MINUTES
University Faculty Council
University of Mary Washington

December 6, 2011

Members Present: Andrew Dolby (Chairperson), Stephen Davies, Leigh Frackelton, Dan Hubbard, Jennifer Jakubecy, Teresa Kennedy, Mary Beth Mathews, Debra Schleef, Suzanne Sumner, Jo Tyler (Secretary); College of Arts and Sciences Dean Richard Finkelstein, College of Business Dean Lynne Richardson

Members Absent: President Richard Hurley, Provost Jay Harper, College of Education Dean Mary Gendernalik-Cooper

Guests: Chief of Staff Martin Wilder, Associate Provost John Morello, Associate Provost of Enrollment Management and Student Services Fred Pierce, Student Government Association Academic Affairs Chair Meagan Holbrook

1. Call to Order. The meeting was called to order by the Chair 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 November 8, 2011 (Attachment 1), so a formal reading of the minutes was dispensed with. There were no corrections or additions. Leigh Frackelton moved that the minutes be approved, Suzanne Sumner seconded, and the motion was approved unanimously by voice vote.

3. President’s Report. Martin Wilder announced that President Hurley was attending a Southern Association of Colleges and Schools (SACS) meeting and had asked him to report to the UFC. He announced that the President plans to address the faculty and present a University update in January and asked for suggestions for dates. He briefly listed some of the items discussed at the November 17 Board of Visitors meeting: Alumni survey, update on SACS review and the Quality Enhancement Plan, developments in the College of Business, the branding initiative, and the opening of the Dahlgren Campus scheduled for January. Regarding the Dahlgren Campus, Martin Wilder explained that UMW was asked to establish the campus as a step toward preventing the base closure under the base realignment and closure process. UMW is serving as the landlord of the property and other institutions will be providing the programs there. It remains a possibility for UMW to provide academic programs there in the future, but that is not the purpose of the campus. He emphasized that the Dahlgren Campus will be operated with state funds and no funds from the UMW budget will be used. In response to a question, he mentioned that we have at least two tenants already contracted.

4. College of Arts and Sciences Dean’s Report. Dean Finkelstein announced that he has been working on bringing a national speaker to address the University regarding the role of liberal arts. He addressed some concerns that have been raised by faculty relating to travel funds. He
explained that the budget for faculty travel funds has been stable and that he has also reallocated funds to support some projects. He noted that professional activity by faculty has increased. In response to a question, he explained that the percentage of requests being funded fluctuates somewhat from year to year, but that over the past several years it has been around 75 to 80 percent.

5. College of Business Dean’s Report. Dean Richardson announced that the first major step toward accreditation by the Association to Advance Collegiate Schools of Business, developing faculty research plans, has been completed. She also discussed the status of the Bachelor of Professional Studies (BPS) program. This evening program offered on the Stafford Campus is being discontinued because of low course enrollments, and several steps are being taken to encourage the remaining students in the program to complete their studies. There are about 150 students in the program.

6. Provost’s Report. John Morello announced that Jay Harper is attending the SACS meeting and had asked him to report on the status of the Convergence Center. The construction will begin in May 2012 on this new building to be located near the Woodard Campus Center and the Simpson Library. The concept of convergence is to bring together information, resources and people for research, teaching, learning, and social engagement. It will provide spaces for collaborative activities supported by advanced technologies. It will also have office space for the Division of Teaching and Learning Technologies, the Help Desk, the Teaching Center, and the Writing Intensive and Speaking Intensive programs. Among the several specialized spaces in the building will be a 162-seat digital auditorium, 24/7 quiet spaces, a technology check-out desk, and ultra-high tech classrooms including a distance learning classroom. Architecturally, the building is designed to match the style of other buildings on the Fredericksburg Campus; it will have a garden with amphitheater seating, and Campus Walk will go through an archway in the building. Before the official groundbreaking in May, some site preparation work involving moving underground infrastructure will occur. The building is scheduled to be essentially complete by December 2013, with a soft launch expected in Spring 2014. Campus Walk will be rerouted during this 2-year construction period. In response to questions, John Morello explained that the technology-enhanced spaces are designed to be extremely flexible to allow for frequent upgrades, and the digital auditorium is a multi-purpose space with seating that can be set up or closed down within minutes. He also explained that although the funding for the building is through the state’s construction bonding process, the operating costs are part of the UMW budget.

7. Committee Reports. Reports had been received from the following University committees: Academic Affairs; Budget Advisory; Curriculum; Faculty Affairs; General Education; Sabbaticals, Fellowships and Faculty Awards; Student Affairs and Campus Life Advisory; and Honors Program (Attachments 2-11). Andrew Dolby asked for a motion to accept the submitted committee reports, with the notation that the two proposals for licensure pathways in special education from the College of Education listed as approved on the University Curriculum Committee’s minutes for November 16 (Attachment 5) had been withdrawn. Leigh Frackelton made the motion, which was seconded by Debra Schleef. In discussion, Jo Tyler asked about the report from the University Budget Advisory Committee containing its recommendations which was originally scheduled for the UFC’s November agenda. She also asked if the University
Faculty Affairs Committee would be taking action regarding the charge from the UFC last month to “comprehensively review our current [student course] evaluation instrument,” as this was not mentioned on the committee’s minutes. Andrew Dolby said that he would contact the chairs of the respective committees about these points. Regarding the University Faculty Affairs Committee, Teresa Kennedy asked about the schedule for evaluation of tenured faculty and department chairs. John Morello mentioned that this information is included on the Annual Evaluation Calendar page of the Provost’s website. Mary Beth Mathews made a motion, seconded by Suzanne Sumner, to call the question. The motion to accept the committee reports was approved unanimously by voice vote.

8. Charge to University Faculty Affairs Committee Regarding Student Course Evaluations. In response to the UFC’s charge to the committee (Attachment 12), the UFAC sent a memo to the Office of Analysis and Institutional Effectiveness requesting information about the pilot study on student course evaluations (Attachment 13). Andrew Dolby suggested that some items requested might be slightly revised. Stephen Davies suggested that in addition to data about median scores of online vs. in-class written responses, data about whether online responses are “in sync” with paper responses is needed, and that we need to consult with a statistician about how to produce this data. Andrew Dolby said that he would work with the University Faculty Affairs Committee to make modifications to their requests.

9. Charge to University Student Affairs and Campus Life Advisory Committee. Michael McCarthy, chair of the committee, presented an update. Explaining that the committee is in the process of defining itself, he noted that faculty are in a unique position to work with students in non-academic ways and that the committee can address important needs. The committee has met with all of the departments under the leadership of Doug Searcy, Vice President of Student Affairs. The committee sees its role as providing a faculty point of view for these departments, and discussing issues of concern to faculty, basically forging mutual communication between faculty and Student Affairs administrators. They feel that the committee should continue its work with the duties previously proposed (Attachment 14).

