

Minutes
University Faculty Council
University of Mary Washington
April 12, 2011

Present: Ernest Ackermann (chair), Andrew Dolby, Leigh Frackelton, Kimberley Kinsley, Mary Beth Mathews, Marie McAllister (acting secretary), George Meadows, Angela Pitts, Suzanne Sumner; President Richard Hurley, Provost Jay Harper, CAS Dean Richard Finkelstein, COB Acting Dean Larry Penwell, COE Dean Mary Gendernalik-Cooper; new members Dan Hubbard, Debra Schleef

Absent: Jo Tyler (secretary)

Guests: Tim O'Donnell, Associate Provost John Morello

1. Call to order. The meeting was called to order by Ernest Ackermann at 4:03 p.m. in the Red Room of the Campus Center.

2. Approval of the Minutes. Ernest Ackermann called for additions or corrections to the minutes of the April 5, 2011 meeting. Leigh Frackelton moved that the minutes be approved, and the motion was approved unanimously by voice vote.

3. President's Report. President Hurley reported on two items:

1) Progress on efforts to work with SCHEV to redefine our peer group, which was changed by the state-mandated addition of the graduate programs. SCHEV supports the change in peer group and has asked for a UMW designate to work on the issue with them. A report will be available by fall 2011.

2) Efforts to create performance measures—"dashboard indicators"—to help measure UMW's progress toward its goals. The BOV will consider such indicators at their summer retreat. Examples include enrollment over time, targets, admissions and acceptance and retention and graduation rates; endowment growth; spending on instruction vs. other areas; etc.

4. Provost's Report. Provost Harper reminded everyone about the April 20th full faculty meeting at 4pm in Klein Theatre. A question was asked about new positions for next year. The Provost replied that those decision will depend on the budget for next year, which cannot be determined until the tuition increase is set in mid-May. Current requests far exceed the likely budget. The President pointed out that the Leadership Council meets on April 20 right before the full faculty meeting and encouraged UFC representatives to attend; the main topics of conversation will be discretionary money and competing demands, and tuition scenarios. A question was asked about the role of he Budget Advisory Committee. The President replied that their role is high-level planning: what are the University's greatest needs and how do we balance competing demands. It was noted that the charge of this committee will be somewhat changed next year. A question was asked about whether faculty can challenge actions already approved by the College governing bodies. Such challenges can only happen at UFC level.

5. College of Arts and Sciences Dean's Report.

Dean Finkelstein thanked Ernie Ackermann and Suzanne Sumner for their good work this year as the chairs of UFC and the CAS Faculty Senate. He reported that he will be meeting with the Promotion and Tenure committee on April 13 to discuss the overall process and that he will attend the annual FAAR workshop. He requested help in spreading the word about recent discussions in CAS about simplifying the process and shortening FAARs. Dean Finkelstein praised CAS and COE for working productively together to explore a possible STEM (science, technology, engineering, and mathematics) major, and mentioned that the College is also exploring a possible Civil Rights and Social Justice major. Last he mentioned that the Honors program received a \$20,000 gift toward a scholarship.

6. College of Business Dean's Report.

Dean Penwell reported that there were few new developments since last week's UFC meeting, that COB is currently working on their graduation and awards ceremonies, and that they have held their last COB Faculty Senate meeting.

7. College of Education Dean's Report.

Dean Gendernalik-Cooper likewise reported that there were few new developments since last week's UFC meeting. As part of its preparations for commencement COE is inaugurating a new Educator-in-Residence lecture as the signature end-of-year experience. The inaugural Educator-in-Residence is an 1991 alumna of UMW, 2011 Colorado Teacher of the Year Michelle Howe Pearson. Dean Gendernalik-Cooper also reported on the search for the founding Dean of the College of Business. The committee has selected four strong candidates, the first of whom will visit this week with others to follow. All faculty are encouraged to attend the candidates' presentations.

8. UFC Chairperson's Report. Ernest Ackermann submitted a written report (attachment 1). There were no questions.

9. Budget Advisory Committee Report. The Budget Advisory Committee submitted a written report (attachment 2). There were no questions.

10. UFC and University Committees Report.

George Meadows submitted a written report (attachment 3). He reported that CAS is about to hold elections to fill its last few spots. The incoming UFC member from COB, Dan Hubbard, agreed to be the UFC representative to the new University Student Affairs committee. Kimberley Kinsley agreed to be the COB representative to the new University Student Affairs committee. There was a round of applause for George Meadows.

Some discussion about committee meetings ensued. Ernest Ackermann noted that the new committees will need to decide own procedures for when to elect officers so that they can start meeting promptly in August. Later in the discussion Leigh Frackelton proposed an orientation session for these committees on the afternoon of Thursday, August 18, with Provost Harper presenting basic information and committees then breaking out into meetings; the proposal was enthusiastically received.

