

MINUTES
University Faculty Council
University of Mary Washington

September 7, 2010

Members Present: Ernest Ackermann, Andrew Dolby, Leigh Frackelton, Kimberley Kinsley, Mary Beth Mathews, Marie McAllister, George Meadows, Angela Pitts, Suzanne Sumner, Jo Tyler; President Richard Hurley, Provost Jay Harper, College of Business Acting Dean Larry Penwell, College of Education Dean Mary Gendernalik-Cooper

Members Absent: College of Arts and Sciences Dean Richard Finkelstein

1. Call to Order. The meeting was called to order at 4:00 p.m. in the Red Room of the Woodard Campus Center by Ernest Ackermann, Chair. He welcomed the members to the inaugural meeting of the UFC and noted that Dean Finkelstein sent his regrets.

2. Motion to Adopt Abbreviated Rules of Order. Ernest Ackermann offered items 1 through 3 of the “Proposed Rules of Order for the University Faculty Council” (Attachment 1) as necessary to conduct the meeting, and suggested discussing items 4 through 5 at a later point in the meeting. Marie McAllister moved approval of items 1 through 3, and Angela Pitts seconded the motion. There being no further discussion, the motion was approved unanimously by voice vote.

3. Reading and Approval of Minutes. Members had received the minutes of the previous meeting of May 17, 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 Suzanne Sumner seconded the motion. The minutes were approved unanimously by voice vote.

4. President’s Report. Richard Hurley reported that the University is off to a good start this year with 966 new students enrolled in the College of Arts and Sciences. He reported on three initiatives of the President’s Office:

Quantico: The University is in preliminary discussions about co-sponsorship of an education center at Quantico, similar to the Center underway at Dahlgren, in collaboration with George Mason University. Also participating are Germanna Community College and the County of Stafford. The President emphasized that a Quantico center is under discussion only, and that the University’s participation is contingent upon the project being economically beneficial.

Master Plan: The consultants have prepared a 10- to 15-year plan which is being rolled out for public review by local government, neighborhood associations, etc. with a few forums held at the University. It will be presented to the UMW Board of Visitors for approval at their November, 2010 meeting.

Statement on Diversity: The University is ready to roll out the statement on diversity and the President asked for suggestions about how to initiate that process. Suggestions included having a period of review and comment involving faculty and students and asking for volunteers to help.

In questioning after the President's report, the subject of marketing came up. The President described several new marketing efforts underway, such as billboards on I-95, radio advertisements, a new "brag sheet" highlighting various recognitions for the University in the media.

Another question for the President related to the ranking of the incoming class. He noted that while such things as average g.p.a. and test scores are slightly down from last year, the difference is not statistically significant. He explained further that because the competition for the top students is highly competitive, the University collects detailed data about why students do and don't decide to enroll at UMW; this data is used to improve marketing as well as to inform strategic decision-making.

5. Provost's Report. Jay Harper announced that the September 2010 edition of the Provost's Newsletter, describing what would otherwise be in his report, was issued today via email to all teaching faculty. It discusses, among other things, new state laws regarding university credit for International Baccalaureate and Advance Placement courses and regarding "dual admissions" to allow community college students to enroll in courses at 4-year public institutions. The Provost has referred the issue of advanced credit to the CAS Academic Affairs Committee and plans to refer the dual admissions issue to the UFC. The Provost congratulated the nine UMW faculty who have recently received external funding for grants described in the Newsletter.

6. College of Business Dean's Report. Larry Penwell announced that the College of Business Faculty Council had elected Louis Martinette as its chair and has organized three standing committees: Promotion and Tenure, Curriculum, and Admissions and Academic Affairs. The COB Curriculum Committee has been working on combining the two undergraduate programs, and will be addressing the graduate programs (MBA and MS/MIS) soon.

In questioning after the Dean's report, Larry Penwell stated that the status of the 5-year MS/MIS program is under discussion as an issue that concerns both COB and CAS. Ernest Ackermann raised the question of whether the 5-year degree model might be developed in other programs and suggested that this topic be included in a future report of the UFC Chairperson.

7. College of Education Dean's Report. Mary Gendernalik-Cooper noted that half of the external grants announced by the Provost were received by College of Education faculty members. She reported that last spring Norah Hooper and Courtney Clayton were elected Chair and Secretary, respectively, of the COE Faculty, and that five working committees for 2010-2011 have been formed: Faculty Affairs, Student Affairs, Curriculum and Assessment, Budget Advisory, Clinical Collaborations and Partnerships; the chairs of these committees will form the Executive Committee of the COE Faculty. In addition, several COE program committees are working this year to perform curriculum audits and examine different pathways toward teacher licensure.