Regarding the issue of having a student representative on the UFC, Michael McCarthy reported that the committee researched the faculty governing bodies of other liberal arts universities and found that many have a non-voting student representative. They feel that the President of the Student Government Association (SGA) would be an appropriate representative on the UFC. Megan Holbrook explained that the SGA wants their representative to be their Academic Affairs Chair. Teresa Kennedy made a motion to revise section 2.3.4 of the University Faculty Handbook to include a representative selected by the SGA as an ex-officio non-voting member of the UFC. The motion was seconded by Stephen Davies and approved unanimously by a voice vote. Leigh Frackelton pointed out that since this motion changes the membership of the UFC, it must be approved by a majority of the faculty in each college before it can go into effect as a Handbook revision. John Morello suggested that section 2.3.4 of the Handbook also be revised to explicitly define the other ex-officio members of the UFC as non-voting members. Jo Tyler pointed out that the voting members of the UFC are defined in the Rules of Order in an appendix to the Handbook. Based on this discussion, Suzanne Sumner volunteered to draft the final wording for the motion, which was approved via email and forwarded by Andrew Dolby to the presidents of the college governing bodies on December 9, 2011 (Attachment 15).
In discussion of the proposed Handbook wording for the duties of the Student Affairs and Campus Life Advisory Committee (Attachment 14), Jo Tyler suggested that the first sentence of section 2 of the proposal be reworded as follows: “Communicate student affairs and campus life decisions to the faculty via the University Faculty Council and the governing bodies of the colleges, and faculty concerns and ideas back to the Vice President for Student Affairs and the Associate Vice President & Dean of Student Life.” Mary Beth Mathews suggested deleting the last sentence of section 1 and the last sentence of section 2 of the proposal. Jo Tyler made a motion that the proposal be approved with the revisions discussed. Leigh Frackelton seconded the motion and it was approved unanimously by a voice vote. As a result, the revised wording of section 2.6.9, subsections .1 and .2, of the University Faculty Handbook would be:

.1 Work in an advisory fashion with the Vice President for Student Affairs and the Associate Vice President & Dean of Student Life on non-academic student priorities, including but not limited to, helping identify timely issues that may put our students in high-risk situations, promoting a positive community ethos across all UMW campuses, publicizing and supporting student-service opportunities, and otherwise helping develop those aspects of campus life, including new buildings, that could enhance students’ educational experience.

.2 Communicate student-affairs and campus-life decisions to the faculty via the University Faculty Council and the governing bodies of the colleges, and faculty concerns and ideas back to the Vice President for Student Affairs and the Associate Vice President & Dean of Student Life.

10. University Faculty Governance Discussion. Andrew Dolby began the discussion with a summary of ideas discussed at the UFC work session held on December 2.

- Change selection of college representatives to University-level standing committees. If the wording states “one member selected by each college” (instead of “from each college”), then colleges will be able to select any faculty member, not necessarily one appointed in that college. The purpose would be to reduce the service burden on faculty in smaller colleges. A question was raised about whether the Handbook should explicitly state that members representing a college may be chosen from other colleges.
- Add explicit language about ex-officio members on the University-level committees being non-voting members.
- Allow members of the University Curriculum Committee to be any member of the Curriculum Committee of each College, rather than specifying that it must be the chair.
- Move the Budget Advisory Committee and the Student Affairs and Campus Life Advisory Committee from Section 2.6 (Standing Committees) to Section 2.8 (Other University Advisory and Special Interest Committees).
- Make revisions to the schedule of committee meetings and the reporting timelines and clarify wording about reporting to college governing bodies.
- Review the duties of several committees that deal with technology issues to reduce overlapping duties and duplication of ex-officio members.
• Review the duties of committees that function primarily to review special courses (Writing Intensive, Speaking Intensive, Honors, First Year Seminar, and Distance and Blended Learning) to determine what ex-officio members are needed.

• Review the duties of the Teaching Center Advisory Committee and the University Academic Resources Advisory Committee; eliminate the duty relating to invited speakers; put the other UARAC duties under the Teaching Center Advisory Committee.

• Revise the officers of the University Faculty Council to include Chair-elect as the third officer.

Additional discussion involved how to proceed with further University-wide discussions about the committee system and arriving at formal Handbook revisions. Andrew Dolby suggested that the target should be approving Handbook revisions at the March UFC meeting.

John Morello pointed out that the April UFC meeting would be the very latest date on which any Handbook revisions could be approved in time to be on the April agenda of the Board of Visitors. Suggestions were made to either hold open discussion forums in January or ask the College governing bodies to put this item on their January agendas and report back to the UFC.

Leigh Frackelton made a motion to recommend revising the wording of the Faculty Handbook section 2.3.4 to state that all ex-officio members of the University Faculty Council be non-voting members. Jo Tyler seconded and the motion passed on a voice vote with one abstention by Suzanne Sumner. The motion was included in the recommendation sent to the college governing bodies on December 9, 2011 (see item 9 above and Attachment 15).

11. Motion from University Academic Affairs Committee. The committee had submitted a proposal to add language to the Dictionary of Academic Regulations to give students who compete in CAC tournaments specific flexibility in scheduling final exams (Attachment 16). Leigh Frackelton made the motion to approve the proposal and Jo Tyler seconded. Stephen Davies explained that this is a small inconvenience to show faculty support for student athletes. The motion was approved unanimously by a voice vote.

12. Resolution from the Sierra Club. This resolution to support the current state moratorium on uranium mining was submitted by student Graham Givens, student organizer for the Virginia Chapter of the Sierra Club (Attachment 17). Andrew Dolby explained that, according to Mr. Givens, the resolution has already been signed by the President’s Sustainability Council, the Student Senate, and the Student Ecology Club. There was discussion about the appropriateness of consideration of such a motion by the UFC. Jo Tyler pointed out that our Rules of Order include the ability to pass resolutions. Andrew Dolby suggested that the UFC take no action on this resolution since the students have already raised awareness through the Sustainability Council and its goal does not clearly fit within the purpose of the UFC. No action was taken.

13. Request from the CAS Faculty Senate. At its November 30 meeting, the CAS Faculty Senate requested that the UFC create a faculty award recognizing annual scholarly, creative, and professional achievement and excellence. John Morello pointed out that the UFC does not have the capacity to create monetary faculty awards, but could make a recommendation to the Office of Advancement and University Relations to raise funds for such an award. In response to a
question, he added that the current awards for teaching are $1200, and for service $800. Andrew Dolby made a motion, seconded by Stephen Davies, that further discussion be tabled until the next UFC meeting.

The meeting was adjourned at 6:20 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Jo Tyler, Secretary
MINUTES
University Faculty Council
University of Mary Washington

November 8, 2011

Members Present: Andrew Dolby (Chairperson), Stephen Davies, Leigh Frackelton, Dan Hubbard, Jennifer Jakubecy, Teresa Kennedy, Mary Beth Mathews, Debra Schleef, Suzanne Sumner, Jo Tyler (Secretary); Provost Jay Harper, College of Arts and Sciences Dean Richard Finkelstein, College of Education Dean Mary Gendernalik-Cooper

Members Absent: President Richard Hurley, College of Business Dean Lynne Richardson

Guests: Associate Provost John Morello, Associate Provost of Enrollment and Student Services Fred Pierce, College of Arts and Sciences Associate Dean Ana Chichester, University Librarian Rosemary Arneson, Academic Resources Advisory Committee Chair David Hunt, College of Business Faculty Senate President-elect Ken Machande, College of Education Faculty Chairperson Norah Hooper, Student Government Association Academic Affairs Chair Meagan Holbrook

1. Call to Order. The meeting was called to order by the Chair 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 October 11, 2011 (Attachment 1), so a formal reading of the minutes was dispensed with. There were no corrections or additions. Leigh Frackelton moved that the minutes be approved, Suzanne Sumner seconded, and the motion was approved unanimously by voice vote.