Andrew Dolby encouraged the new committees, particularly those whose first charge is to determine their mission, to invite a broad range of stakeholders to early meetings in order to get wide input.

John Morello noted that he is currently preparing the committee schedule for next year. He asked for input on three issues: should UFC continue to meet on Tuesdays, should College governance meetings still precede UFC meetings, and how best can we coordinate the timing of College governance meetings with other meetings. Ernest Ackermann noted that the members of next year's UFC will meet in dead week, and that these questions will be on the agenda then. Several people noted the challenges of coordinating meetings when faculty teach on two campuses with very different schedules.

11. University Faculty Handbook Report.

Associate Provost John Morello submitted a written report (attachment 4). Morello noted that the current version of the Handbook online has been updated to include all actions, although a few queries for individual Colleges remain. He pointed out that we need a consistent abbreviation policy for the Style Manual in the Handbook and invited suggestions: COB or CoB, COE or CoE, etc. He pointed out that the UFC will need to offer guidance about how any changes to next year's Handbook should happen; the norm is that changes come directly from committees rather than a special Handbook Committee. Finally, Associate Provost Morello strongly recommended that a deadline that would allow all revisions to next year's Handbook and appendices to be approved at the BOV's February meeting, so that when the SACS Compliance Report is written next spring, it can make reference to a stable policy document approved by the Board. He noted that he will be recommending the same timetable to next year's University Curriculum Committee so that the catalogue is also a stable document. There was a round of applause for John Morello's hard work on the Handbook.

Old Business

12. Motion from the CAS Senate Regarding International Baccalaureate Diploma. (attachment 5)

Suzanne Sumner explained that this motion had been brought forward from CAS Academic Affairs through the CAS Senate. It is a response to a mandate that originated in Senate Bill 209 from 2010, requiring Boards of Visitors to review the awarding of IB and AP transfer credit. UMW's Board will review the awarding of such credits at its May meeting. The goal of the current motion is to make the awarding of IB credits comparable to that of AP credits. After brief discussion the motion passed unanimously.

13. Motion from the CAS Senate Regarding Human Experience and Society General Education Requirements. (attachment 6)

This motion was brought by the CAS General Education Committee, via the CAS Senate. It is a response to a SACS mandate that all students complete a behavioral or social science course. Mary Beth Mathews offered a substitute motion (attachment 7). She explained that the motion as passed marginalizes humanities courses, something that was carefully avoided when the new General Education requirements were created. An extended discussion about procedure ensued, focusing on the substitute motion and on the broader question of how and whether General Education or other curricular motions that may not have won approval in all three Colleges can come to the UFC. Ultimately it was determined that the timetable for SACS

compliance permitted the UFC to defer a decision and thus avoid the procedural issues. Andrew Dolby requested that the University General Education Committee be tasked with preparing a solution to the conflict between the current Human Experience and Society general education component and SACS' social science requirement. Leigh Frackelton moved that the UFC send both motions to the General Education Committee, which shall bring a final version of the motion, approved by the Colleges, to the UFC no later than December 2011. The motion passed unanimously.

New Business

14. Consideration of principles of the Campaign for the Future of Higher Education. (attachment 8). Suzanne Sumner moved that the UFC endorse the principles in this document. Angela Pitts seconded the motion. Suzanne explained that the Faculty Senate of Virginia endorsed these principles at their recent meeting at Norfolk State, where governor's higher education act was also discussed. She noted that the principles are in alignment with our UMW's strategic plan. The motion passed unanimously.

15. Curriculum report from Leigh Frackelton.

On behalf of COB, Leigh Frackelton asked that the UFC approve two recent prerequisite changes that had not yet been submitted in writing, but that needed to be approved to go into effect for next year. The prerequisites for BUAD353 will once again be BUAD 152 and MATH200. The prerequisite for BUAD414 will be BUAD410 rather than BUAD310. These changes were approved.

There being no further business, the meeting adjourned at 5:25 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Marie E. McAllister, Acting Secretary

Chairperson's Report
University Faculty Council
April 12, 2011

Things seem to be moving forward as we have worked this year to fulfill our charge.

The University Faculty Handbook has been revised and will formally be presented to the Board of Visitors at their meeting this weekend.

Congratulations to the newly-elected members of the UFC: Stephen Davies, Dan Hubbard, Jennifer Jakubecy, Debra Schleef, and Terry Kennedy.

Most of the positions on the newly-created university-level committees have been filled. College of Arts and Sciences will complete elections for several seats by the end of next week. The UFC still needs to select a member of the Student Affairs and Campus Life Advisory Committee, and I hope we can do that at this meeting.