8. UFC Chairperson's Report. Ernest Ackermann announced that he has submitted a report for the Board of Visitors' meeting on September 16 (Attachment 2), and he thanked everyone for their input on the report. He also noted that he will plan to invite reports from the governing bodies of the Colleges to include in his reports to the BOV. The Chair also reported that numerous requests for University-level committees are coming in, such as a General Education Committee and a Budget Advisory Committee, and that the CAS Faculty Organization Committee has asked the UFC for guidance. He suggested that the UFC conduct a work session

to address the formation of committees. In questioning following the Chairperson's Report, the following topics relating to committees were discussed:

- The proliferation of committees puts a strain on smaller colleges
- Are parallels for all committees at the college level needed at the university level?
- The role of a university-level budget advisory committee
- Allowing for flexibility as the university and college committees develop
- Timing of decisions about committee structures related to election schedule in CAS

9. Motion to Adopt Full Rules of Order. Discussion of this agenda item focused on whether to require reports and motions before the UFC to be in writing. The discussion was suspended and the issue referred to the Bylaws Subcommittee (Ackermann and Tyler) to prepare a revised draft for discussion at the next UFC meeting.

10. University Curriculum Committee Proposal and Discussion. Ernest Ackermann announced that the proposal that had been circulated from the study group on curriculum should be sent to the Colleges for their input to the UFC, as required in the Faculty Handbook. Discussion ensued regarding particulars of the proposal, such as ex officio members and relationship of curriculum decisions to budget decisions. The study group agreed to make the discussed revisions to the proposal in order for the UFC Chairperson to deliver it to the chairs of the COB and COE governing bodies; the President of the CAS will be receiving it as a member of the UFC. The proposal being sent to the Colleges' governing bodies is attached (Attachment 3).

11. University Promotion and Tenure Committee Proposal and Discussion. Ernest Ackermann summarized the proposal that had been circulated from the study group on promotion, tenure and evaluation, and discussion followed regarding particulars of the proposal, such as membership of full professors, ex officio members, and appeals procedures. The study group agreed to make the discussed revisions to the proposal in order for the UFC Chairperson to deliver it to the chairs of the COB and COE governing bodies; the President of the CAS will be receiving it as a member of the UFC. The proposal being sent to the Colleges' governing bodies is attached (Attachment 4).

12. UFC Representative to Compliance Certification Committee for SACS Review. This agenda item appears at the request of Tim O'Donnell, director of the self-study (Attachment 5). After summarizing the scope of the SACS review process and the duties of the Compliance Certification Committee, he asked for a member of the UFC who can write a history of governance at UMW to serve on the committee. Angela Pitts volunteered to serve in that position. Tim O'Donnell offered to give status reports about the self-study to the UFC when requested.

13. Faculty Committee to Review Jepson Fellowship Applications. The UFC discussed and reached consensus to follow the recommendation by Associate Provost John Morello for formation of this committee (Attachment 6). Ernest Ackermann agreed to notify the leadership of the governing bodies of the Colleges to enlist volunteers to serve on this committee this year.

14. Discussion of Charge to the Faculty Handbook Committee. A draft of the charge to this committee was circulated to the UFC by Associate Provost John Morello (Attachment 7).

Discussion focused on procedures for enlisting members and on including in the charge establishment of a University Budget Committee. Ernest Ackermann agreed to notify the leadership of the governing bodies of the Colleges to enlist volunteers to serve on this committee this year.

15. Discussion of Committee on Academic Standing. JoAnn Schrass, CAS Associate Dean of Student Services had asked the UFC to discuss whether there is a need for a University-level committee on academic standing. In discussion there was general agreement among UFC members that academic standing issues should be handled at the College-level, and that the committee and procedures already in place for CAS continue as is. Ernest Ackermann agreed to report the outcome of this discussion to JoAnn Schrass.

16. Discussion of James Farmer Multicultural Center Advisory Committee. Kristin Marsh (Department of Sociology and Anthropology) had inquired about recruiting members from the Colleges of Business and Education to serve on this committee. The discussion focused on the fact that the committee as currently constituted is a committee of CAS, and there was general agreement that the committee should proceed as constituted and propose a change in their charge if they want to expand membership beyond CAS.