3. President’s Report. Andrew Dolby reported that President Hurley sent his regrets that he was unable to attend the meeting.

4. Provost’s Report. Jay Harper reported briefly about the forthcoming faculty salary adjustments. The funds were apportioned among colleges. There was a very limited amount of money available, so only a fraction of the need could be met. This is just the first step in a long-term process of making salary adjustments.

5. College of Arts and Sciences Dean’s Report. Dean Finkelstein reiterated the Provost’s comments regarding salary adjustments. With the limited amount of funds available it was impossible to correct the salary inversion problem in CAS, but a small first step has been made. Each individual increase is very small, and in some departments there were no adjustments. An attempt was made to base the increases on an objective rationale.
6. **College of Education Dean’s Report.** Dean Gendernalik-Cooper stated that there was no report at this time.

7. **UFC Chairperson’s Report.** Andrew Dolby had previously circulated his report to the Board of Visitors (Attachment 2). There were no questions.

8. **Committee Reports.** Andrew Dolby noted that the Budget Advisory Committee’s report of their recommendations to the President will be submitted at the December UFC meeting. He added that the Honors Program Committee will also have a report for the December UFC meeting. He explained that the committees had agreed to omit names of students from their reports. Teresa Kennedy made a motion to accept all committee reports submitted (Attachments 3-14), and it was seconded by Leigh Frackelton. There was no discussion, and the motion was approved by a unanimous voice vote.

9. **University Academic Resources Advisory Committee Proposal.** The proposal (Attachment 15) asked the UFC to clarify the charge of the UARAC as it relates to other committees and to the Strategic Plan. Mary Beth Mathews made a motion, seconded by Leigh Frackelton, to approve the UARAC proposal. The UARAC Chair, David Hunt, explained some of the difficulties with the overlap of duties between the UARAC and such committees as the Teaching Center Committee and the Distance and Blended Learning Committee. University Librarian Rosemary Arneson questioned whether this committee was needed, and pointed out that although the Strategic Plan calls for establishment of the UARAC, it has many of the duties of other committees. She pointed out that there are several committees that deal with the library and have the Librarian as member. In further discussion, it was pointed out that several ex-officio members of these related committees are attending multiple meetings and discussing many of the same issues in each. David Hunt requested that a member of the UFC attend the next meeting of the UARAC on November 18 to discuss these issues further with leaders of other related committees. Teresa Kennedy volunteered to be the UFC representative. No vote was taken on the motion to approve the UARAC proposal.

10. **University Student Affairs and Campus Life Advisory Committee Proposal.** The proposal (Attachment 16) outlined the duties of this committee. It was introduced for discussion by Andrew Dolby. Jo Tyler suggested some changes in wording. Mary Beth Mathews pointed out concerns of faculty regarding an apparent increase in student emotional and mental issues and asked if procedures regarding student mental health should be added to the committee’s duties. Dean Finkelstein explained that the Office of Counseling and Psychological Services is currently understaffed, making it difficult to support faculty in dealing with these issues. Associate Provost John Morello pointed out that because the committee’s duties are advisory, it should not be a standing committee, but rather should appear in section 2.8 of the Faculty Handbook under Other University Advisory and Special Interest Committees. He also recommended moving the University Budget Advisory Committee to section 2.8. Teresa Kennedy asked if a University-level faculty committee was needed to deal with student affairs and asked if the Vice President of Student Affairs could appoint his own advisory committee. Mary Beth Mathews suggested that as far as faculty needed to be involved, the duties could be a charge for the University Academic Affairs Committee, and she offered to bring a formal proposal to this effect at the next UFC meeting. Dan Hubbard pointed out that an important reason to retain this committee is that it is
the only one that brings students, faculty and staff together. Andrew Dolby suggested that we obtain feedback from the members of the University Student Affairs and Campus Life Advisory Committee about these suggestions. Jo Tyler made a motion that the proposal be returned to the committee for them to consider these suggestions. It was seconded by Leigh Frackelton and approved unanimously by a voice vote.

11. Charge to University Faculty Affairs Committee. Andrew Dolby made a motion, seconded by Teresa Kennedy, that the UFC give the following charge to the committee:

To comprehensively review our current student course evaluation system, process the results of the current on-line course evaluation pilot study, and recommend a course of action to the UFC

In discussion it was stated that the Office of Institutional Analysis and Effectiveness is conducting a pilot study on the effectiveness of the online course evaluation process, and that this study should address the issues in the proposed charge. It was also pointed out that the pilot study focuses on the online process and does not address the evaluation questionnaire itself. Teresa Kennedy explained that the faculty are not only interested in the validity of the process used to disseminate the questionnaire (whether online or in person), but also the validity of the instrument itself, since it is the just about the only documentation, other than self-reported accomplishments, that is used for faculty evaluation. There was general consensus that evaluation needs to be multi-sourced and that the UFAC should investigate other sources for documentation in the faculty evaluation process. Stephen Davies pointed out that there is research showing that online and paper-based data cannot be compared and suggested that the committee examine how the process of data collection affects the usability of the data. Dean Finkelstein pointed out that departments and individual faculty members vary widely in their attitude toward online versus paper-based evaluations and that there are many factors that contribute to these variations. Teresa Kennedy proposed that the charge to the committee be revised to include investigating the use of multiple sources in the evaluation process, and Andrew Dolby suggested that it also include making recommendations about the criteria included on the student course evaluations. He agreed to work with Suzanne Sumner to reword the charge to the committee and to circulate it to the UFC for an electronic vote before sending it to the UFAC.

12. Reform of University Faculty Governance. Andrew Dolby reported that his discussions with faculty across the University over the past two months indicate that the UFC’s best course of action for this academic year is to implement feasible reforms to the currently existing governance system. The three main areas of concern are communications, efficiency, and service workload for faculty. He pointed out that curriculum should be our top priority, and he also suggested that we review the decision-making responsibilities of the committees to determine what can be decided at the college level and whether issues that are decided at the University level need to be approved afterwards at the College level. He added that we need to find ways of reducing the overlapping charges of the various committees and the number of reports and recommended working with the University Faculty Organization Committee in this effort. He also suggested looking at the UFC itself, and particularly at the term of office of the Chair. Finally, he recommended that we conduct a work session of UFC members meeting to brainstorm ideas that we could bring to the December meeting. John Morello pointed out that the final deadline for submitting changes to the Faculty Handbook to the Board of Visitors is their
April 19 meeting, and that changes could be made as late as the April 10 UFC meeting, although March would be better. Andrew Dolby said that he would consult with UFC members by email to schedule the work session.