One of the challenges the UFC will face next year is the establishment and implementation of each of its committees. We created descriptions and charges for each, and those items will have to be made clear to each committee. Some have no previous history and we have asked them to "Draft and submit to the UFC for approval a list of the Committee's future responsibilities." Other are new but we have assigned them a more specific charge. Finally, some are modeled after existing committees, and we have modified their charges.

Faculty governance has been in the forefront of my mind this year. The governing bodies of the College of Business and the College of Education have had to establish themselves; the Faculty Senate of the College of Arts and Sciences has had to adapt its governance structures to the changed environment; and all three colleges have had to deal with the UFC that has been, along with the others, working to adapt, and in some instances invent, a culture and structure of faculty governance new to this University. We have had a great deal of work to do and have accomplished much working together.

There may be some disadvantages to the governance structure we have adopted: a University Faculty Council. A University Faculty Senate would provide representation based on some criteria that reflects the number of faculty and/or students served by a College or department. For what we had to do this year, I believe, the UFC is the right size with the right representation. The mix of faculty and top administrators meeting regularly and working together is new at UMW, but the benefits to all parties are clear. The possibility of a great future for UMW is increased through this common involvement. This has been amplified by the President including members of the UFC in his Leadership Council.

I applaud the role played by each member of the UFC. None has shirked from any duty, and we have had constructive discussions on a range of issues taking into account the opinions of faculty, from different colleges and with different student populations, the President, the Provost, and the deans of each college. In some cases we did not reach consensus, but we have made decisions and held discussions with respect and without rancor.

This has been a very busy year for all of us, undoubtedly more than we imagined when we started. I feel we were able to get through it all because we worked together, supported each other, and 'hung together.' Thank you for the opportunity to serve as the chairperson of the University Faculty Council.

University of Mary Washington

Budget Advisory Committee 2010-11

February 25, 2011

George Washington Hall – Room 106

8:00 to 9:00 a.m.

Present: Messplay, Romero, Pearce, Asper, Gordon, O'Donnell, Harper, Hall, Doug Searcy (VP).

Minutes from 2/11/2011 passed unanimous.

New business:

VP for Student Affairs, Doug Searcy presented an overview of his budget and discussed his budget requests. His budget covers all student services; including athletics, campus recreation, and services such as counseling center, residence life, etc.

Doug pointed out that The Leadership program suffered from the level of cuts last year and this was an on-going program that was in existence before mandatory cuts. His is requesting funds to reinstate this program and establish a comprehensive student leadership program, using this program to possibly develop a Leadership Center that would tie in such programs as the Peace Corps, Community Outreach programs, etc. All divisional leaders now provide leadership skills sessions within their divisions of Student Affairs.

Doug complemented all of his Directors of the division under him, stating they are doing the best they can with the resources given. There is a need of funds to maintain the level of excellence that UMW has achieved. He recognized AD, Dr Ed Hegmann, for his outstanding Board of Visitors presentation recently and acknowledged there is a need to increase funding for Athletics as costs are continuing to escalate on necessary things such as transportation, security, officials, dues for the conference (CAC), and uniforms. Doug also addressed the dual coaches in the Athletic Department and presented his request.

Doug addressed successful Graduate Assistant program he established last year and is asking for three more positions. This program has provided a pivotal connection between the graduate program and the undergraduate experience.

There was a discussion and an overview of the Campus Recreation, OSACS and JFMC programs and funding.

Doug explained his Divisional Goals and how they match to the University's Strategic Plan. He then spent his time going over justifications for his summary of Requests.

Question & Answer:

Q – Have you done to comparison against benchmark institutions? Doug- Have not compared to other institutions. I have used my experiences at three other institutions mostly when making decisions.

Q – How do you look at balance between your divisions. Doug- Where is the greatest need?
Doug – The athletic department touches the greatest number of students on campus and is need of increased resources.

Q – Are the departments actually being charged by our police department for services provided on campus? Rick Pearce – Yes the police department charges each department for services rendered by their staff or if they need to “rent a cop”.

Future Meetings:

March 11th, 2011, GW Hall, Rm 106 8:00am

- a. Torree Meringolo – Presenting

March 18th, 2011 GW Hall, Rm 106 7:30am

- a. Rick Pearce – overview
- b. Jay Harper – discuss personnel needs for the academic yr 2012-13

Meeting adjourned – 9:05am

Minutes respectfully submitted by Dana Hall

University of Mary Washington

Budget Advisory Committee 2010-11

March 11, 2011

George Washington Hall – Room 106

8:00 to 9:00 a.m.

Present: Messplay, Romero, Tweedy, Asper, Pratt-Fartro, O'Donnell, Harper, Hall, Torre (VP).

Amended Minutes from 2/25/2011 will be passed next week.

