MINUTES
University Faculty Council
University of Mary Washington
March 13, 2012

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

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

Guests: Chief of Staff Martin Wilder, Associate Provost John Morello, University Librarian Rosemary Arneson, SACS Compliance Certification Director Timothy O’Donnell, University Academic Affairs Committee Chair Nicole Crowder, University Faculty Affairs Committee Chair Keith Mellinger, Student Government Association Academic Affairs Chair Meagan Holbrook

1. Call to Order. The meeting was called to order by the Chair at 4:03 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 February 7, 2012 (Attachment 1), so a formal reading of the minutes was dispensed with. Leigh Frackelton moved that the minutes be approved, and Dan Hubbard seconded. Stephen Davies suggested that the Provost’s announcement about student course evaluations being conducted online should be more prominent. He also pointed out that the pilot study has shown that the students’ written comments are not as long in the online format as in the handwritten format. The motion, with the suggested revisions, was approved unanimously by voice vote.

3. Reports. Due to the extensive agenda, Andrew Dolby asked that the President’s, Provost’s and Deans’ reports be kept short. There were no reports from the Provost, Deans or UFC Chair. Marty Wilder extended the President’s apologies for not being able to attend the meeting and made a couple of announcements. The Board of Visitors participated in a conference call with the Governor who asked that tuition increases be no greater than the increase in the consumer price index. He also pointed out that the recent realignment of administrative positions previously announced by email did not contain any additional administrative staff positions.

Dean Finkelstein announced that a new Master’s degree program in Geographic Information Science has been sent to the CAS Curriculum Committee, and is on track to be ready for admissions in Fall 2014. There is also a program in development for a Master’s degree in National Security Studies. He also announced that the University is collaborating with an environmental consulting firm and other local organizations to develop a regional climate plan.
4. Committee Reports. Andrew Dolby asked for a motion to accept the submitted reports from standing committees (Attachments 2-8; no reports were received from the Grievances and Appeals, the Faculty Organization, and the Sabbaticals, Fellowships and Faculty Awards Committees). Leigh Frackelton made the motion, Debra Schleef seconded, and it passed unanimously by a voice vote. Leigh Frackelton also made a motion to accept the reports submitted from the Other Advisory and Special Interest Committees (Attachments 9-13; no reports were received from the Distance and Blended Learning, First Year Seminar, Speaking Intensive, Teaching Center Advisory, and Honors Program Committees). The motion was seconded by Debra Schleef and passed unanimously by a voice vote.

5. Faculty Handbook Section 2 Revisions. The revisions to Section 2.3.4 of the Faculty Handbook, and the addition of the Honors Program Advisory Committee that the UFC had recommended at the February meeting had been forwarded to the Colleges for approval. Suzanne Sumner reported that they were approved by the College of Arts and Sciences, and Leigh Frackelton reported that they were approved by the College of Business. Jo Tyler reported that all revisions, except the proposal in Section 2.3.4.2 to extend the term of office of UFC members from two to three years, were approved by the College of Education.

In discussing the additional revisions to Section 2 of the Handbook that had been discussed at the February UFC meeting, Andrew Dolby reported that the Acting CIO Justin Webb had requested that the CIO be added as an ex-officio member of the Distance and Blended Learning Committee. Jo Tyler also pointed out that in the duties of the First Year Seminar, Speaking Intensive, and Writing Intensive Committees, the option for the chair to add to the committees’ duties should be deleted, since we have proposed that these committees become faculty advisory committees instead of administrative advisory committees.

In further discussion of the motion, Rosemary Arneson pointed out that the effect of doing away with the University Academic Resources Committee means that there is no committee that specifically gives the faculty a role in advising the UMW Libraries director. She recommended the creation of a Library Advisory Committee as a faculty committee (Attachment 14) and explained that as Director she feels that the faculty would provide better input than an administrative committee of members appointed by the Director. Andrew Dolby suggested that we include this recommendation as new business at a future UFC meeting. Megan Holbrook expressed support for the inclusion of a student as an ex-officio member of the proposed committee, and Mary Gendernalik-Cooper suggested that a graduate student also be included.

Jo Tyler made the motion to approve the changes in Section 2 of the Handbook, with the addition of the CIO as an ex-officio member of the Distance and Blended Learning Committee and with the deletion of the possibility for chairs of advisory committees to add to the duties of their committees. The motion was seconded by Debra Schleef and approved unanimously by a voice vote. The final version of the changes in Section 2 (Attachment 15) was forwarded to the Provost’s office for incorporation into the Handbook.

6. Academic Affairs Motions. Nicole Crowder, Chair of the University Academic Affairs Committee, introduced three motions relating to 1) course equivalencies for Cambridge A-level exams, 2) requirements for students enrolling in internship courses, and 3) the co-enrollment agreement with Germanna Community College (Attachment 16). She explained that the chart accompanying their motion about Cambridge A-level course equivalencies does not include...
foreign languages, but they are part of the UAAC motion. Mary Beth Mathews moved that the UAAC’s motion on Cambridge A-levels be approved, Leigh Frackelton seconded, and the motion passed unanimously by a voice vote.

In discussion of the internship motion, Jo Tyler asked if the requirement that students have a GPA of 2.0 for enrollment in an internship course would prohibit a college or department from requiring a higher GPA. Nicole Crowder explained that this is already covered in other parts of the policy that are not being changed by this motion. However, there was general agreement that the GPA requirement be worded as “a minimum UMW GPA of 2.0”. John Morello pointed out the importance of precisely wording what departments can do and suggested that the policy should be included in the Dictionary of Academic Regulations, and asked for wording as soon as possible. Dean Gendernalik-Cooper pointed out that if departments can set a higher GPA, then it should also appear in the departments’ policies. Stephen Davies made a motion to remove the 58 credit hour prerequisite for enrollment in internship courses, while retaining the requirement for 12 credits earned at UMW. This motion was seconded by Mary Beth Mathews and approved unanimously by a voice vote. Andrew Dolby suggested that the rest of the motion be returned to the UAAC for clarification of wording about the GPA requirement and suggestions for how and where the policy would be published.

In discussion of the motion on the co-enrollment agreement with Germanna Community College (Attachment 17), John Morello explained that it is long overdue and that we will probably make a similar agreement with Northern Virginia Community College next. In response to a question about what impact these co-enrollment agreements would have on course enrollment numbers, he explained that it would be self-limiting, since the community college students would be enrolled as non-degree students after the early registration period for degree students ends. He added that the overall impact on enrollments will not be known until the agreement has been in place for a while. The agreement is expected to be finalized in the Fall 2012, allowing course enrollments by Germanna students in Spring 2013. Stephen Davies moved that the motion be approved, Suzanne Sumner seconded, and it was approved unanimously by a voice vote.