The meeting was adjourned at 5:25 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Jo Tyler, UFC Secretary
University Academic Affairs Committee
Meeting Minutes
21 October 2011

Present: Nicole Crowder, Joann Schrass, Jay Harper, Zach Whalen, Jan Huffman, Rita Dunston, John Morello.

Next Meeting: 16 November 2011 at 12:30 PM in Jepson 109

Call to Order at 3:30 PM

I. Approval of Minutes from 26 September Meeting
Jay moves to approve as submitted. Nicole C. seconds. The vote is unanimous.

II. Old Business
Policy on course credit for Cambridge Examinations
Nicole is still working with Rita to compose the letters that will be sent to Department Chairs requesting their input on course credit mapping.

III. New Business
A. Three items for University online policy manual (From John Morello)
These documents simply codify existing policies and practices. The content is, therefore, non-controversial. After some clarification of the distinction between the University Academic Affairs Council versus the University Academic Affairs Committee, we agree that the references in these policies should in fact refer to the latter. Similarly, the incorrect abbreviation UACC should be changed to UAAC.

B. Proposal from the UMW Student Athlete Advisory Committee, referred from UFC
Joann has discussed this somewhat with Ed Hegmann. One problem with the proposal is that the potential number of students that might take advantage of this policy could create logistical chaos for faculty as they try and accommodate alternate exam times. According to Hegmann, the maximum number of students who could be affected is around 100. Jay points out that the actual number will be much lower.

Joann has proposed that, in response to scheduling challenges, to use the Saturday of exam week as a date for athletes whose tournament participation precludes one of their reading days. The problems with this may be that faculty would be unwilling to proctor exams on a Saturday and that this establishes a rather short turnaround time for senior grades, which will be due the following Monday.

In addition, Nicole C. reports that an email from Stephen Stageberg (sent to Andrew Dolby) on behalf of the “Intercollegiate Athletics Advisory Committee” expresses adamant opposition to intercollegiate competition on reading days, which seems to be a contradiction of the report from the Student Athlete Advisory Committee. Clearly, there is a need for these two groups to determine the actual will and best interests of student athletes.

UAAC will table this proposal pending further clarification.
C. Policy on pass/fail for prerequisite and co-requisite courses

The question here is whether students should be allowed to take a course for pass/fail credit when that course is being taken as a prerequisite for a course required in the Major. Some specific scenarios involve Chemistry and Biology coursework.

John reports that other schools have a concept of “foundation” courses for majors. These are courses that are “implicitly required”, but are not actually considered courses in the major. This structure does create the possibility of introducing specific requirements – such as how the course must be credited – but it also creates major loopholes and potential traps for students who change majors.

Regarding the question of pass/fail for minors, we do require that courses in a minor are taken for full credit.

The committee agrees that no action is warranted at this time.

D. Discussion of new proposed scheme for faculty governance

The scheme sent by Andrew Dolby is very much in progress; at least, the idea that a University Faculty Senate replace college governing bodies may no longer be part of the discussion.

IV. Adjournment


The next meeting will be on November 16 at 12:30.
University Academic Affairs Committee

Meeting Minutes

16 November 2011

Present: Nicole Crowder [chair], Zach Whalen [secretary], Meagan Holbrook, Jane Huffman, Xiaofeng Zhao, Fred Pierce, Rita Dunston, Jay Harper.

Next Meeting: 25 January 2011

Called to Order at 12:30 PM

I. Approval of Minutes from 10/21/11 UAAC Meeting
Jane moves to approve as submitted. Nicole C. seconds. The vote is unanimous.

II. Old Business

A. Policy on course credit for Cambridge examinations

Nicole reports that letters have been sent to the appropriate department chairs, and some replies have already been received. She is sending a reminder specifying Jan 20th as a deadline to respond so that we can vote on these at our Jan 25th meeting.

It is noted that of all schools in VA listed on the Cambridge website, only 3 that we know of have a published list of which courses match Cambridge Examination credit: UVA, George Mason, and Christopher Newport. Virginia Tech is evaluating their list as we are now.

Some Cambridge exams don’t offer an obvious course credit from us, including several languages that we don’t teach. This is expected, and we will explore options for awarding credit for foreign languages that we don’t offer through existing procedures.

B. Proposal from the UMW Student Athlete Advisory Committee

Full text of the proposal, referred from UFC:

“In the spirit of cooperation, for CAC Spring Championship Tournaments only, UMW Teams will participate on ONLY ONE Reading Day, Saturday OR Sunday, IF participating UMW student-athletes (SA’s) will be allowed to RESCHEDULE ALL EXAMS, originally scheduled for the Monday following their Reading Day participation. However, student-athletes are not REQUIRED to reschedule these exams, if they desire to follow the original finals schedule. This language was unanimously supported by the UMW Student Athlete Advisory Committee, a council composed of members from ALL UMW Intercollegiate Teams.”
This proposal is in response to tournament scheduling conflicts with the CAC. Stephen Stageberg, on behalf of the Intercollegiate Athletics Advisory, has opposed this proposal. The understanding is that IAA wishes to insist on the value of the reading days and, implicitly, the priority of academics over athletics in keeping with NCAA Division III ideals.

The UAAC supports the proposal from SAAC, noting that the decision before us simply relates to creating the possibility for student athletes to reschedule some exams under very specific circumstances. We observed that existing policies justify exam rescheduling in cases of religious holiday observance or in cases where students have more than 2 exams scheduled within 24 hours. We feel that the scope and impact of this proposed policy will be similarly limited.

Nicole C. makes a motion (with Zach seconding) to add the following text to the Dictionary of Academic Regulations:

“Student-athletes participating in conference championships during the Reading Days period shall be permitted to reschedule any final examinations scheduled for the Monday following the competition. Alternative dates will be set by consulting with the instructor or instructors and, if necessary, through consultation with a dean from the Office of Academic Services. It is the student’s responsibility to make alternative arrangements for final examinations as early as possible.”

The vote is unanimous.

III. New Business

A. Faculty Governance Reform

It has been suggested that UAAC merge with the University Curriculum Committee. We discuss and agree (apparently, along with UCC) that the work of the two committees is different enough and substantive enough to warrant continuing as separate groups.

Meagan inquires about her status as student representative, wondering why the UAAC – and not other University-level committees – requires a student representative. In fact, UAAC is supposed to have two student representatives, but currently does not.

More questions than answers.