NEW BUSINESS:

Paul Messplay summarized the “Preliminary Analysis of Conference Budget Amendments” Report distributed by President Hurley to the faculty and staff last week.

Highlights from this report include:

- An additional allocation of about \$1.5 M to the UMW budget. But remember that spring term enrollment decreases and the retirement of ARRA funding leaves us with a net decrease, and a tuition increase will still be required just to balance the university budget.
- For employees with ORPs, Employer contributions will remain at 10.4%.
- Employees with VRS will now be required to make 5% of their contributions themselves; to help offset this expense, their salaries will be permanently increased 5%. Note, however, that these contributions do not come out on a “pre-tax” basis, so the net effect will be a decrease in income.
- There will be no 2% bonus on December 1, 2011.

Jay Harper summarized his meeting with the BOV – and updated the committee on changes that may be taking place for next year with Admissions.

Torre Meringolo – VP for Advancement/University Relations updated the committee on his past month's travels to bridge relationships with our past large donors. The Board has approved a 5-year capital campaign for \$50,000,000 to begin July 1, 2011 in a quiet phase. Funds from this campaign will be linked to the strategic plan. Press Releases are up 30% this past year for the University's visibility across the Nation which is a positive move for National exposure.

Q & A

Q-Have you benchmarked your budget with comparable institutions? A-We are looking to do this with the marketing consultants from CO.

Q-How does your budget coincide with the Admissions budget? A-We work with them in producing their brochures.

Q-Explain the photography requests- A-Consultants said this area needs to be improved dramatically. Currently we use free-lance photographers.

Q- Steve Greenlaw- do you have any plans to increase working with the individual departments to assist in contacting and maintaining contact with recent alumni. Torre- we need to do this but don't have the resources to do this.

Next meeting Fri March 18th at 7:30am. Rick Pearce and Jay Harper will be presenting.

Meeting adjourned at 9:05am

Respectfully submitted: Dana S. Hall

Budget Advisory Committee 2010-11

March 18, 2011

George Washington Hall – Room 106

7:30 to 9:00 a.m.

Present: Messplay, Romero, Pearce, Greenlaw, Asper, Gordon, Hall, Harper, O'Donnell

Approval of Minutes – The minutes from 2-25 and 3-11 were approved without additions, corrections, or comments.

2011-12 Budget Requests – Administration and Finance (Attachment A) – Mr. Pearce discussed the budget for Administration and Finance. He noted that there had been more than a million dollars in cuts over the past few years. To become what we aspire to be it will be essential to have a physical plant which supports those aspirations. From the summary of requests, which included a few one time requests, he discussed the following items in particular:

Purchasing – He also discussed the tier system and the issue of autonomy. We are still level 1 (UMW, VA State, and Christopher Newport). The plan is to move to level 2. That will increase purchasing autonomy and flexibility. Most importantly, this will free UMW from VITA (information technology) oversight on information technology. The areas that are wanting are small purchase cards and contract administration. He proposed a new person that will help with both of these areas. Moving to tier two will allow for some savings and increases in efficiency. It will also begin to alleviate some of the pressure on departmental administrative assistants to whom purchasing primarily falls.

Facilities – There are benchmarks for the custodial level from the Association of Higher Education Facilities Officers. We fall between moderate dingyness and unkept neglect according to square foot benchmarks. The plan is to phase out temporary workers and replace with full time people that are UMW employees. Support will be essential with more functions, the Anderson Center, etc.

Human Resources – this area has become much more complex in recent years. At the same time, when we lost Sherry Morgan, we lost multiple positions. In addition, we spend more time refereeing between supervisors and employees than we have previously which has increased the work load.

EagleOne Card – we have begun to think about the future of the card and its use. This will require significant new oversight and software. At this point we have only two people dedicated to this and we need greater technical expertise. The plan is to hire a manager with the technical skills.

Accounting – presently, we have student aide's entering sensitive transactional data. In addition we do considerably more reconciliations on a daily basis.

Dodd Auditorium – there needs to be greater AV support for recording events and a part-time person would help in this regard.

Questions: Can we take credit cards for tuition payment? Yes. We cannot take Visa (they do not allow us to charge a fee). No other questions.

III. Faculty position priorities – Dr. Harper

1. New position requests – The provost provided a handout on “New Faculty Position Requests” from the dean of CAS – these are the dean's priorities. No new requests came from COB or COE. We are unlikely to get any new resources to fund any of these positions. There may be some searches through cost savings. These are the new requests budgeted at \$75,000.
1. Grants officer – Dr. Harper explained that he had argued for this position for two years. The degree to which a grants officer would pay for itself was discussed. The load on the associate provost, who is the defacto grants officer, was discussed. Mr. Pearce suggested that this may be the type of position worth taking a risk on and that there are still federal dollars available to be tapped.

