections might want to suggest additional member/s appointed by UMW Student Association.)

**UMW UFC**  
**UFC Academic Resources**  
**University-Level A-Standing Committee**

.## University Academic Resources Committee The committee consists of five faculty members, to include one representative selected from each college and two at-large faculty; as *ex officio* members, University Librarian, the Director of Division of Teaching and Learning Technologies, and the Director of the Teaching Center, or any of their designees. The committee's duties are to:

- .1 Study and recommend to the University Faculty Council action concerning policies on academic resources including Simpson and Stafford Libraries, Division of Teaching and Learning Technologies, academic computing, instructional resources and technology, the Teaching Center, professional development resources (to include, but not limited to, research and creative resources) visiting speakers, textbooks, concerts, and exhibits.
- .2 Provide information and recommendations to the above named administrators and directors regarding matters that lie within the charge of the committee.
- .3 When requested, assist the above named administrators and directors in administering any monies designated specifically for academic resources.
- .4 Serve as a liaison between the University Faculty Council and the above named administrators regarding university academic resources and as a source of information to the faculty regarding university academic resources.

## University Curriculum Advisory Committees

### THE CURRICULUM ADVISORY COMMITTEES OF THE UNIVERSITY

Each committee will include five faculty members appointed by the University Faculty Organization Committee with the condition that the five represent a balanced range of disciplines and each is active in the program or work of the committee.

1. **First Year Seminar Committee** The committee consists of five faculty members as described above and, as a non-voting member, a representative from the Office of the Provost (as named by the Provost). The committee's duties are to:

.1 Study and recommend to the University Faculty Council procedures and criteria for approval, deletion, and alteration of course offerings meeting the first year seminar requirement

.2 Review and approve or reject proposals from the various departments for courses to be designated as first year seminars.

.3 Review at its discretion the frequency of offering and general relevance of courses so designated and make recommendations for changes as appropriate.

.4 Perform any and all additional duties, such as evaluating transfer credit, pertaining to this committee at the request of the committee chair.

.5 Make information available regarding the procedures and deadlines for proposing courses to the general education committee.

2. **Speaking Intensive Committee** The committee consists of the Director of the Speaking Intensive Program, the Director of the Speaking Center, and five faculty members as described above. The committee chair is the Director of the Speaking Intensive Program or one of the faculty members. The committee's duties are to:

.1 Study and recommend to the University Faculty Council procedures and criteria for approval, deletion, and alteration of course offerings in the speaking intensive ATC requirement.

.2 Review and approve or reject proposals from the various departments for courses to be designated speaking intensive.

.3 Review at its discretion the frequency of offering and general relevance of courses so designated and make recommendations for changes as appropriate.

.4 Perform any and all additional duties, such as evaluating transfer credit, pertaining to this committee at the request of the committee's chair.

.5 Make information available regarding the procedures and deadlines for proposing courses to the general education committee.

3. **Writing Intensive Committee** The committee consists of the Director of the Writing Intensive Program, the Director of the Writing Center, and five faculty members as described above. The committee chair is the Director of the Writing Intensive Program or one of the faculty members. The committee's duties are to:

.1 Study and recommend to the University Faculty Council procedures and criteria for approval, deletion, and alteration of course offerings in the writing intensive ATC requirement.

.2 Review and approve or reject proposals from the various departments for courses to be designated writing intensive.

3. Review at its discretion the frequency of offering and general relevance of courses so

designated and make recommendations for changes as appropriate.

.4 Perform any and all additional duties, such as evaluating transfer credit, pertaining to the committee at the request of the committee chair.

.5 Make information available regarding the procedures and deadlines for proposing courses to the general education committee.

**4. Distance & Blended Learning Committee** The committee consists of the Director of Distance and Blended Learning and five faculty members as described above. The committee chair is the Director of Distance and Blended Learning or one of the faculty members. Additional ex-officio members should include the Director of the Division of Teaching & Learning with Technology, the Director of the University Teaching Center, a representative appointed (by the University Librarian) from the UMW Library, a representative appointed (by the Vice President of Student Affairs) from Student Affairs, and a representative appointed by the CIO. The committee's duties are to:

.1 Maintain the quality and integrity of the curriculum for courses and programs offered in a majority online format.

.2 Establish procedures and criteria for approval, deletion, and alteration of courses and programs offered in a majority online format.

.3 Review and approve or reject proposals from the various departments for courses to be offered in a majority online format.

.4 Review and evaluate majority online courses on a scheduled and on-going basis to ensure that courses continue to represent the tradition of quality education at UMW, making suggestions for course revisions or removal from the curriculum as appropriate.

.5 Perform any and all additional duties pertaining to this committee at the request of the committee's chair.

.6 Make information available regarding the procedures and deadlines for proposing courses to the appropriate oversight committee.

**5. Teaching Center Advisory Committee.** The committee consists of five faculty members as described above, one representative each from the Division of Teaching & Learning Technologies, Distance & Blended Learning, and the Library, and the Director of the University Teaching Center who chairs the committee.

The committee's duties are to:

.1 Support the creation and enhancement of a culture of teaching excellence at the University of Mary Washington.

.2 Serve as a resource for the director in planning and implementing programs of the Teaching Center.

.3 Promote and participate in the programs of the Teaching Center.

.4 Facilitate communication between faculty & staff and the Teaching Center.

.5 Model the use of innovative pedagogical practices in one's own teaching.

**6. James Farmer Multicultural Center Advisory Committee.** The committee consists of five faculty members as described above, two student members appointed by the President of the University, and the Director of the James Farmer Multicultural Center as an *ex officio* member. Appointed faculty members serve three-year staggered terms, beginning with the fall semester following their appointment. The committee's duties are to:

- .1 Work in an advisory fashion with the Director and staff of the Multicultural Center on planning and setting priorities.
- .2 Work in an advisory fashion with the Director and staff of the Multicultural Center to enhance opportunities for multicultural learning through student programming.
- .3 Work in an advisory fashion with the Director and staff of the Multicultural Center on leadership development opportunities for all students, including historically underrepresented students.
- .4 Facilitate communication and coordination between faculty and the Multicultural Center toward enhancing the intersection of coursework, student programming, and community involvement.
- .5 Communicate Multicultural Center programming and policy decisions to faculty via the Senate, and faculty concerns and ideas back to the Director of the Multicultural Center. Faculty concerns and ideas will be communicated to the Vice President for Student Affairs via the Director of the Multicultural Center.