IV. Announcements

All Spring meetings will be on Wednesdays:

- Jan. 25th
- Feb. 22nd
- Mar. 14th
- April 18th

We will coordinate a mutually convenient meeting time over email.
Motion to adjourn – Jay, seconded by Nicole – at 1:20.
BAC Meeting Minutes  
October 10, 2011

In Attendance: Joe Romero, Jay Harper, Paul Messplay, Nabil Al-Tikriti, Tim O’Donnell, Dana Hall, Raul Chavez Negrete and Tamie Pratt-Fartro

I. Meeting called to order at 7:35am

II. Approval of Minutes from 10-3-11
   a. Dana motioned to accept; Nabil seconded

III. Discussion of Changes to the 9-26 Minutes
   a. Dana motioned to accept; Nabil seconded

IV. Summary of Allocation of $500,000:
   a. Discussion of COB accreditation process
   b. Discussion of restoration of frozen positions and conversion of adjuncts to full-time faculty

V. President Hurley’s 2011-2012 Budget: Allocations
   a. Discussion of Allocated Funds versus Centrally Held Funds (set aside but cannot currently use)

VI. Questions/Comments
   a. Paul going to retrieve information on actual cost of Canvas and previous costs of Blackboard
   b. Committee asking Paul for more information regarding the Student Affairs allocation, page 12; marked as low priority by BAC, yet funded
   c. Discussion warranty replacements

VII. Six-Year Plan Discussion
   a. Reiteration of timeline and personnel providing input into plan
   b. Reminder that items prioritizing items was required
   c. Budget had to include six-year plan items and could not include salary requests
   d. Raul suggested that in spring 2012, BAC analyze projected revenue streams for next few years
   e. Joe asked Paul to provide figures on % of funds for Admissions

VIII. Report to UFC
   a. Draft due to BAC by October 28, 2011, final copy to UFC by November 5, 2011
   b. Potential components:
      i. Review previous actions of BAC and actions taken by President Hurley based on BAC’s recommendations in 2010-2011
      ii. Guiding Principles of Committee including process recommendations
      iii. Timeline of Budgeting Process
   c. Joe will begin the draft and we will contribute electronically

IX. Will not meet again until potentially October 31, 2011

X. Adjournment at 9:00am
Minutes of the University Curriculum Committee  
University of Mary Washington  
16 November 2011

Present: Voting members:
- Gail Brooks (Accounting and Management Information Systems) – College of Business
- Beverly Epps (Foundation, Leadership, and Special Populations) – College of Education
- Mary Beth Mathews (Classics, Philosophy, and Religion), chair – University Faculty Council
- Gary Richards (English, Linguistics, and Communication), secretary – College of Arts and Sciences

Non-voting members:
- Susan Colbow – Associate Registrar for Information Technology
- John Morello – Associate Provost

Chair Mary Beth Mathews called the meeting to order at 3:02 p.m. in Trinkle 106B.

Minutes of the 21 October meeting had been circulated and approved electronically, and secretary Gary Richards had filed them with UFC. The corrected version is posted at http://ufc.umw.edu/committees/university-curriculum-committee/.

Old business:

From the College of Education:
- The committee approved a change in the prerequisites to and the catalog copy of EDCI 509: 
  Language and Literacy Development for fall 2012.
- The committee approved the new program Diverse Student Population and Instructional Design and Technology for fall 2012.

New business:

From the College of Arts and Sciences:
- The committee approved the new course ENGL 379: Fantasy for fall 2012.
- The committee approved a request to change the German Major by adding IDIS 350M: The Holocaust and Its Representations in Germany as an elective for fall 2012.

From the College of Business:
- The committee approved the new course BUAD 000: Research Experience for fall 2012.

From the College of Education:
• The committee approved with slight corrections the new course EDSE 511: *General and Special Education Goals and Practices: Middle and Secondary* for fall 2012.

• The committee approved the change to the Special Education Core Requirements for fall 2012.

• The committee approved the new course EDUC 390: *Survey of Special Education: Characteristics and Legal Issues* for fall 2012.

• The committee approved with slight corrections two new pathway programs, M.Ed. Initial Licensure Five Year Pathway: Special Education General Curriculum and M.Ed. Initial Licensure Five Year Pathway: Special Education: Adapted Curriculum, for fall 2012.

The committee discussed ways to streamline the curriculum approval process.

The committee will next meet Wednesday, 25 January 2012.

The meeting adjourned at 4:12 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Gary Richards
Report of the University Faculty Affairs Committee Meeting  
University of Mary Washington  
November 16, 2011

Present:
Alan Griffith (Biology) – College of Arts and Sciences  
Leslie Martin, secretary (Sociology and Anthropology) – College of Arts and Sciences  
Keith Mellinger, chair (Mathematics) – College of Arts and Sciences  
Patricia Orozco (Modern Foreign Languages) – College of Arts and Sciences  
Larry Penwell (Management and Marketing) – College of Business  
Venitta McCall (Foundation, Leadership and Special Populations) – College of Education

The meeting came to order at 4:00pm.

The committee discussed two issues communicated to Keith Mellinger by a CAS faculty member about the salary study and faculty development grant processes in the COB and COE. After consulting with the Provost, we learned that the salary study considered peer institutions for the COB, and not all were “aspirational” peers or AACSB accredited. In addition, after consulting with members of COB and COE we learned that all three colleges have similar processes in place to apply for Faculty Development funding, and these pots of money are distributed proportionally to the colleges, based on head count of faculty members. The UFAC determined that the concerns brought to us did not require any additional action by the committee at this time.

The committee reviewed the charge from the UFC to examine the evaluation instrument, the question of online evaluations, and the feasibility or desirability of diversifying the methods used to evaluate teaching. The committee took the following steps to begin addressing this charge:
1. Compiled a list of information desired from Taiwo Ande’s office about the online course evaluation pilot study.
2. Several committee members will investigate if other COPLAC schools use methods other than student course evaluations to evaluate teaching. Committee members will look into what methods are used and how they are implemented.

The committee will meet next on Jan 25, 2012 at 4pm in Trinkle 119.

The meeting adjourned at approximately 5:35pm.

Respectfully submitted,

Leslie Martin
Minutes of the University General Education Committee Oct. 28, 2011

The meeting was called to order at 4 PM and agendas were distributed.

In attendance: Dianne Baker, chair; Jim Gaines, sec.; Nora Kim, Rita Dunston, Carole Ann Creque, JoAnn Schrass

Minutes for the previous meeting were approved with the changes distributed by Prof. Baker.

It was announced that there would be no major discussion of assessment at this meeting, pending developments under way. A discussion is planned for the next meeting.

The proposal for General Education course approval for BUAD 259 in experiential learning was discussed and approved, with the amended provision that EL contracts be used until such time as the course is presented for automatic approval for all students.

A student’s request for re-evaluation transfer credit for Quantitative Reasoning equivalent to Computer Science 105 based on Virginia Western CC ITE 115 was discussed at length, but it was agreed by vote that the present request did not present proof of equivalency and thus could not be approved.

A student’s request for re-evaluation transfer credit for ALPP equivalent to an art process class from Montgomery County CC Art 111 was discussed at length and approved with one abstention.

Meeting was adjourned at 4:55 PM

Next Meeting will be on Nov. 18.

Respectfully submitted, Jim Gaines
Sabbaticals, Fellowships, and Faculty Awards Committee  
Meeting of 28 October, 2011  
Chair: Chris Foss  
Secretary: JeanAnn Dabb  
Members present: Dawn Bowen, Teresa Coffman, JeanAnn Dabb, Chris Foss, and John Morello  
(ex-officio) Member absent: Bob Greene

The meeting convened at 4:00 p.m. in Combs 322.