17. Adjournment. There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 6:00 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Jo Tyler, Secretary

PROPOSED RULES OF ORDER FOR THE UNIVERSITY FACULTY COUNCIL

1. ORGANIZATION OF THE UNIVERSITY FACULTY COUNCIL

1.1 Role of the University Faculty Council The UFC serves to promote effective communication and coordination among the different College governing bodies at UMW. It also serves to recognize and address matters of common concern to all instructional faculty, matters that transcend the issues of a specific College, matters affecting general faculty welfare, and curriculum matters affecting all colleges. The UFC also serves to promote effective coordination and interaction by providing a formal means of regular communication between the University Faculty, the President and the Provost, and the Board of Visitors.

1.2 University Faculty Council Meeting Membership The UFC will be comprised of the following members: two (2) faculty elected from the College of Education; two (2) faculty elected from the College of Business; two (2) faculty elected from the College of Arts and Sciences; and four (4) faculty elected from the instructional faculty-at-large. In addition, the President, the Provost, and the deans of all three colleges will serve as *ex-officio* members.

1.3 UFC Officers From among its membership, the UFC annually elects these officers:

1.3.1 UFC Chair, responsible for preparing the agenda for UFC meetings and presiding over the meetings. The Chair will also serve as one of the two UMW representatives to the Faculty Senate of Virginia.

1.3.2 UFC Secretary, responsible for taking the minutes of each meeting, which are to be distributed to the University Faculty within two weeks after being approved by the UFC; serving as the other UMW representative to the Faculty Senate of Virginia; and serving as Chair in the absence of the Chair.

1.3.3 The UFC Chair, Secretary and one member elected from the Council will represent the faculty in meetings with the President's Cabinet and the Board of Visitors.

2. MEETINGS OF THE UNIVERSITY FACULTY COUNCIL

2.1 Meeting Rules University Faculty Council meetings shall be conducted according to *Robert's Rules of Order, Newly Revised*, unless noted otherwise in these Rules of Order.

2.2 Voting Privileges Voting privileges extend to the elected members of the University Faculty Council

2.3 Quorum. A quorum for UFC meetings of record is a majority of voting members that includes at least one member from each member election category (CAS, COE, COB, At-large).

2.4 Attendance. Attendance at University Faculty Council meetings is open to all faculty, administrators and students.

3. MODIFICATION OF RULES OF ORDER

3.1 These rules of order may be modified by a two-thirds majority of the voting members present at a regularly scheduled meeting.

4. CONDUCT OF BUSINESS FOR UNIVERSITY FACULTY COUNCIL

4.1 Order of Business The agenda of University Faculty Council meetings will be set by the Chairperson, with assistance provided by the Secretary. The agenda will be distributed to all members of the Council and all teaching faculty at least two working days before a scheduled meeting. The order of business in regularly scheduled meetings of the UFC will include the following: Call to order; reading of and approval of Minutes; Reports from President, Provost, Deans; Chair's report (e.g., from meetings w/ admin, other committees, groups); reports from University-level standing committees; Reports from UFC subcommittees/study groups; other unfinished business; other new business; announcements; adjournment. The Chairperson may include additional items on the agenda.

4.2 Recognition by Chairperson. Members or visitors shall speak only when recognized by the Chairperson. An individual may speak when recognized by the Chairperson. Unless more time is granted by the chair, a visitor must conclude their remarks within 5 minutes.

5. INTRODUCING MOTIONS AT UNIVERSITY FACULTY SENATE MEETINGS

5.1 Motions from the Floor. Motions for consideration by the UFC shall be made from the floor by UFC members during regularly scheduled meetings. After being seconded, motions from the floor shall be discussed and considered unless or until the UFC Chair orders referral to a committee or the motion is tabled. Approval of motions from the floor shall be by a majority of those present and

voting, upon determination that a quorum is present.

5.2 Motions Recommended by Report. Standing committees of the University and *ex officio* members of the UFC may include recommended motions in their reports to the UFC (see sec. 4.1). In order for such recommended motions to be considered by the UFC, the motion must be made from the floor by a UFC member during a regularly scheduled UFC meeting. Debate and consideration of the motion shall follow the procedure in section 5.1.

5.3 Motions normal to the operations of organized groups but which are not central to the functions of the College or the University (e.g., resolutions of sympathy, congratulations, etc.) may be acted upon immediately without previous referral to committee.