IV. Prioritize 2011-12 Budget Requests (Attachment B) The committee began discussing the process of ranking. It was decided that we should start ranking next week. Mr. Messplay will keep the master list of priorities.

V. Next Meeting

a. March 25, 2011, GW Hall, Room 106

b. Continue Request Prioritization

VI. Other Matters – The meeting adjourned at 8:50 am.

University Committees Election Results

Faculty Affairs (3 positions).

1. One-year term - Leslie Martin (CAS, Sociology and Anthropology)
2. Two-year term – Keith Mellinger (CAS, Mathematics)
3. Three-year term – Patricia Orozco – Renewable Term/Adjunct (CAS, Modern Foreign Languages)

Faculty Appeals and Grievance (2 positions).

1. One-year term - Paul Fallon (CAS, English, Linguistics, and Communication)
2. Two-year term – Craig Vasey (CAS, Classics, Philosophy, and Religion)

Faculty Organization (2 positions).

1. One-year term – David Rettinger (CAS, Psychology)
2. Two-year term – Janet Asper (CAS, Chemistry)

Sabbaticals, Fellowships, and Faculty Awards (2 positions).

1. One-year term - Dawn Bowen (CAS, Geography)
2. Two-year term - JeanAnn Dabb (CAS, Art and Art History)

University Faculty Council (2 positions).

1. Two-year term – Stephen Davies (CAS, Computer Science)
2. Two-year term – Debra Schleef (CAS, Sociology and Anthropology)

UNIVERSITY FACULTY HANDBOOK FINAL REPORT for the UFC Meeting on April 12, 2011
Submitted by John T. Morello, Faculty Handbook Committee Chair

1. Status of the online *Faculty Handbook*

The version of the *Faculty Handbook* as approved by the UFC is available at:

http://www.umw.edu/provost/faculty_handbook/univfachbkaug2011/default.php

Following approval by the College of Business (CoB) Faculty Senate, Appendix G was updated to provide the rules for the CoB Faculty Senate and the CoB committee structure. The text I received stated that the details about the Budget Advisory Committee were to be determined. Reference was made to the April CoB Faculty Senate as the meeting where details would be worked out. I will check to see what was decided, and will update the appendix as appropriate.

Appendix F, the rules for the College of Arts and Sciences (CAS) Faculty Senate and the CAS committee structure, was updated to reflect actions taken by the CAS Senate meeting on April 6.

Appendix H, the rules for the College of Education (CoE) meetings and the CoE committee structure, is the one item still not completed. The current appendix has details from a memo regarding the committee structure for the current year. As soon as the plan for an on-going CoE committee structure is finalized, Appendix H will be updated.

As soon as the Board approves the *Handbook*, the document will undergo a final and thorough proofreading. A complete pdf of the whole *Handbook* will be assembled, and a section-by-section html version of the *Handbook* will be constructed. The migration of UMW's web site to a new platform creates some challenges with regard to the approach and timing of the construction of the new html version. Regardless of the challenges, the new html *Handbook* will be ready by August.

2. College Abbreviation Conventions

It would be useful to establish how we abbreviate the names of the three colleges. CAS is used fairly consistently, but the Business and Education are sometimes referred to as COB and COE, or as CoB and CoE. We need to agree on a standard, and use it consistently in the *Handbook*.

3. Process and Deadlines for Faculty Handbook Changes in 2011-12

As much as it would be nice to have a year when the *Handbook* did not undergo any changes, that seems highly unlikely. UFC needs to determine the processes for revisions. Should changes be initiated through the relevant committee having jurisdiction over the *Handbook* section in question? Or should some other process be followed? Regarding deadlines, **I urge the UFC to set this deadline: that all *Handbook* changes that are to take effect in August 2012 MUST be approved by the UFC at their February 2012 meeting, and approved by the Board of Visitors at their February 2012 meeting.** The reason for moving up the deadline for next year is so that the final version of the next *Handbook* may be formalized earlier in the spring of 2012, thereby facilitating the writing of the SACS "Compliance Report." Many of the SACS accreditation criteria will require that the report make reference to relevant sections of the *Faculty Handbook* as part of the documentation. The goal is to complete the "Compliance Report" by June 1, 2012.

MOTION: To recognize the International Baccalaureate (IB) diploma and ensure that UMW's IB policy is in alignment with its Advanced Placement (AP) policy. The committee recommends that CAS Faculty Senate consider the following motions:

A. UMW will grant a minimum of 15 transfer credits upon matriculation to an IB Diploma student.

Rationale: Awarding credits for the IB diploma recognizes the rigor and the scope of the IB program.

Most IB diploma students will have some credit awarded from scores on higher level, individual tests.