7. Faculty Handbook Section 1.9 Revisions. A proposal for revising the section of the Handbook dealing with the role, evaluation, and replacement of department chairs was prepared by the Provost’s office with input from Deans and Department Chairs (Attachment 18). Leigh Frackelton made a motion for approval of these revisions, which was seconded by Dan Hubbard. Leigh Frackelton opened the discussion saying that he disagrees with the proposed procedure for replacing a department chair (section 1.9.4). He pointed out that the proposal prevents the faculty from having a say in the removal decision, yet chairs are originally appointed through a process that begins with nomination by the faculty. John Morello explained that until now there has been no policy for how to remove a chair for poor performance. There was a good deal of discussion comparing the process for selecting chairs, which was unchanged in the proposal, with the proposed process for removal. Several faculty suggested that the faculty should be involved in both processes. An additional point made was that the chair often acts as an intermediary between faculty and the dean, so it would not be in the interests of the faculty for the dean alone to initiate the termination process. It was also pointed out that in the rationale accompanying the proposal, reference is made to “the department chair’s performance” as the reason for removal, yet the proposed wording in the subsection about termination (1.9.4.4) did not mention “performance” or any other grounds upon which removal can take place. Another point made
was that a department chair who goes on sabbatical should have the option to continue as chair, yet this option was not included in the proposal.

During the discussion, John Morello adapted these concerns to handbook language for further revisions of section 1.9.4 while projecting them on the screen. Eventually, he had wording that found general consensus among UFC members. Leigh Frackelton amended his motion to incorporate the newly crafted wording for section 1.9.4 (Attachment 19), which was seconded by Debra Schleef and approved unanimously by voice vote.

8. **Faculty Handbook Section 7 Revisions.** The University Faculty Affairs Committee submitted a proposal to add procedures to the *Handbook* for appealing decisions of the college Promotion and Tenure Committees (Attachment 6). Procedures for such appeals are currently part of the Colleges’ Promotion and Tenure Appendices. The UFAC’s rationale for the proposal pointed out that the College of Arts and Sciences and the College of Business have the same procedure for appeals, while the College of Education’s tenure appeal process is different. The UFAC’s goal in making the proposal was to ensure that all colleges have the same appeal procedure. Jo Tyler moved that the proposal be tabled to allow more time to consider the broader implications that the proposal may have for college autonomy and to explore ideas for how University-level committees should exercise oversight.

Discussion of the UFAC proposal began with ideas from the three colleges for other changes they have considered in their promotion and tenure appendices. Keith Mellinger, Chair of the UFAC, suggested that these could be included in the appendices. Suzanne Sumner asked whether a proposal from a university level committee that changes the appendices of a college should be approved by the colleges before coming to the UFC. George Meadows mentioned that the newer, smaller colleges may need to have more flexible procedures, and suggested that the University-level policy should establish guidelines within which the colleges would develop their different specific procedures. Andrew Dolby pointed out that in its details the proposal contains changes that affect all three colleges’ policies. Several members expressed ideas about how to involve the colleges in approval of university-level proposals that impact the colleges’ policies.

In response to a question about whether the College of Education feels the proposal is unfair to them, Mary Gendernalik-Cooper explained that, regardless of the specifics of the proposal, the concern in the COE is with the process in which the proposal was developed without input from the college as a whole. She pointed out that the COE appendix was thoroughly reviewed last year by the special Oversight Committee and by the UFC to make sure it was parallel to policies of the other colleges. She added that the UFAC’s rationale implies that there was something unfair about the COE’s appeal process, but there has been no claim from any of the candidates that they were treated unfairly.

Mary Beth Matthews seconded the motion to table the discussion of the UFAC proposal and called the question. The motion to table failed on a voice vote.

Discussion continued with a focus on section 7.8.11 of the proposal about the procedure for appointing the tenure appeals committees. Currently the tenure appeals committee in the College of Education is appointed by the dean with one member selected by the candidate, while in the other colleges the dean, the Provost, and the college Faculty Affairs Committee, as well as the candidate, appoint members. There was general consensus that in order to ensure fairness to candidates making appeals, the appeals committees in all three colleges should consist of members appointed by a variety of participants in the appeals process, and not have a majority of
members appointed by the dean alone. It was pointed out that a claim of unfairness could result if
the committee, which submits its recommendation to the dean, has a majority of members
appointed by the dean.

Further discussion addressed the next steps needed in order for the COE appeal
committees to be appointed in the same manner as exists in the other colleges. Terry Kennedy
expressed a concern about having a vote on a proposal that affects only the COE but is not
supported by the COE representatives on the UFC. Leigh Frackelton agreed that we need to give
the COE a chance to make the changes we recommend. He made a motion to table discussion of
the UFAC proposal and ask the COE to change its appeal committee to make it consistent with
that of other colleges. John Morello explained that if language is changed in the appendices,
rather than in Section 7, it does not have to be approved by the Board of Visitors, allowing more
time for the colleges to review and revise their appendices. Stephen Davies seconded the motion,
stating that the issue of appeals committee membership is small compared to the bigger issue of
respect among the colleges. Andrew Dolby summarized the motion, stating that we will ask the
COE for revised wording of their appendix to make it consistent with the sections of the other
colleges’ appendices dealing with appeals committees, and we will vote on the COE language at
our next meeting before considering the proposal from the UFAC. The motion was approved by
a voice vote. Andrew Dolby subsequently sent COE Faculty President Norah Hooper an email
containing this request (Attachment 20).

Curriculum Committee had submitted a draft of guidelines and procedures to be followed when
proposing changes in courses or programs (Attachment 21). Jo Tyler pointed out that changes to
certificate programs are listed in the section on proposals requiring approval by SCHEV and also
in the section on proposals not requiring approval by SCHEV. John Morello said that this
inconsistency will be corrected. Further discussion focused on the issue of shared governance
between administration and faculty in the area of curriculum decisions. Leigh Frackelton
suggested that we need more collaboration rather than parallel processes. UCC Chair Mary Beth
Mathews explained that both the college and university curriculum committees include
administrators and that this proposal doesn’t change that. John Morello pointed out that the
proposal emphasizes consultation between faculty and administrators, particularly in relation to
program changes. He added that all changes will still be initiated by faculty, and when deans or
other administrators reject changes they must provide their justification in writing. Jo Tyler
asked about the provision to post the justifications on the UCC’s website. Mary Beth Mathews
stated that making them public would help in drafting subsequent curriculum proposals. Richard
Finkelstein stated that it does, however, make the process more cumbersome. Terry Kennedy
made a motion to approve the proposed guidelines with the correction about certificate programs
but without requiring justification for rejection of proposals to be posted online. She
recommended that we deal with the broader issue of “sunshine” later. Leigh Frackelton seconded
the motion, and it was approved by a voice vote.