Deliberations began as John introduced the topic of sabbaticals and the evaluation process and criteria that were used for the 2010-2011 year. With input from committee members it was determined that a new listing of criteria should be posted on the Provost’s web page. One example is that the 16-point grading scale is no longer in effect and the Deans now give greater weight to the quality and magnitude of a proposed project. Faculty should be apprised of these criteria, particularly as Deans of the three colleges will make decisions prior to proposals being forwarded to this committee and the Provost. The committee recommended that the Provost’s page should also have a list of approved sabbaticals, and should also include a brief abstract of each topic.

Discussion then moved on to the Jepson Fellowships as committee members reviewed the history of the program, the intent of the program to function as a faculty retention initiative with emphasis on connecting scholarly activity to teaching. Committee members considered topics such as whether supplementary teaching materials would be required or optional as well as the possibility of changing the calendar for applications, but in the end determined that the current calendar was preferred. It was determined that the application process should move to electronic submissions so that next year, each candidate will submit only one hard copy for archival use and an electronic copy which can be distributed to Committee members. This may require some applicants to digitize some aspects of their applications materials but will be, in the long run, a more efficient method for distribution of materials.

The final topic of discussion was faculty awards. This year all nomination materials will be in electronic format as individuals (both faculty and students) respond to the Provost’s call for nominations (which will go out via email sometime in January.) The deadline for submission of nominations with supporting materials will be the Friday before Spring Break. The committee will deliberate and reach decisions about the nominations by 19 March. The committee next reviewed descriptions of the faculty awards.

As there would be no pressing business to require a meeting on 18 November, that meeting will be cancelled. The committee will next meet on 6 February to coordinate a schedule for discussion of faculty awards.

The meeting adjourned at 5:02.

submitted by JeanAnn Dabb
University Student Affairs and Campus Life Committee

Meeting Minutes

28 October 2011

Members Present: Mike McCarthy (chair), Suzanne Houff, Kim Kinsley, Shayda Rezazad and Dan Hubbard (secretary)

The meeting was called to order at 13h06 in the Fitness Room, and the minutes of the last meeting, as amended, were approved by those present.

The definition of the committee’s duties, as developed in the last meeting, is now before the University Faculty Council for deliberation. The committee awaits their decision before proceeding with a variety of activities.

One question facing the committee is whether there should be student representation on the UFC. Ms. Rezazad proposed student representation in a non-voting capacity, but as an informational source. Ms. Kinsley noted that most schools she had surveyed did not have voting student representation. In particular, she noted that at Christopher Newport University, students are permitted to present issues of interest, but are then required to withdraw from faculty deliberation. The phrase “a spot on the schedule” was discussed. Mr. McCarthy noted that the Bullet provides a voice for students and supported the idea of non-voting student representation with a designated place on the meeting schedule. He agreed to create a draft suggestion of this idea for the committee’s further deliberation.

The suggestion was made that the Bullet should regularly highlight service opportunities, and that this committee should provide a better conduit for the two-way flow of information between students and faculty.

Ms. Houff reiterated the importance of linking the Stafford Campus to student activities. One thought was to promote a “Battle of the Bands,” inviting Fredericksburg students to visit and use the Stafford Campus facilities.

The meeting adjourned at 14h10, with the next meeting scheduled for 18 November 2011 at 11h45 in the Underground.
Student Affairs and Campus Life Advisory Committee Report
November 28, 2011

Committee Members: Suzanne Houff, Dan Hubbard (secretary) Kimberly Kinsley, Mike McCarthy (chair) Patricia Reynolds, Shayda Rezadad, Doug Searcy (ex officio)

The Student Affairs and Campus Life Advisory Committee met monthly during this semester to review three items we were asked to provide: 1) a definition of duties for this new committee 2) a recommendation at the Dec. 6 UFC meeting as to whether students should have representation on the faculty council 3) a recommendation on how the Student Affairs committee might be restructured, or if it should even continue.

1) Definition of duties, provided Oct. 19 to the UFC.

.1 Work in an advisory fashion with the Vice President for Student Affairs and the Associate Vice President & Dean of Student Life on non-academic student priorities, including but not limited to, helping identify timely issues that may put our students in high-risk situations, promoting a positive community ethos across all UMW campuses, publicizing and supporting student-service opportunities, and otherwise helping develop those aspects of campus life, including new buildings, that could enhance students’ educational experience. The recommendations for priorities will be communicated to the President via the Vice President for Student Affairs and the Associate Vice President & Dean of Student Life.

.2 Communicate student-affairs and campus-life decisions to the faculty via the Senates, and faculty concerns and ideas back to the Vice President for Student Affairs and the Associate Vice President & Dean of Student Life. Faculty concerns and ideas will be communicated to the President via the Vice President for Student Affairs and the Associate Vice President & Dean of Student Life.

Rationale: This was arrived at after a meeting to solicit input from all of Doug Searcy’s department heads and a look at the duties of other faculty governance student-affairs committees. The language is modeled after the that of the UFC budget-advisory committee’s definition of duties.

2) Recommendation to appoint a non-voting student representative to the UFC.

While the Student Government Association and the Bullet, among other groups, offer important and visible outlets for students to air issues and concerns, we recommend the UFC appoint one non-voting student member to the UFC to bring matters directly before the faculty.
That representative should be allowed a regular, designated spot at or near the beginning of each UFC meeting to highlight student issues, as needed.

We recommend that the student representative's intended business for any given meeting, as a matter of courtesy, be presented in accordance with UFC standards of advance notice for meeting agendas. We further recommend that the SGA president automatically be the students’ representative on the UFC.

**Rationale:** Our research of several COPLAC schools, including UNC (Asheville) and the University of Science and Arts of Oklahoma, along with non-COPLAC schools, showed no examples of students’ being allowed to vote on governing bodies outside of student groups and “student life” type faculty committees. Nonetheless, their voice, if not their vote, would be an important contribution to deliberations around faculty governance.

3) **Recommendation to keep Student Affairs and Campus Life Advisory Committee intact**

After much discussion at our Nov. 18 meeting, we unanimously voted to recommend that the committee continue as a standing committee of the UFC, largely because this group can focus solely on issues affecting students outside the classroom and the curriculum.

**Rationale:** This committee can and should act as an important liaison between UMW’s student-affairs office and our students, whom we as faculty see uniquely in the classroom, during office hours, and in the clubs we advise. Additionally, two students serve on the committee.

We intend to study reports generated by administrative offices—whether residence life, security, wellness, community outreach—and meet regularly with their authors to gain greater insight into student and campus life. We will report our most important findings back to the UFC.

Too many things could fall through the cracks otherwise. A quick example: At our meeting with Doug Searcy’s staff, two Health Services nurses approached our committee’s Prof. Reynolds, from the College of Education, and told her they had seen student teachers with verified strep throats who told the nurses they were unable to take a “day off” from student teaching and must go to their assigned schools. Prof. Reynolds immediately went back to the faculty at her college to correct this: No, UMW does not want to send sick student teachers into classrooms. If the committee weren’t in place, Prof. Reynolds stated, she would never have known about this problem.
To: University Faculty Council

From: Honors Program Committee, Kelli Slunt, Director of the Honors Program

Date: 16 November 2011

The Honors Program Committee met on Monday November 14, 2012 and discussed the twelve proposals submitted for designation as an honors section of a course.