If those did not add up to 15 credits, then UMW would award the difference as IB diploma elective credits. A minimum of 15 transfer credits would count towards the total required for graduation.

B. UMW will remove the maximum of 30 transfer credits permitted for IB.

Rationale: This aligns the credit award with the current AP policy.

Motion to modify how students satisfy the Human Experience and Society general education requirement

MOTION: The Members of the General Education Committee move that the Faculty Senate of the College of Arts and Sciences recommend the following modification to the general education curriculum to the University Faculty Council. The motion would change the existing description of how the Human Experience and Society requirement may be met by adding new language shown in bold type:

Human Experience and Society: Six credits from two different disciplines that explore the forces shaping human activity, relationships, social structures, institutions, and intellectual systems. **At least one of the courses taken to satisfy this requirement must be selected from one of these disciplines: Anthropology, Economics, Geography, Linguistics, Political Science, Psychology or Sociology.**

It is further moved that this change go into effect with the publication of the Fall 2012 academic catalog.

RATIONALE: This motion is a result of a concern brought to the General Education Committee by Tim O'Donnell who is serving as the SACS Compliance Certification Chair. SACS sets forth general education standards within SACS Core Requirement 2.7.3. which reads as follows:

“In each undergraduate degree program, the institution requires the successful completion of a general education component at the collegiate level that (1) is a substantial component of each undergraduate degree, (2) ensures breadth of knowledge, and (3) is based on a coherent rationale. For degree completion in associate programs, the component constitutes a minimum of 15 semester hours or the equivalent; for baccalaureate programs, a minimum of 30 semester hours or the equivalent. These credit hours are to be drawn from and include at least one course from each of the following areas: humanities/fine arts, social/behavioral sciences, and natural science/mathematics. The courses do not narrowly focus on those skills, techniques, and procedures specific to a particular occupation or profession. If an institution uses a unit other than semester credit hours, it provides an explanation for the equivalency. The institution also provides a justification if it allows for fewer than the required number of semester credit hours or its equivalent unit of general education courses.(General Education)”

The concern focuses on the course required from the social/behavioral sciences category. Our Human Experience and Society general education category is very broadly defined and includes approved courses from disciplines widely acknowledged to be within the social/behavioral sciences, such as Anthropology and Psychology, as well as courses from disciplines that are not, such as Art History, Classics, Math, and Theatre, for example. The members of the General Education Committee concluded that since it is possible for students to satisfy our current general education curriculum without taking a course from a generally recognized social/behavioral sciences discipline we would be vulnerable to a judgment of “not compliant” with SACS Core Requirement 2.7.3. at the time of our reaccreditation. This motion addresses

this concern by requiring that students take a minimum of one course from a discipline that has been classified by the U.S. Department of Education as a social science discipline. A full listing of all programs that have been classified within the social sciences may be found at the following web site for the National Center for Education Statistics Classification of Instructional Programs: <http://nces.ed.gov/pubs2002/cip2000/ciplist.asp?CIP2=45>

Behavioral/Social Sciences proposal (revised March 30, 2011)

Author: Mary Beth Mathews, CPR

Proposal:

On page 66 of the catalog, insert the following language:

Human Experience and Society: *Two courses* that explore the forces shaping human activity, relationships, social structures, institutions, and intellectual systems. **One course will emphasize a behavioral or social sciences approach, while the other will concentrate on the humanities.**

On page 74 of the catalog, divide the courses into two columns, as follows:

Behavioral/Social Sciences**Humanities**

Courses under the Behavioral/Social Sciences column will include all HES-approved courses in Anthropology, Economics, Geography, Linguistics, Political Science, Psychology or Sociology.

Courses under the Humanities column will include all HES-approved courses in Art History, Classics, Historic Preservation, History, Interdisciplinary Studies, Math, Philosophy, Religion, and Theatre.

Rationale:

The most recent revision of the General Education requirements correctly expanded the choices University of Mary Washington students have for satisfying a core curriculum, as well as revising the University's understanding of what that core curriculum should be. The current General Education requirements reflect a more flexible approach which uses broad categories rather than narrow areas.

In order to stay in compliance with SACS, we must somehow ensure that all students take at least one course in the behavioral/social sciences. This requirement is not under dispute, and all departments and colleges at the University strongly support the goal of a liberal arts education. A sound curriculum certainly demands such a course requirement.

The issue at hand, however, is how to ensure that students do indeed take one course in either Anthropology, Sociology, Geography, Psychology, Economics, Linguistics, or Political Science. The first attempt to bring our General Education requirements into compliance with SACS took a narrow approach. Language passed by the CAS Faculty Senate directed that that course come

from the Human Experience and Society section of the Gen Eds. This amendment, while well intentioned, privileges the Social/Behavioral Science courses within Human Experience and Society over the Humanities courses in that category. It also mistakenly uses credit hours as a benchmark, rather than courses.