The meeting adjourned at approximately 6:40 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

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

February 7, 2012

Members Present: Andrew Dolby (Chairperson), Stephen Davies, Leigh Frackelton, Dan Hubbard, 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 Business Dean Lynne Richardson, College of Education Dean Mary Gendernalik-Cooper

Members Absent: President Richard Hurley, George Meadows

Guests: Chief of Staff Martin Wilder, Associate Provost John Morello, Associate Provost of Enrollment Management and Student Services Fred Pierce, Budget Advisory Committee Chair Joe Romero, Faculty Affairs Committee Chair Keith Mellinger, 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 December 6, 2011 (Attachment 1), so a formal reading of the minutes was dispensed with. There were no corrections or additions. Terry Kennedy moved that the minutes be approved, Leigh Frackelton seconded, and the motion was approved unanimously by voice vote.

3. Reports. Due to the extensive agenda, Chair Andrew Dolby asked that the President’s, Provost’s and Deans’ reports be submitted in writing, but none were received. The Chair had provided his report in writing (Attachment 2), and there was no discussion.

4. University Standing Committee Reports. Reports were received from the following committees:
   a. University Budget Advisory Committee: The committee’s fall summary report (Attachment 3) was discussed. Suzanne Sumner asked if there were any discretionary funds available in the budget. Joe Romero explained that there were none and that in the UBAC meeting on February 6 they were asked to make recommendations for meeting a budget deficit of approximately $2.5 million. He would like guidance from the UFC about how to proceed with this. Jay Harper clarified that this is a potential deficit, and that while the committee’s charge is to recommend budgeting of available funds, they have now been asked to explore ideas for saving money. He emphasized that the administration is not necessarily looking for specific areas to make budget cuts. Joe Romero pointed out that although the committee has access to the entire University budget, they focus on just a small part of it, and they have not been asked to recommend budget cuts before this. Marty Wilder said that he thought the President was looking for a wide view and some new ideas, rather than recommendations for specific budget cuts. He
said that he would relay to the President the UBAC’s request for clarification of what kind of recommendations are being requested and how to proceed. Mary Beth Mathews made a motion that the BAC report be accepted, Terry Kennedy seconded, and the motion passed unanimously by a voice vote.

b. University Curriculum Committee: Mary Beth Mathews introduced the UCC’s January 25 report (Attachment 4), asking that it be amended to indicate deletion of the proposal from the College of Business regarding BUAD 310, as a revision is needed and the revision is not time sensitive. She added that the chairs of the colleges’ curriculum committees did a fantastic job of coordinating the very large number of curriculum changes that the UCC handled this semester. Debra Schleef moved that the amendment to the January 25 UCC report be accepted, Suzanne Sumner seconded, and the motion was approved unanimously by a voice vote. Mary Beth Mathews made a motion that the January 25 UCC report be accepted as amended, Stephen Davies seconded, and the motion was approved unanimously by a voice vote. Mary Beth Mathews moved that the January 31 UCC report (Attachment 5) be accepted, noting that it did not contain any curriculum changes. The motion was seconded by Dan Hubbard and was approved unanimously by a voice vote.

c. University Faculty Affairs Committee: Committee chair Keith Mellinger introduced the committee’s January 25 report (Attachment 5), explaining that they are exploring moving some policies from the Colleges’ Promotion and Tenure Appendices in the Faculty Handbook to section 7 of the Handbook to make them University-wide policies. Dean Gendernalik-Cooper asked which policies are being considered. Keith Mellinger explained that there are no specific proposals yet, but that some policies are being discussed, such as how candidates apply for tenure and what the contents of the portfolio should be. He explained that after their next meeting they would report further. Dean Gendernalik-Cooper reminded the committee that the colleges have vested interests in this area and to keep college autonomy in mind. Andrew Dolby asked if the appendices of individual colleges need to be approved. John Morello answered that the BOV approved the entire Handbook last year, but it does not need to approve changes the colleges make in their appendices. Keith Mellinger said that the UFAC will communicate with the chairs of the College Promotion and Tenure committees before making recommendations. Andrew Dolby emphasized that it will also be an open discussion in the UFC.

Andrew Dolby asked about the committee’s charge, given at the November 8, 2011, UFC meeting, to study the course evaluation process. Keith Mellinger explained that they are looking at what our peer institutions are doing, but will make those recommendations after the Handbook recommendations. Suzanne Sumner asked if they will be making a recommendation about whether to put course evaluations online. Stephen Davies pointed out that the study about online course evaluations conducted by the Office of Institutional Analysis and Effectiveness did not answer all the questions and he asked if additional information would be available for the faculty to make informed recommendations about how to proceed on this issue.

Jay Harper announced that as a result of the study, the administration has decided move to an online system in the fall, and he emphasized that the faculty should be looking at how to improve the questions on the course evaluation instrument. He also suggested that the faculty look at other sources of data to be used in faculty evaluations. Terry Kennedy pointed out the importance of including other sources of data and that this was in our charge to the UFAC. Stephen Davies pointed out that the data from the survey showed that the written comments in the online format were about half of what they were in the paper-and-pencil format, and that this
was a major concern to faculty. Dean Richardson explained that the Academic Affairs Council is looking for data about how to improve the number of student responses with the online format.

Mary Beth Mathews suggested that since the decision has been made to go ahead with online course evaluations, work needs to be done to assure faculty that this change will not have a detrimental effect on their annual evaluations and tenure candidacy. Dean Gendernalik-Cooper pointed out that the results of the study are quantitative and suggested that we need more qualitative data about the content of the evaluations. Andrew Dolby asked the committee to continue its work to make recommendations about course evaluations. Leigh Frackelton moved, and Mary Beth Mathews seconded, that the UFAC report be accepted, and the motion carried unanimously by a voice vote.

d. University Faculty Organization Committee: Leigh Frackelton moved that the UFOC report of October 21 (Attachment 7) be accepted, Debra Schleef seconded the motion, there was no discussion, and it was unanimously passed by a voice vote. Andrew Dolby noted that the UFOC’s November 16 report (Attachment 8) includes a motion about the Honor Program Committee which will be discussed later on the agenda. Jo Tyler moved that the November UFOC report be accepted, Leigh Frackelton seconded the motion and it was passed by a unanimous voice vote. Andrew Dolby noted that the UFOC’s January 25 report (Attachment 9) contained proposed handbook wording regarding preferential voting, and Jo Tyler suggested discussing that during the discussion of other handbook changes later in the meeting. Mary Beth Mathews moved that the January report of the UFOC be accepted, Terry Kennedy seconded, and the motion was passed by a unanimous voice vote.