Report to the Board of Visitors, September 2010

Submitted by Ernest Ackermann
Professor of Computer Science
Chairperson of the University Faculty Council
Faculty Representative to the Board of Visitors

September 6, 2010

The University Faculty Council will hold its first meeting on Tuesday, September 7. Members of the UFC held four working sessions over the summer to begin tackling the major challenges before us, including faculty governance across the three colleges and the establishment of appropriate university-wide committees to handle such issues as promotion and tenure and curriculum.

The University Faculty Council is a new entity and its purpose as stated in the Faculty Handbook, Section 2.3.1 is “The UFC serves to promote effective communication and coordination among the different College governing bodies at UMW. It also serves to recognize and address matters of common concern to all instructional faculty, matters that transcend the issues of a specific College, matters affecting general faculty welfare, and curriculum matters affecting all colleges. The UFC also serves to promote effective coordination and interaction by providing a formal means of regular communication between the University Faculty, the President and the Provost, and the Board of Visitors.”

The UFC consists of ten elected faculty, the deans of each of the colleges, the Provost, and the President. The faculty are from each of the three colleges. In the spring the elected members of the UFC met and elected Ernest Ackermann, College of Arts and Sciences, as Chairperson, and Jo Tyler, College of Education as Secretary. Three members of the UFC will represent the faculty in meetings with the Executive committee of the Board of Visitors. They are Ernest Ackermann, Jo Tyler, and Kim Kinsley, College of Business.

The Council looks forward to working closely with the Board of Visitors during the coming year and fulfilling its mission as described in the Faculty Handbook.

Minutes of meetings of the UFC and other information about the UFC are accessible using the URL <http://ufc.umw.edu>.

Solicit Comments Curriculum Committee Handbook Language draft 9-18-10

I am write to solicit your consideration of and feedback on the following proposal being considered by the University Faculty Council (UFC). This proposal deals with establishing a university-level curriculum committee. Please send your comments to Suzanne Sumner if you are in CAS, Louis Martinette if you are in COB, and Norah Hooper if you are in COE. Feel free to get in touch with me too.

We are considering this proposal because the Faculty Handbook Section 2.3.2.6 requires the UFC to develop a University-level committee whose duties include curriculum oversight.

We wanted to write our proposals using Handbook-like language. When these or derived proposals are adopted they may become part of the Faculty Handbook.

The UFC intends that this committee will acknowledge, review, and accept proposals after they have been considered and forwarded by the Curriculum Committee of either CAS, COB, or COE. The UFC does not intend for this committee to duplicate work done in each college. We also do not intend that this replace a General Education Committee.

[Section #] University Curriculum Committee

The Committee includes the Chairs of the CAS, COB, and COE Curriculum Committees (or their equivalents), one member of the University Faculty Council, and the Provost. *Ex officio* members shall include the Registrar, the University Librarian, and a representative from DTLT.

The Committee's duties are to:

- .1 Work 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 Determine policies and procedures for curriculum development and implementation, including clear direction for the college-level curriculum committees as to which decisions require University-level oversight and which do not.
- .3 Review proposals for courses, programs, majors, minors, and special degrees with the goal of working to prevent course or program duplication. In its deliberations, the committee will consider general philosophy, college and university facilities, staffing, and current course offerings.
- .4 Evaluate proposals for changes in the relationship between programs or departments (for example, dissolution, division, or mergers).

- .5 Modify, when necessary, the general education program and its requirements.
- .6 Work with the Associate Provost for Assessment to ensure that curriculum changes take into account assessment findings.
- .7 Publish on the University website all curriculum changes.

It will be most helpful if you convey your opinions or suggestions regarding these proposals on or before your college faculty or senate meets. COE faculty meet on September 24, 2010, CAS and COB are scheduled for September 29. I also encourage you to discuss these within your departments and at the meetings of the CAS Senate and meetings of the COB and COE faculty. The next meeting of the UFC is October 5, 2010.

Thank you.

Solicit Comments P&T handbook language draft 9-18-10

I am writing to solicit your consideration of and feedback on the following proposal being considered by the University Faculty Council (UFC). This proposal deals with promotion and tenure (P&T) committees for each of the colleges and a university-level P&T oversight committee. Please send your comments to Suzanne Sumner if you are faculty in CAS, Louis Martinette if you are faculty in COB, and Norah Hooper if you are faculty in COE.