This updated proposal, however, sets our General Education rules in line with SACS requirements without creating a hierarchical system within a single General Education area. If we retain the language from the CAS Faculty Senate, we will have a General Education program which specifically mentions Arts, Literature, Social/Behavioral Sciences, Math, and Natural Sciences but will not mention the other humanities in general. We have an Arts, Literature, and Performance section of our Gen Eds, but it has no humanities courses beyond what is narrowly considered Art, Literature, and Performance.

This proposal rectifies that problem by creating a Humanities section within the Human Experience and Society requirement and by directing students to take one course in the Behavioral/Social Sciences and one from the Humanities.

Changes to language passed by CAS Senate:

1. Catalog copy for all other Gen Ed requirements says “two courses,” and does not specify credit hour minimums. This change does that.
2. Division of the list into two broad areas: Behavioral/Social Sciences and Humanities

The Campaign for the Future of Higher Education is a movement begun in Los Angeles in January 2011 when representatives from twenty-one states met at the invitation of the California Federation of Teachers to consider re-orienting the dominant narrative in the US about higher education. The Campaign articulates seven basic principles from the point of view of faculty, and challenges the calls for cuts, for narrowing of curricula, for simplistic measures of success, and for overly optimistic reliance on on-line teaching. It has been endorsed by the AAUP, AFT, and NEA. The Virginia Conference of the AAUP endorsed the seven principles at its meeting of April 2, 2011, and urges the Faculty Senate of Virginia and university and college Faculty Senates around the Commonwealth to do so as well. The national launch of the Campaign will take place at a press conference on May 17 at the National Press Club in Washington, D.C.

–Craig Vasey, President, VA Conference, American Association of University Professors

Campaign for the Future of Higher Education

Perhaps the most widely accepted belief about higher education today is that our nation will need more college- educated people in the future than we have now or than we are on track to produce. This belief, given greater urgency by the most recent economic recession, has increasingly led to calls for transforming higher education and for embracing a wide variety of “innovations.”

Without question, improving higher education should be a goal of everyone—the public, elected leaders, businesses, and those who work to provide that education.

But as conversations about specifics develop, it is crucial for discussion about change to be guided by principles that will lead us toward real improvement in American higher education. Wholesale embrace of change without careful thought and deliberation can take us in the wrong direction—not toward reforming higher education but, in fact, toward deforming precisely those aspects of American higher education that have made it the envy of the world.

There are surely no simple answers, no one model, and no “magic bullets” for meeting America’s needs for broadly accessible quality higher education; but we believe that the following principles can provide a helpful framework for developing and assessing proposals for innovation or restructuring in the future.

- 1. Higher Education in the 21st Century must be inclusive; it should be available to and affordable for all who can benefit from and want a college education.**

Demographic projections make it clear that the United States will not return to world leadership in higher education attainment without increasing higher education opportunities and success for all sectors of our increasingly diverse society. A vigorous democracy and a thriving economy in the future demand that we give this principle full attention when we consider proposals for change, seeking out changes that will enhance educational opportunity and success for all,

including low-income communities and communities of color, and rejecting any proposals that may have unintended negative consequences for access and success.

We simply cannot risk a return to earlier times when education was rationed on the basis of race and economic status.

For this principle to be realized, higher education must also be recognized as a right and a public good rather than as a privilege and primarily a private good. High tuition, inadequate financial aid, and burdensome levels of student debt might seem more acceptable when we focus on the advantages higher education brings to the individual, but our current approach of increasing the costs of college restricts access for individuals and dampens the broader social and economic benefits of higher education.

1. The curriculum for a quality 21st Century higher education must be broad and diverse.

Our economy demands a population that is broadly educated for critical thinking and innovation. Narrow job training alone can condemn graduates to dead-end paths— in low-wage jobs , unable to repay their student loans, and ill-equipped to adjust to changing job markets and careers.

The value of a broad and diverse curriculum extends beyond economics. In the increasingly interconnected world of the 21st century, we will need more people who understand its history, who can think outside of narrow boundaries, and who have the tools to function in a culturally diverse environment.

Our democracy needs a broadly educated citizenry. Civic participation cannot flourish when a liberal education is reserved for the elite, and narrow training is provided for everyone else.

1. Quality higher education in the 21st Century will require a sufficient investment in excellent faculty who have the academic freedom, terms of employment, and institutional support needed to do state-of-the-art professional work.

Faculty and professionals must have the academic freedom to exercise their professional judgment in educational decisions about what and how to teach in the best interests of a quality education. They must be free and secure enough in their terms of employment to stretch and challenge students, and to apply high academic standards.