5. Reports of the Other Advisory and Special Interest Committees. Andrew Dolby asked these reports to be accepted in one motion. The UFC received reports from the following committees: Freshman Seminar Committee (Attachment 10), Speaking Intensive Program Committee (Attachments 11 and 12), and Writing Intensive Program Committee (Attachment 13). Mary Beth Matthews moved that the reports be accepted, Lynne Richardson seconded the motion, and it passed unanimously by a voice vote.

6. Faculty Research Award. Discussion of establishing a faculty award for research had been tabled at the previous UFC meeting. Andrew Dolby asked for a motion to charge the Sabbaticals, Fellowships and Faculty Awards Committee to explore the possibility of creating such an award with the Office of Advancement and University Relations, and to make a recommendation to the UFC at our April 10 meeting. Jo Tyler made the motion, Mary Beth Mathews seconded it, and it passed unanimously by a voice vote.

7. College of Arts and Sciences revisions to Appendix F of the Faculty Handbook. Jo Tyler moved that the document (Attachment 14) be accepted, and Debra Schleef seconded the motion. There was no discussion, and the motion was passed by a unanimous voice vote.

8. Revisions to Section 2 of the Faculty Handbook. Andrew Dolby thanked John Morello and Jo Tyler for their extensive and careful work on this document (Attachment 15).

As required in section 2.3.3 of the Handbook, changes made to section 2.3.4 and its subsections must be approved by the colleges. The recommended changes in section 2.3.4 were approved at the November UFC meeting. Regarding changes in section 2.3.4.1, after some discussion about the pros and cons of limited terms of membership on the UFC, the vote by show
of hands was 3 for and 5 against recommending the change in section 2.3.4.1, with 1 abstention. Regarding the proposed change in section 2.3.4.2 to change the length of terms on the UFC from two to three years, the vote by show of hands was 4 to 4 with 1 abstention, and we decided to refer this issue to the colleges. There was general consensus in favor of the proposed revisions to sections 2.3.4.3 and 2.3.4.4. A report to the Colleges explaining the recommended changes to section 2.3.4 and its subsections will be issued as soon as possible so that their faculties can vote on them before the next UFC meeting.

The remaining revisions of section 2 of the Handbook, as described on the Summary (Attachment 15) were discussed in turn with general consensus in favor of the recommendations except as follows:

2.3.5.2 naming a Chair-elect as an officer of the UFC. The general consensus was not to make this change and to restore the original language about UFC officers;
2.4.3.4 regarding reporting from the University-level committees, the consensus was to restore language about providing opportunities for input from the colleges;
2.5.2.2 and 2.5.2.3 regarding preferential voting in at-large committee elections, the consensus was to revise as recommended by the UFOC (see Attachment 9);
2.6.4 regarding the requirement that the University Faculty Appeals and Grievance Committee meet at least once per year, the consensus was to require only that they report once a year;
2.6.5 regarding addition of a UFC representative on the UFOC, the consensus was not to make this revision; and
2.6.6 regarding membership categories on the General Education Committee, the consensus was to simply require that members be appointed who have background experience with general education, rather than listing specific general education goal areas.

A revised summary of changes to section 2 with revised Handbook wording will be prepared and sent to the Colleges so that their faculties may provide feedback to the UFC before our March meeting.

9. Formation of an Ad Hoc Committee on Employee Satisfaction. Andrew Dolby suggested that we request the University Faculty Affairs Committee and the Staff Advisory Council to form a committee to address the results of the Chronicle of Higher Education’s Great Universities to Work For survey. There was general consensus in favor of this recommendation.

The meeting adjourned at 7:10 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Jo Tyler, Secretary
University Academic Affairs Committee

Meeting Minutes

25 January 2012

Present: Nicole Crowder [chair], Zach Whalen [secretary], Xiaofeng Zhao, Jane Huffman, Fred Pierce, Meagan Holbrook, Joann Schrass, Rita Dunston, John Morello

Next Meeting: February 22, 2012

Call to Order at 4:00 PM

I. Approval of Minutes from 11/16/2011 Meeting

Minutes submitted with some revisions by Nicole. Unanimously approved as revised.

II. Old Business

A. Policy on course credit for Cambridge examinations

Information is nearing completion, with some questions remaining unanswered with regard exams in Classics, Physics, and Modern Languages. Regarding language exams for languages not currently offered at UMW (Portugese, Urdu, Afrikaans, Hindi, Marathi, Tamil, Telegu), credit and exemption may be available through channels already established with MDFL, but no credit will automatically apply to Cambridge Examinations in these languages.

Nicole will continue communicating with MDFL, CPR and Physics to clarify outstanding issues, and a motion regarding this issue will be communicated via email.

III. New Business

A. Motion from SGA to waive 58-hour restriction on eligibility for internships

The full text of the motion from SGA:

That the Academic and Faculty Affairs Committee (of student senate) work with the Faculty Senate and the Career Center to repeal the current 60 completed credit requirements that prohibits most freshmen and sophomores from completing internships for academic credit.

Discussion notes that this policy is in effect from Career Services point of view, but within the current framework, since all internships are in-major 499 courses, departments may have additional credit hour or GPA requirements determining eligibility. Fred notes that a broader concern here is the lack of an interdisciplinary or non-major internship, which is necessary for, among other reasons, satisfying the need for employers who often must require, in order to avoid legal liability, that internships be completed academic credit. A 58-hour limitation, in effect, closes that door
entirely for many students, not just those wishing to complete internships within their chosen fields and/or for Experiential Learning credit.

Other eligibility provisions like a 2.0 minimum UMW GPA provide the necessary oversight from our institution and clear the path for future developments like an university-level course designation for not-major internships.

After discussion, Jane makes the following motion:

*Students completing internships must have a UMW GPA of 2.0. Remove the 58-hour credit requirement, including the provision that 12 be credits earned at UMW.*

Nicole seconds. Unanimously approved.

B. Co-Enrollment Agreement with Germanna Community College

This agreement comes as a response to the legislature's charge that four-year institutions create co-enrollment agreements with area community colleges. The committee discusses details of this proposal including consequences for student GPA credits. Rita recognizes that some special designations for these credits will need to be created to reflect on unofficial transcripts, much like the current transferring grades appear as, e.g. "TA".