The committee recommends the following courses as topics for the recently approved HONR 100 course:

- Is Trying to be Happier as Futile as Trying to be Taller – Holly Schiffnin, Psychology
- Mad, Bad, and Evil Scientists – Leanna Giancarlo, Chemistry
- Sexuality in Southern Literature – Gary Richards, English, Linguistics, and Communication

The committee has also approved HIST 201 – First-Year Seminar in European History: Statesmen, Soldiers and Leadership in Wartime: Four Historical Case Studies – Porter Blakemore- as an honors section. As stated in the course catalog, HIST 201 fulfills the FSEM general education requirement and HIST 201 HN will fulfill the requirement that all honors students complete an honors first year seminar.

The Honors Program committee has submitted a proposal to the University General Education Committee and the First-Year Seminar committee to allow HONR 100 to fulfill the First Year Seminar General Education requirement.

The Honors Program committee has also approved the following courses/instructors for Honors Designation (HN):

- BIOL 125, Phage Hunters I – Lynn Lewis, Kathy Loesser-Casey
- BIOL 443, The Biology and Biochemistry of Proteins – Steve Gallik
- CPSC 110, Introduction to Computer Science – Ron Zacharski, Karen Anewalt, Stephen Davies, Jennifer Polack
- MATH 122, Calculus II – Randall Helmostutler, Leo Lee, Gary Collier, Larry Lehman
- MATH 200, Introduction to Statistics - Julius Esunge, Elizabeth Creath, Debra Hydorn
PSYC 100, General Psychology - Mindy Erchull

PSYC 339, Health Psychology - Mindy Erchull, Christine McBride

PSYC 350: Psychology of Women - Miriam Liss, Mindy Erchull
To: University Faculty Affairs Committee

From: University Faculty Council

Date: November 9, 2011

The Office of Institutional Analysis and Effectiveness has recently instituted a pilot study to assess the feasibility and effectiveness of implementing an on-line course evaluation system. The College of Arts and Sciences, through its Faculty Affairs Committee and Faculty Senate, has been engaging with Associate Provost Taiwo Ande to develop a faculty stance on this potential change to our delivery of course evaluations and have been debating the validity and efficacy of the university’s current course evaluation instrument. Because any change to our course evaluation policy may affect all faculty, however, the University Faculty Council (UFC) has concluded that this issue would be better addressed by the University Faculty Affairs Committee (UFAC).

Furthermore, the UFC is concerned about the current weight which course evaluations carry in the annual faculty evaluation process. A more diversified array of instruments may be warranted to evaluate faculty more thoroughly and with greater validity. Therefore, the UFC charges the UFAC with the following:

1) Comprehensively review our current evaluation instrument, advise the Office of Institutional Analysis and Effectiveness regarding which particular data (i.e. which independent variables) need to be gleaned from the ongoing pilot study to satisfactorily address faculty concerns about on-line course evaluation delivery, monitor the analysis of data collected from the pilot study, and recommend a course of action to the UFC.

2) Review current annual faculty evaluation policies, assess the role of course evaluations in this process, and recommend strategies for diversifying the sources used to evaluate faculty’s overall performance, with the aim of increasing the effectiveness and validity of annual evaluation.

Please let me know if you have any questions regarding these charges.

Andrew Dolby, UFC Chair
E-mailed memo from the UFAC to the Office of Institutional Analysis and Effectiveness:

The University Faculty Affairs Committee is in the process of looking into the course evaluation procedures. Part of that effort has us looking at the on-line evaluation process and trying to determine whether the faculty want to endorse this as a viable method. So, in regards to the on-line pilot study, we were hoping that you could provide us with the following information once the pilot is completed.

1. Overall completion rates (compared to paper evals) – how many students completed the evaluation. This will help address concerns that students will not complete the surveys if they are administered on-line.

2. Completion rates for qualitative portions of the evals (compared to paper, if possible). There was particular concern in UFAC about whether or not students will take the time to write comments in the on-line form. Data on the number of students giving non-quantitative data would be helpful to us.

3. Piggy-backing on 2., it would be great to know anything at all about the quality of the qualitative data. For instance, since the data is stored electronically, would it be possible to determine the number of responses consisting of more than just a few words? This would be very meaningful. I would appreciate your thoughts on this. While we would not be able to compare this data to the data from the paper version, it might provide some indication that students are taking the on-line forms seriously.

4. Median scores for individual questions in comparison to median scores from the paper forms. The concern here is that an on-line form might encourage students to run through the evaluation as quickly as possible, simply checking boxes without any regard to the questions, or that those completing online evaluations are only the “most motivated” – in both the positive and negative sense. If medians were at least close, we might be able to justify a rough equivalence to the paper method. Also, if frequency counts (or maybe a variance) per response could be made available, it would allow faculty to ascertain whether the hypothesized bipolar distribution (i.e. only those who really like or really dislike the class complete the evaluation) does, in fact, occur.

5. Finally, can you comment on any possibilities for how to administer on-line evals beyond the standard outside-the-classroom method? On one hand, faculty seem to be concerned about the evaluation process taking up valuable class time and this attitude seems to imply that evaluations are not important enough to take place during class. On the other hand, faculty seem to be arguing that the evaluations are so important that they cannot be completed outside of class in the on-line format. This seems contradictory to me. I wonder if we might suggest methods for students to complete on-line evaluations during class time. For instance, could they use their laptops, phones, or clickers, or some other means? I don’t know if these are reasonable options considering that the qualitative portion would require a keyboard (of course, these kids text faster than I type!). But I would appreciate any thoughts you have on this as well. Do you know of other universities using online evaluations in class? What strategies and resources do they use?

For each of these items, please let me know if you think it is possible to collect the data requested and/or give me whatever input you might have on the concern. Thanks very much for your help on this.
Student Affairs and Campus Life Advisory Committee’s Duties

.1 Work in an advisory fashion with the Vice President for Student Affairs and the Associate Vice President & Dean of Student Life on non-academic student priorities, including but not limited to, helping identify timely issues that may put our students in high-risk situations, promoting a positive community ethos across all UMW campuses, publicizing and supporting student-service opportunities, and otherwise helping develop those aspects of campus life, including new buildings, that could enhance students’ educational experience. The recommendations for priorities will be communicated to the President via the Vice President for Student Affairs and the Associate Vice President & Dean of Student Life.

.2 Communicate student-affairs and campus-life decisions to the faculty via the Senates, and faculty concerns and ideas back to the Vice President for Student Affairs and the Associate Vice President & Dean of Student Life. Faculty concerns and ideas will be communicated to the President via the Vice President for Student Affairs and the Associate Vice President & Dean of Student Life.
According to *Faculty Handbook* section 2.3.3 “The UFC has the authority to propose modifications to its membership and organization…; such changes must first be approved by the majority votes of the faculties of each college before being incorporated into the *Faculty Handbook*”. The University Faculty Council would like recommend the following change to section 2.3.4 for the Colleges’ consideration:

**From: 2.3.4 Membership and Organization of the UFC**  
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.

**To: 2.3.4 Membership and Organization of the UFC**  
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, the deans of all three colleges, and one student representative selected by the Student Government Association** will serve as nonvoting *ex-officio* members.