Colleges and universities must also provide faculty and staff with the resources and continuing professional development to stay current in their fields and to use the best methods for enhancing student learning and success.

The growing practice of hiring faculty into full and part-time contingent positions that are not eligible for due process protections of tenure inhibits the full application of academic standards and the free exercise of professional judgment.

1. **Quality higher education in the 21st century should incorporate technology in ways that expand opportunity and maintain quality.**

Technology that enhances learning is a welcome addition to the 21st century higher education experience. The current public conversation about the use of technology in higher education, however, suffers from a lack of depth and subtlety.

Too often the discussion begins with the unexamined assumption that “technology” and “the internet” are not already being incorporated into higher education in significant ways. Anyone who has spent any time in a college or university recently would dispute the assumption that underpins many demands for “innovation” in this area.

Even more significant, the technology debate would be improved if we made a more careful distinction between **education** and the **transfer of information**. Undoubtedly, the internet has already revolutionized the latter in universities and in the wider world. But education, which involves the development of higher level skills of assessment, critique, and expression, is a complex process that is often more challenging to produce in digital formats.

This latter point is related to another common assumption made when discussing online education—that it will save vast sums of money. When online technologies are used for higher levels of teaching rather than simply for rote learning or transfer of information, cost savings quickly evaporate. In fact, many faculty who are proponents of and experts in online education argue that teaching a good online course is **more** labor-intensive and thus **more** costly than more traditional formats.

In short, the role of online formats and other technological innovations in higher education are vastly more complex than the current public discussion would suggest. Issues of access (will some students be shortchanged simply because they don’t own a good computer or have access to high-speed internet), success (will online formats work for under-prepared students who also deserve a chance for success?), equity, and quality need a deeper analysis if we are to have the kind of higher education we will need in the 21st century.

1. **Quality education in the 21st Century will require the pursuit of real efficiencies and the avoidance of false economies.**

Not every cut in costs in a business—or in a college—is a real efficiency.

Many of the cuts colleges and universities have made during this current economic crisis—cutting classes, increasing class sizes, closing departments, slashing curricula, and reducing support services for students have helped campuses balance their budgets in the short-term, but the long-term costs of these cuts have not been adequately acknowledged or discussed.

In fact, the economic pressure to cut budgets and the political pressure to define all cuts as “efficiencies” currently makes it almost impossible to open a conversation about the hidden costs of various cuts.

We propose that the public discussion of increasing efficiency and productivity in higher education start here: a real efficiency that should be pursued will not only cut costs but also enhance or at least not harm the principles of a quality higher education for the 21st century outlined in this document.

1. Quality higher education in the 21st Century will require substantially more public investment over current levels.

Money will not solve all of higher education's problems, but adequate public investment in an enterprise so crucial to the country's future well-being simply must be provided.

Assurances that "we can do more with less" may play well politically, but they will not move us toward affordable, quality higher education in the 21st century.

In fact, failure of leaders in higher education and in government to highlight the currently perilous level of public investment in higher education does the country a grave disservice, for it allows the public to believe we can achieve world leadership in higher education or even maintain our current levels of achievement by simply accepting the status quo.

1. Quality higher education in the 21st century cannot be measured by a standardized, simplistic set of metrics.

Simplistic measures of success in K-12 that are the legacy of No Child Left Behind have not served our country or our children well. We should not make the same mistakes in higher education.

Unfortunately, graduation rates, in isolation, appear to be gaining ascendancy as **the** national measure of higher education success. While we agree with the goal of significantly increasing the number of people with college degrees and certificates, this trend is disturbing because a national drive toward that goal—to the exclusion of others—can threaten important principles, including inclusiveness and access, that are crucial for the kind of higher education we will need in the 21st century.

A more fruitful direction would recognize that educational success, like human health, is a complex systemic process that requires a rich data picture (of both qualitative and quantitative measures) for full assessment. For higher education to flourish, all our leaders—in government and in education—must avoid the lure of reductionist measures and simplistic goals that will foster a false sense of progress now but bitter disappointment at the results in the future.

Conclusion: Change in American higher education in the 21st Century is both inevitable and desirable.

Change **is**, in fact, a commonplace in every college and university worthy of the name.

Historically, our colleges and universities have offered an ever-changing array of programs, courses, and teaching formats. Instead of seeing that rich diversity as a "luxury" we can no

longer afford or as a “problem” to be fixed, we should see it as a strength that should be preserved and fostered. It is the environment in which higher education teaching and research flourish best.

As we examine proposals for change in higher education in the coming decades, we should build on the traditions, principles, and vision that have characterized American higher education at its best. We believe that using the principles discussed here to inform the national conversation can lead us toward an American higher education system in the 21st century that will serve our nation well and be a source of pride.

3/21/2011