Nicole moves to approve the Co-Enrollment Agreement with Germanna as submitted. Jane seconds. Unanimously approved.

Meeting adjourned.
University of Mary Washington  
Budget Advisory Committee Minutes  
January 23, 2012  
Trinkle Hall – Room 243

I. Members Present: Joe Romero, Dana Hall, Tim O’Donnell, Jay Harper, Paul Messplay, Chavez Negrete, Danny Tweedy, Tamie Pratt-Fartro

II. Meeting called to order at 7:30 am

III. Review of Draft UFC Report (Attachment A)  
   a. Grammatical corrections to report  
   b. Motion made by Dana and seconded by Tim to approve UFC Report approved as amended

IV. Staff Advisory Committee Participation  
   a. Approved motion to include one staff representative from the Staff Advisory Committee on BAC  
   b. Discussion of voting/non-voting member from SAC  
   c. Drafted addendum to BAC Report:  
      Going Forward: Regarding the constitution of the committee, SAC has no formal representation in budgeting matters; therefore, BAC recommends that UFC takes under consideration exploring the representation of university-wide committees to determine which if any committees warrant the inclusion of a SAC representative and the voting status of that representative.

V. Updates on 2012-13 Budget Development  
   a. Report on Governor’s Budget (Attachment B)  
   b. Identification of Potential Budget Savings (Attachment C)  
      i. Raul suggested discussing revenue-generating programs as well as areas of savings  
      ii. $2.5 million in savings needed  
      iii. No budget requests from departments this year for BAC to review/rank as there are no additional funds to allocate  
      iv. VP Meetings: Need to discuss 1) analysis of unspent funds from past three years; 2) possible budget reduction areas; 3) planned and/or potential revenue streams

VI. Schedule of Future Committee Meetings  
   a. Jay to review E & G Budget on February 6, 2012

VII. Other Matters  
   a. Tim brought up discussion of early retirement plans to be discussed at a later date  
   b. Adjourned at 9:00am; Next meeting: February 6, 2012 at 8:00am
I. Meeting called to order by Joe Romero at 8:00am
II. Approval of minutes from 1-23-12 as amended; Motion made by Tim O’Donnell and seconded by Dana Hall
III. Discussion of Budget Review Process
   • President Hurley is seeking recommendations for areas that can be reduced on a permanent basis; approximately $2.5 million deficit
   • Rick Pearce suggested that we look at the budget as a whole and by larger categories to determine areas to reduce
     o Revenue-generating ideas currently under consideration:
       ▪ Using space more effectively, events, summer facility use, ESL program, grants, resident hall differential fee, tuition differential, lab fees, revenue sharing among the college
   • Discussion of establishing guiding principles for reviewing the budget:
     o Whom do we need to speak with and what do we need to ask those people?
     o Tim suggested that the strategic plan should drive decisions; benchmarking is important; consider looking at sister institutions for comparisons
     o Nabil suggested looking at the foreign language initiative with more emphasis on recruiting local high school students for summer and/or academic programs throughout the year
     o Joe suggested we need to speak with the VPs and Deans to inform BAC of budget decisions to better understand what is driving expenses and potential revenue streams
     o Rick suggested looking at large categories of budget to help generate conversations with invited guests
     o Paul suggested that we separate our discussions into categorization of recommended cuts in the short term and longer term revenue-generating possibilities
IV. Review of Budget Balances – Provost Harper
   • Insufficient amount of time to present information, but requested that BAC clarify questions/issues needing to be addressed to Deans and VPs so they could prepare
IV. Next Week:
   • Reviewing past budgets for comparison including:
     i. Redistribute Attachment C: Summary of Operating budget for past FY10, FY11, FY12
     ii. Budget versus actual for last year which includes balances for three years
   • Tim to suggest readings related to analyzing budgets
   • Next Meeting: Monday, 2-13-12 at 8:00am; Meeting adjourned at 9:30
Minutes of the University Curriculum Committee  
University of Mary Washington  
22 February 2012

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:

- Rita Dunston – Registrar
- John Morello – Associate Provost

Chair Mary Beth Mathews called the meeting to order at 3:08 p.m. in Trinkle 106B.

Minutes of the 25 January and 31 January meetings have been circulated and approved electronically, and secretary Gary Richards had filed them with UFC. These are posted at http://ufc.umw.edu/committees/university-curriculum-committee/.

New business:

From the College of Arts and Sciences:

- With the slight modification of changing the title of WGST 400 from Special Topics in Women’s and Gender Studies to Seminar in Women’s and Gender Studies, the Committee approved the proposals for two new courses, WGST 300: Special Topics in Women’s and Gender Studies and WGST 400: Seminar in Women’s and Gender Studies, for Fall 2013.
- The Committee approved the proposal to add a prerequisite to ENGL 314: The Literary Journal for Fall 2013.

From the College of Business:

- With the slight modification of changing any one upper-level business elective excluding BUAD 350, 353, 391, and 490A to “any three-credit upper-level business elective excluding BUAD 350, 353, 391, and 490A,” the committee approved the proposal for a minor in Business Administration for fall 2013.

From the College of Education:

- The Committee noted the correction to the proposal approved at the 25 January meeting addressing the prerequisite to EDCI 509: Language and Literacy Development.

The Committee discussed:
• the regulations concerning the conversion of special topics courses to regular courses.
• the role of major courses’ prerequisites outside the major and how those will function in determining GPAs for students seeking admission to the College of Business. The Committee charged the College to determine whether all five of the Business major “qualification courses” are to be taken for a grade.
• the proposed drafts of “Guidelines for Submitting Course and Curriculum Proposals to the University Curriculum Committee at the University of Mary Washington” and the roles and steps outlined there. The Committee suggested modifications and agreed that the revised guidelines should be distributed to the three faculty presidents, the UFC chair, and the Committee after revisions were incorporated.

The meeting adjourned at 4:22 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Gary Richards
Report from the University Faculty Affairs Committee  
University of Mary Washington  
February 22, 2012

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

Absent: Alan Griffith (Biology) – College of Arts and Sciences

The meeting came to order at 3:30pm in Trinkle 138.

The meeting was spent discussing issues related to the Promotion and Tenure policies and procedures outlined in the University Faculty Handbook. Section 2.6.4 of the Handbook charges UFAC with “ensuring that criteria and procedures for evaluation, promotion and tenure of each College (as approved by each College) adhere to the guidelines established in the University Faculty Handbook;” and to “Study and recommend changes in University-level promotion and tenure policies and procedures to the University Faculty Council.”