Rationale:

1) Inclusion of a student representative in our overarching university faculty governance body, in a nonvoting advisory capacity, would be consistent with our institutional mission, values, and ongoing tradition. The addition of a student representative would furthermore recognize the value placed upon student input by faculty as decisions of university import are being deliberated. Finally, the University Student Affairs and Campus Life Advisory Committee, in consultation with students and after extensive research on the practices of other institutions, recommends that the UFC add a nonvoting student to its membership. It is appropriate, therefore, that the UFC include a nonvoting student representative.

2) According to Robert’s *Rules of Order*, *ex-officio* members have voting privileges on committees unless otherwise specified. The current UFC *ex-officio* members do not have voting rights, as indicated by the UFC’s approved Rules of Order (*Faculty Handbook* Appendix L.2), but their nonvoting status is not specified in section 2.3.4, which provides the *Handbook*’s full description of the UFC’s membership and organization. *Faculty Handbook* section 2.3.4 should be revised to reflect the Rules of Order adopted by the UFC during the 2010-11 academic year and clarify the role of the UFC’s *ex-officio* members.
University Academic Affairs Committee Report to University Faculty Council (November 2011)

The University Academic Affairs Committee met on Friday, October 21st, and Wednesday, November 16th, 2011.

The committee continued our discussion on clarifying our policy for transfer credit for Cambridge A-level Examinations. The committee also examined our policy on taking prerequisite courses with the pass/fail option.

The final issue on our agendas was a proposal submitted to UFC and referred to our committee regarding allowing student-athletes to reschedule certain exams following conference championship tournaments. We ask the UFC to consider the following motion:

**Motion:** To add the following language to the Dictionary of Academic Regulations:

> “Student-athletes participating in conference championships during the Reading Days period shall be permitted to reschedule any final examinations scheduled for the Monday following the competition. Alternative dates will be set by consulting with the instructor or instructors and, if necessary, through consultation with a dean from the Office of Academic Services. It is the student's responsibility to make alternative arrangements for final examinations as early as possible.”

**Rationale:** UMW has what is considered to be a fairly “early” Academic Calendar, and our refusal to play on our Reading Days causes the Capital Athletic Conference (CAC) Spring Championships to be scheduled around the third week-end of April. Unfortunately that means these competitions, for some institutions, occur weeks prior to the end of their Academic Calendars, thus forcing them to schedule many dates of competitions after the CAC Championships. This becomes very problematic since these dates must be filled with non-conference opponents. Also, many of CAC members actually allow their student-athletes to not only participate on Reading Days, but also participate during their Exam Weeks. Therefore, late in the fall of 2010, the CAC membership, frustrated by UMW’s refusal to play on our Reading Days, voted to schedule Conference Championships on the same dates as our Reading Days and stated that, “if UMW refused to attend, UMW student-athletes would be denied the opportunity to compete for Spring Conference Championships.”

UMW coaches do not support forcing student-athletes to participate on our Reading Days, but they and the Student Athletic Advisory Committee (SAAC) asked that we consider allowing student-athletes to be able to reschedule any final exams on the Monday following the Championship competitions so that our student-athletes will not be prohibited from participating in the Conference Championships.

The UAAC supports the proposal from SAAC, noting that the decision before us simply relates to creating the possibility for student athletes to reschedule some exams under very specific circumstances. We observed that existing policies justify exam rescheduling in cases of religious holiday observance or in cases where students have more than 2 exams scheduled within 24 hours. We feel that the scope and impact of this proposed policy will be similarly limited.

Respectfully submitted,

Nicole Crowder, Chair of the University Academic Affairs Committee
RESOLUTION
SUPPORTING THE MORATORIUM
ON URANIUM MINING IN VIRGINIA

WHEREAS, in 1983, in response to proposals to mine uranium in the Commonwealth of Virginia, the General Assembly enacted a legislative moratorium on the mining of uranium in Virginia, which remains in effect today; and

WHEREAS, a company known as Virginia Uranium, Inc. has proposed to establish one of the largest uranium mining operations in North America in Pittsylvania County and has stated to its investors, that it will seek legislation to repeal the moratorium in the 2012 session of the General Assembly; and

Whereas, other localities in Virginia, including but not limited to the counties of Culpeper, Fauquier, Floyd, Madison, Orange and Patrick have all been identified as potential sites for additional uranium mining, thereby extending the potential effects of such mining far beyond Pittsylvania County, and

WHEREAS, the 1985 report of the Virginia Uranium Administrative Group is now over a quarter-century old and thus fails to address scientific, environmental, social and economic changes which have since occurred; and

WHEREAS, in 2010 the City of Virginia Beach commissioned a study which concluded that uranium mining could significantly impact water quality in Kerr Lake Reservoir and Lake Gaston resulting in radiation levels in the water 10-20 times above the Safe Drinking Water Act levels; and

WHEREAS, in 2011 the Kerr-Tar Regional Council of Governments, consisting of twenty-one localities in North Carolina, passed a resolution supporting the moratorium on uranium mining in Virginia and emphasizing the potentially hazardous effects of uranium mining upon the water supply of over one million residents of Virginia and North Carolina; and

WHEREAS, the 2011 National Academy of Sciences “Uranium Mining in Virginia” study, while not yet completed, will not address the criteria mandated by Chapter 3 of the 1983 Virginia Acts of Assembly, specifically section 45.1-285.6 of the Code of Virginia, as necessary for study before any consideration of a legislative framework allowing uranium mining may be competently conducted; and
WHEREAS, Virginia Uranium Inc has not disclosed the specific nature of its proposed mining, milling and tailings management, the safety of which thus cannot be addressed by the National Academy of Sciences Study, but which are nevertheless specifically mandated as criteria for study in section 45.1-285.6(E); and

WHEREAS, no study can adequately address the social and psychological effect upon prospective business, industry and population considering locating in proximity to uranium mining; and

WHEREAS, the social and psychological effect of uranium mining will be unquestionably negative, without regard to the assurances in any study of the safety of uranium mining, and will result in business, industry and population deciding to locate in areas other than those in proximity to uranium mining; and

WHEREAS, such decisions by prospective business, industry and residents will diminish, and potentially destroy, the economic development efforts of our entire region, and will sacrifice our economic future, including business recruitment, real estate values and retention of youth in our communities, with all the social stresses and ills attendant upon such economic decline, merely for the sake of the limited number of jobs directly created by uranium mining; and

WHEREAS, such destructive effects upon the efforts to improve the economy of this region will result in additional strain upon the financial resources of local, state and federal governments, through increased expenditures on social services programs, financial assistance, and subsidies, and will render the millions already spent in economic development ineffective; and

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, that ______________________________ supports the continuation of the moratorium on uranium mining in Virginia and believes that uranium mining in Virginia would be detrimental to the people and economy of Virginia as a whole.

_______________________________________
(Signature)

_______________________________________
(Printed Name, Title)