We are considering this proposal because the Faculty Handbook Section 2.3.2.6 requires the UFC to develop a University-level committee whose duties include P&T oversight. When we began our work we thought it important to first work on the issue of P&T oversight, and then deal with the more general issue of faculty evaluation matters.

We wanted to write our proposals using Handbook-like language. When these or derived proposals are adopted they may become part of the Faculty Handbook.

There are two major portions to this proposal.

The first deals with College P&T Committees:

[section #] College Promotion and Tenure Committees Each College shall elect a Promotion and Tenure committee, to include at least two faculty members from outside that college. All members must have attained the rank of associate professor or above with tenure, and at least one shall have attained the rank of full professor, by the date of election. Members serve staggered three-years terms. Each College Promotion and Tenure committee elects a chair from its membership. Members are nominated and elected according to the rules spelled out in [section number] of this *Handbook*. The College committees' duties are to:

- .1 Make recommendations in matters of promotion according to each College's faculty promotion policy and procedures ([section numbers] of this *Handbook*). In making its recommendations, the primary responsibility of each College committee is to evaluate all candidates' applications according to the criteria for each College stated in the *Faculty Handbook*.
- .2 Make recommendations to the Dean of the appropriate College in matters of tenure according to each College's faculty tenure policy and procedures ([section numbers] of this *Handbook*). In making its recommendations, the primary responsibility of each College committee is to evaluate all candidates' applications according to the criteria for each College stated in the *Faculty Handbook*.
- .3 Recommend changes in promotion and tenure policy or procedure to the college governing bodies and the University Promotion and Tenure Oversight Committee.

You will note that the proposal calls for each college to have its own P&T committee. This is because the criteria for P&T will likely have differences that are specific to the expectations for faculty in each college. Indeed, each college is charged with developing criteria for P&T.

We also propose that the each College P&T Committee have members from all three colleges.

One of the reasons for proposing this is that there are only few tenured faculty in the College of Business (COB) and in the College of Education (COE), and it is appropriate to not have only a few in a college making decisions regarding evaluation. Having the perspective of faculty from all colleges is also closer to the environment in which we have dealt with P&T recommendations up until this year.

The second proposal deals with the University P&T Oversight Committee:

[#] University Promotion and Tenure Oversight Committee. The chairs of the College Promotion and Tenure Committees constitute the membership of the University Promotion and Tenure Oversight Committee. The University committee's duties are to:

- .1 Review the promotion and tenure guidelines proposed by each College for the *Handbook*, to ensure that such guidelines are clear and parallel to those of the other Colleges. Approved guidelines shall be recommended to the University Faculty Council in the form of suggested *Handbook* language.
- .2 Once guidelines have been established for each College, meet as needed to evaluate proposals from the College committees for changes in promotion and tenure policy or procedure. Approved changes shall be recommended to the University Faculty Council in the form of suggested *Handbook* language.
- .3 Review appeals of promotion and tenure decisions when such appeals are based on violations of College procedural or policy guidelines, as explained in [the handbook section on promotion and tenure appeals, and the timetable for promotion and tenure, both still to be written].

This committee will be composed of the chairpersons of each of the P&T Committees of the Colleges, and they will make recommendations to the UFC. The chairpersons of each P&T committee are in a good position to deal with University-level P&T issues. The proposal also calls for this University-level committee to deal with appeals where the appeals are based on procedure or policy, not on the interpretation of the contents of a promotion or tenure folder.

It will be most helpful if you convey your opinions or suggestions regarding these proposals on or before your college faculty or senate meets. COE faculty meet on September 24, 2010, CAS and COB are scheduled for September 29. I also encourage you to discuss these within your departments and at the meetings of the CAS Senate and meetings of the COB and COE faculty. The next meeting of the UFC is October 5, 2010.

A copy of this is also posted at <http://ufc.umw.edu>. Thank you.

From: Tim O'Donnell (todonnel)
Sent: Tuesday, August 24, 2010 4:19 PM
To: Ernie Ackermann (ernie)
Subject: SACS and UFC

Hi Ernie,

Thanks for taking the time to meet with me. As we discussed, I would like a representative of the UFC to serve on the Compliance Certification Committee.

Their primary task and responsibility will be to work on the governance related aspects of compliance certification with a team of individuals who have expertise in particular areas of the institution. Although the SACS compliance certification doesn't neatly map on to the terms of UFC office, I think if we had a two year commitment, that would provide the longevity necessary to complete at least a draft and revision of the compliance certification report.