The committee reviewed university policies on tenure and promotion processes and drafted recommendations (below) to send to the UFC by the March 13 meeting.

**MOTION:** The UFAC moves that changes be made to Section 7 of the University Faculty Handbook as outlined on the attached document.

**Rationale:** After reviewing Section 7 of the University Faculty Handbook, the UFAC has decided that there is benefit in establishing a uniform process for promotion and tenure at the University. While there is good reason for the criteria for promotion and tenure to remain a college-level decision, there is also reason for every faculty member at the university to be guaranteed the same due process in their application for promotion and/or tenure.

Currently, the procedures for promotion are fairly uniform between colleges. The procedures for CAS and COB are virtually identical, while the procedure for COE simply refers the reader to the CAS procedure (See Section K.8.4). The only suggested change is that appeal committees be formed uniformly with one representative coming from the UFAC (with the restriction that this representative come from the appellant’s college). This allows for a single elected faculty committee to play a role in the appeal process, and acknowledges the UFAC’s role in providing university-level oversight in P&T matters.
The procedures between colleges for applying for tenure are also quite similar for COB and CAS. While COE’s process bears some similarities, it does vary in substantial ways at the appeal stage. Section 7.6.1 of our Handbook states that “Tenure creates a mutual obligation between the University and the individual faculty member.” As such, UFAC believes even more strongly that the procedures for applying for tenure should be at the university level.

To help guide the reader through the document:

The black type is what was there previously.
The red type was lifted from appendix I.
The blue type was added by UFAC
The green is just comments.

Respectfully submitted,

Leslie Martin, secretary
SECTION 7
PROMOTION AND TENURE PROCEDURES

NOTE: This section contains general guidelines, expectations, and deadlines procedures that apply to the promotion and tenure processes at the University. Each college has a separate its own additional tenure and promotion policy document containing additional information about tenure and promotion criteria and procedures. Each of these documents appears as an appendix in this Handbook; see the appendices I, J, and K. Applicants for promotion and/or tenure should be mindful of both the general requirements, expectations, and deadlines procedures as expressed in this section of the Handbook and the specific evaluative criteria, procedures, expectations, and other details that pertain to the promotion and tenure process as it is carried out in the faculty member’s college and as detailed in the relevant appendix.

no recommended changes to sections:
7.1 PROMOTION POLICY
7.2 GENERAL MINIMUM PROMOTION REQUIREMENTS
7.3 INDIVIDUAL CRITERIA FOR PROMOTION
7.4 INSTITUTIONAL RANK STRUCTURE POLICY

7.5 PROMOTION PROCEDURE

Each college has its own set of promotion procedures. For the College of Arts and Sciences promotion procedures, see Appendix I; for the College of Business promotion procedure, see Appendix J; and for the College of Education promotion procedure, see Appendix K.

.1 By May 1 of the spring semester preceding the academic year in which the minimum requirements for consideration for promotion will have been met, a request for promotion to the next higher professional rank may be initiated by the individual faculty member, or his or her department chair, by submitting such a request in writing to the appropriate department chair, who shall notify the appropriate college dean, who in turn will verify the length of service. When the length of service is verified, the dean will notify the Provost of the candidate’s intention.

In the case of department chairs, requests for promotion should be submitted directly to the college dean. In this instance, the dean shall appoint, in consultation with the chair, a member of the faculty (from the chair’s department whenever possible) who has tenure and the rank of full professor to act as his or her chair. The dean shall supply this appointee with the results of teaching evaluation materials and a copy of the chair’s Annual Performance Review (APR) for each of the preceding academic years since the candidate’s prior promotion. The appointee, after consultation with the other members of the department, shall prepare a written recommendation that promotion be granted or withheld from the chair and reasons for the specific recommendation.

.2 The faculty member being considered for promotion and/or his or her department chair shall solicit from institutional colleagues and all tenured members of the faculty member’s department
letters of recommendation as to whether or not promotion to the next higher rank should be
granted to the faculty member. These letters become part of the promotion credentials file and
should be received early enough to be included in the file before the August 31 deadline. The
tenured members of the respective department may elect to submit a letter of abstention.

.3 By August 26 (or subsequent business day), the chair (or the appointee of the college dean, in
the case of a chair seeking promotion) shall review his or her written recommendation regarding
promotion and the reasons for the recommendation with the faculty member. The faculty
member may submit a letter of exception to the dean by August 31. The chair shall submit the
candidate’s request for promotion, the chair’s recommendation and reasons for the
recommendation, and all letters submitted to the chair to the dean by August 31 for inclusion in
the promotion credentials file.

.4 By August 31 (or subsequent business day), the candidate shall submit to the college dean the
complete promotion credentials file (as described below). It is the candidate’s responsibility to
insure that the promotion credentials file is complete by this date.

.5 Each faculty member requesting promotion shall prepare a promotion credentials file. It shall
be the responsibility of the faculty member to submit all pertinent data he or she wishes to have
included in the file. For the remainder of the decision-making process, this file shall constitute
the exclusive official written record by the candidate for the promotion of the procedure. The file
must contain copies of all the faculty member’s APRs since the last promotion. The file also
contains a faculty data sheet providing information contained in the candidate’s state personnel
file (see §3.12.3) concerning the individual’s degrees and dates received, terms of service,
promotion record, and other personnel data as deemed appropriate: this faculty data sheet must
be reviewed by the candidate, countersigned by the candidate, and is inserted in the candidate’s
promotion credentials file. Additional material required for the promotion credentials files are
determined by the individual colleges. Candidates should consult the appropriate appendices of
this Handbook. The file shall include all communications and documents developed as part of
the process beginning with the initial letter requesting promotion. The file shall be accessible
only to the faculty member involved, the College P&T Committee, Promotion Appeal Advisory
Committee, the college dean, the Provost, the President, and the Board of Visitors. All persons
asked to write evaluations and/or recommendations should be informed by the requester that
these documents will be accessible to the faculty member. This file is due in the dean’s Office by
August 31.

.6 From August 31 until the file is conveyed to the College P&T Committee on September 7, the
candidate has the right to review all materials in the file and write a letter of exception or
explication to be included in the file. The candidate may not during this time remove materials
from the file or modify them in any way. The file shall not be accessible to the candidate from
the time that it is conveyed to the College P&T Committee until the promotion process and all
appeals are complete. No material received after the credentials file is transmitted to the College
P&T Committee will be included in the credentials file or used in the promotion consideration, to
assure that the same documentary record form the basis for recommendations on promotion at
each level of review. After the appeals are exhausted, the material supplied by the college dean
and the letters of recommendation (and of exception, if any) shall be inserted in the University
personnel file (see §3.12.4) maintained by the Office of the Provost; material submitted by the
faculty member shall be returned to him or her.

.7 On September 7, or subsequent business day if September 7 falls on the weekend, the
promotion credentials file is officially closed and the college dean shall transmit the faculty
member’s promotion credentials file to the College P&T Committee.

.8 The College P&T Committee shall carefully study each promotion credentials file and shall
formulate and submit by January 5 a recommendation to the college dean on whether promotion
should be granted or withheld, together with a written justification for each recommendation.
The number of faculty members recommended for promotion to each rank shall not exceed the
numbers in the guidance provided by the dean. The recommendations and justifications of the
committee shall be included in the appropriate credentials files and, ultimately, in the faculty
members’ University personnel file.

.9 Within one week (five working days), the college dean shall inform each faculty member
requesting promotion of the College P&T Committee’s recommendation, of the justifications for
the recommendation pertaining to him or her, and of the faculty member’s right to appeal.

.10 No later than January 17, (or the subsequent business day) faculty members requesting
promotion may appeal the recommendations of the College P&T Committee by submitting a
request for reconsideration and justification for such reconsideration on the basis of procedural
or substantive grounds to the college dean.

.11 In each instance when an appeal is requested, the college dean shall, within one working
week, establish a Promotion Appeal Advisory Committee (PAAC) that shall be composed of one
member of the CAS University Faculty Affairs Committee (UFAC), selected by the committee
from the candidate’s college; one member appointed by the college dean; one member appointed
by the Provost; and one member appointed by the appellant. The representative from the
University Faculty Affairs Committee may be an ex officio member of FAC. If no member of
the UFAC is eligible to serve on the PAAC, the committee will select an eligible faculty member
from the candidate’s college who, if possible, has previously served on the UFAC. No person on
the PAAC, other than the person selected by the appellant, should be a faculty member who has
written a letter of recommendation for the candidate’s promotion and/or tenure file. In the event
of multiple appeals within a college, the three members appointed respectively by the University
Faculty Affairs Committee, the dean, and the Provost shall serve on each appeal committee
within that college; the member selected by the appellant shall serve only on the committee
reviewing the appeal of his or her selector. All members serving on the PAAC shall be tenured
and have the rank of full professor.

.12 The PAAC, with access to all information available to the original College P&T Committee
for all applicants in the respective college to the rank sought by the appellant, shall reconsider
the recommendations of the original committee. In addition, the PAAC will have access to both
the letter of recommendation from the College P&T Committee as well as the applicant’s letter
of appeal. The PAAC shall report to the college dean within four weeks, either endorsing the
original report or presenting an alternative recommendation in writing. The college dean shall inform the appellant of the PAAC’s recommendation within two working days.

.13 The college dean shall review all information and recommendations contained in the promotion credentials file of each faculty member in his or her college, shall formulate and state in writing his or her recommendations, with reasons, and shall forward these and the promotion credentials files to the Provost by March 10. A copy of this letter will be sent to the faculty member and his or her department chair. When the college dean recommends that promotion be withheld, the recommendation letter from the dean shall inform the faculty member of his or her right to appeal the dean’s recommendation, in writing, within seven days to the Provost. (see §7.12.2.)

.14 The Provost shall review the recommendation letter from the college promotion and tenure committee along with the recommendation letter from the dean. The Provost shall formulate and state in writing his or her recommendation and shall submit this letter to the President by April 1. A copy of this letter shall be sent to the faculty member, his or her department chair, and the dean. When the Provost recommends that promotion be withheld, the recommendation letter from the Provost shall inform the faculty member of his or her right to appeal the Provost’s recommendation, in writing, within seven days to the President and the Board of Visitors. (see §7.12.3.)

.15 The Board of Visitors (or the Executive Committee thereof) in consultation with the President shall, no later than May 15, review all information of record, as well as any written appeals, and shall render a final decision in the matter and so notify each candidate, his or her department chair, the dean, and the Provost in writing. Action by the Board of Visitors (or the Executive Committee thereof) shall be final. (see §7.12.4.)

.16 All official notification of administrative action shall be by certified mail.

7.6 TENURE POLICY  no proposed changes

7.7 TENURE REQUIREMENTS  no proposed changes

7.8 TENURE PROCEDURE

.1 During the years preceding the sixth probationary year (or the year in which the tenure decision is made), the department chair will be a mentor to the tenure candidate. The tenure candidate will be apprised in writing of strengths and areas that need improvement as part of his or her performance evaluation. If the formative evaluation and assistance do not improve the level of performance of a candidate, he or she may be dismissed before the sixth probationary year (see §3.17).

.2 By May 1 of the spring semester preceding the final year of the probationary period, it is the responsibility of the individual faculty member desiring tenure to request in writing of his or her department chair that he or she be considered for tenure. (In the case of a department chair
seeking tenure as a faculty member, the dean, in consultation with the chair involved, shall appoint someone to act in the role of chair.) Should a faculty member not request tenure as specified, he or she will be notified in writing that the seventh year of service will be the terminal year of employment at the University unless the individual is offered and elects to accept a term contract without tenure.

.3 It is the department chair’s responsibility to solicit a written evaluation and recommendation for or against tenure or a written statement of abstention. These letters are to be delivered to the department chair from each tenured member of the department by August 22. At his or her discretion, the chair may solicit a maximum of five additional letters from faculty members inside or outside of the department. These letters become part of the promotion credentials file and should be received early enough to be included in the file before the August 31 deadline. When the department chair (or a substitute) requests recommendations on the matter of a candidate’s promotion or tenure, he or she will promptly provide the candidate with a list of those from whom letters have been requested. The department chair shall be responsible for transmitting these recommendations to the dean for inclusion in the tenure credentials file. If a faculty member, after being requested to submit a recommendation, declines or fails to present a written recommendation, the procedure for determining tenure shall proceed, and the fact that one or more recommendations are not obtained shall not void the process. The faculty member requesting tenure may solicit letters of recommendation from other faculty members inside or outside of his or her assigned department, and at the faculty member’s request such letters shall be included in the tenure credentials file. The faculty member requesting tenure also may include in the file such other documents and materials, including publications, as he or she may desire.

.4 By August 26, the chair (or the appointee of the dean, in the case of a chair seeking tenure as a faculty member) shall review his or her written recommendation(s) regarding tenure and the reasons for the recommendation with the faculty member. The faculty member may submit a letter of exception to the dean by August 31. The chair shall submit the candidate’s request for tenure, the chair’s recommendation and reasons for the recommendation, and all letters submitted to the chair to the dean by August 31 for inclusion in the tenure credentials file.