I have no opinion as to whether or not this person will keep the UFC in the loop with regular briefings. I too am happy to do that and will defer to the wisdom of the Council on this issue. Further, I am happy to meet with the Council to discuss this further - just let me know when it would be appropriate.

Best,

- Tim

From: John Morello (jmorello)
Sent: Tuesday, July 27, 2010 4:57 PM
To: Ernie Ackermann (ernie)
Subject: UFC input needed

The issue I'm writing about is the **faculty committee to review Jepson Fellowship applications.**

In the distant past, CAS Fellowship applications were reviewed by the Faculty Development and Grants Committee. CGPS had it's own process. CAS was able to recommend a maximum of 5 Fellows; CGPS could name one.

Last year with the permission of the FOC, we created a combination committee to review the Jepson applications — the Faculty Development and Grants Committee plus one person from CGPS. The committee reviewed all applications and made six recommendations. There was allocation by college — the top six applications were the recommendations.

For the 2010-11 process, I need a faculty committee. Here is what I'd like to propose, if this is OK by the UFC

That the CAS Faculty Development and Grants Committee be asked to name four of their six faculty members to serve on the Jepson Fellowship Committee
That the College of Education and the College of Business each be asked to name one person to serve.

That gives a committee of 6; 4 CAS, 1 COB; 1 COE. This committee will review applications and make recommendations to the Provost following procedures set forth at: http://www.umw.edu/provost/leaves/jepson/guidelines_for_jepson_fell.php

The deadline for applications is Friday, September 17. The committee needs to be set before that date so that they can begin reviewing applications immediately after the deadline passes.

The BOV makes the final decision, and they do that at their meeting in November.

I'd like to know if the plan I have outlined is acceptable — or if there is a different way you'd like me to proceed, we can do that. I just need a committee in place so that the applications may be reviewed in a timely fashion.

Thanks.

Draft of a Charge to the *University Faculty Handbook* Advisory Committee

1. Update the current 2010-11 *University Faculty Handbook* so that it may serve as a continuing handbook for the university's instructional faculty.
2. Consider and take appropriate action regarding items left over as unfinished business by the *Faculty Handbook* Advisory Committee that was appointed in 2009-2010 (see list, below).
3. Thoroughly review the 2010-11 *University Faculty Handbook* and edit as appropriate to eliminate ambiguity and inconsistency in language.
4. Incorporate into appropriate handbook language any handbook changes adopted by the University Faculty Council in 2010-11.
5. Ensure that a revised handbook is approved by the faculty and then submitted for final action by the Board of Visitors at the Board's meeting on April 21-22, 2011.

***FACULTY HANDBOOK* ISSUES REQUIRING FURTHER EXAMINATION**

As Identified by the *Faculty Handbook* Advisory Committee (February 22, 2010)

1. **Clarification of the process and criteria whereby the institution may claim "financial exigency" as grounds for termination of a full-time tenured faculty position (§3.17.2).** The *College of William and Mary Faculty Handbook* (pp. 53-84) has a clearly delineated process to be followed in such cases that might serve as a model for developing something similar at UMW.
2. **Definition of the terms in §3.18.2.** There should be clearer understanding about the meaning of several terms found in this section that are subject to variable interpretation, such as: (1) professional incompetence or lack of teaching effectiveness, (2) willful failure to support and abide by the University of Mary Washington Honor Code, (3) neglect of duty, (4) serious misconduct, (5) moral turpitude, and (6) physical incapacity or medical disability.
3. **Additional standing committees of the university.** There should probably be a university-level Budget Advisory Committee. Several committees that manage areas of the undergraduate curriculum, such as the General Education and Academic Affairs Committees, might need to be university committees since all BA/BS undergraduate students, regardless of college, are subject at this point to the same curricular and academic policies.
4. **Committee process for appeals and grievances.** Rather than having multiple ad-hoc processes for grievances and appeals, the University Faculty Council should consider whether or not there should be a standing appeals committee (or committees) to handle grievances and appeals. Several university faculty handbooks include descriptions of such committees. In some cases, a single committee handles all actions. In other instances, there are separate committees for grievances and appeals – but they are standing, rather than ad hoc, committees. See, for example, the *George Mason University Faculty Handbook* (pp. 53-54) and the *James Madison University Faculty Handbook* (pp. 76-81).

John T. Mulla