.5 Each faculty member requesting tenure shall prepare a tenure credentials file. (Persons applying simultaneously for promotion and tenure prepare only one file.) It shall be the responsibility of the faculty member to submit all pertinent data he or she wishes to have included in the file, and the file must include copies of the APRs for each of the preceding academic years of the faculty member’s probationary period (normally five years but sometimes fewer). The file also contains a faculty data sheet providing information contained in the candidate’s state personnel file (see §3.12.3) concerning the individual’s degrees and dates received, terms of service, promotion record, and other personnel data as deemed appropriate: this faculty data sheet must be reviewed by the candidate, countersigned by the candidate, and is inserted in the candidate’s tenure credentials file. For the remainder of the decision-making process, this file shall constitute the exclusive official written record of the procedure. The file shall include all communications and documents developed as part of the process beginning with the initial letter requesting promotion. The file shall be accessible only to the faculty member involved, the College P&T Committee, PAAC, the college dean, the Provost, the President, and the Board of Visitors. All persons asked to write evaluations and/or recommendations should be
informed by the requester that these documents will be accessible to the faculty member. This file is due in the dean’s Office by August 31.

.6 From August 31 until the file is made available to the College P&T Committee on September 7, the candidate has the right to review all materials in the file and to write a letter of exception or explication for inclusion in the file. The candidate may not during this time remove materials from the file or modify them in any way. The file shall not be accessible to the candidate from the time that it is made available to the College P&T Committee until the tenure process and all appeals are complete. No materials received after the file is transmitted to the College P&T Committee will be included in the file or used in the tenure consideration, to insure that the same documentary record forms the basis for tenure recommendations at each level of review. After the appeals are exhausted, any materials supplied by the dean, the letters of recommendation, and any letters of exception shall be inserted in the faculty member’s college personnel file (see §3.12.4); materials submitted by the faculty member shall be returned to him or her.

.7 On September 7 or the following subsequent business day if September 7 falls on the weekend, the dean shall transmit the faculty member’s tenure credentials file to the College P&T Committee.

.8 The College P&T Committee shall carefully study each tenure credentials file and shall formulate and submit a recommendation to the dean as to whether tenure should be awarded or withheld for each faculty member together with a written justification for each recommendation. The recommendations and justifications of the committee shall be included in the appropriate credentials files.

.9 Within one week (five working days), the college dean shall inform each faculty member requesting tenure of the College P&T Committee’s recommendation, of the justifications for the recommendation pertaining to him or her, and of the faculty member’s right to appeal.

.10 No later than January 17, faculty members requesting tenure may appeal the recommendations of the College P&T Committee by submitting a request for reconsideration and justification for such reconsideration on the basis of procedural or substantive grounds to the dean.

.11 In each instance when an appeal is requested, the college dean shall, within one working week, establish a Tenure Appeal Advisory Committee (TAAC) which shall be composed of one member of the University Faculty Affairs Committee selected by the committee, one member appointed by the college dean, one member appointed by the Provost, and one member appointed by the appellant. No person on the TAAC, other than the person selected by the appellant, should be a faculty member who has written a letter of recommendation for the candidate’s promotion and/or tenure file. In the event of multiple appeals, the three members appointed respectively by the UFAC, the dean, and the Provost shall serve on each appeal committee; the member selected by the appellant shall serve only on the committee reviewing the appeal of his selector. All members serving on the TAAC(s) shall be tenured. In the case that a candidate is appealing both a tenure and a promotion decision, only one appeal committee will be formed. This committee will act as the appeal committee for both tenure and promotion.
.12 The TAAC, with access to all information available to the original College P&T Committee, shall reconsider the recommendations of the original committee. In addition, the TAAC will have access to both the letter of recommendation from the College P&T Committee as well as the applicant’s letter of appeal. The TAAC shall report to the college dean within four working weeks, either endorsing the original report or else presenting an alternative recommendation in writing. The college dean shall inform the appellant of the TAAC’s recommendation within two working days.

.13 The college dean shall review all information and recommendations contained in the tenure credentials file of each faculty member; shall formulate and state in writing his or her recommendations, with reasons; and shall forward these and the tenure credentials files to the Provost by March 10. A copy of this letter will be sent to the faculty member and his or her department chair.

.14 When considering tenure decisions, the college dean must consider each application according to criteria expressed in the Faculty Handbook. The college dean must also consider carefully the rank and tenure profiles of the college and the university, projected enrollment patterns, staffing needs, current and projected mission of each department, the specific academic competence of the faculty member, and the preservation of opportunities for the infusion of new talent.

.15 When the college dean recommends that tenure be withheld, the recommendation letter from the dean shall inform the faculty member of his or her right to appeal the dean’s recommendation, in writing, within 7 days to the Provost. (see §7.12.2.)

.16 The Provost shall review the recommendation letter from the promotion and tenure committee along with the recommendation letter from the college dean. The Provost shall formulate and state in writing his or her recommendation and shall submit this letter to the President by April 1. A copy of this letter shall be sent to the faculty member, his or her department chair, and the dean. When the Provost recommends that tenure be withheld, the recommendation letter from the Provost shall inform the faculty member of his or her right to appeal the Provost’s recommendation, in writing, within 7 days to the President and the Board of Visitors. (see §7.12.3.)

.17 The President and the Board of Visitors (or the Executive Committee thereof), shall, within one month, review all information of record, as well as any written appeals and shall render a final decision in the matter and so notify the faculty member, his or her department chair, the dean, and the Provost in writing. Action by the Board of Visitors, or the Executive Committee thereof, shall be final. If tenure is denied, a one-year contract will be offered to the faculty member. The Board of Visitors may offer additional one-year contracts but such additional contracts carry no right to tenure. (see §7.12.4.)

.18 All official notification to the candidate of administrative action shall be by certified mail.

7.9 GENERAL PROMOTION AND TENURE CALENDAR  no proposed changes
7.10 CONTENTS OF THE PROMOTION AND TENURE FILE

Each candidate for promotion and/or tenure prepares a promotion and/or tenure credentials file. At a minimum, each such file must contain:

• a letter of application to chair/dean;
• personnel data sheet;
• *curriculum vitae*;
• all applicable Faculty Annual Activity Reports and Annual Performance Reviews; and
• letters of recommendation.

Each college has its own additional set of requirements for the preparation of the promotion and tenure credentials file. For the promotion and tenure file requirements followed by the College of Arts and Sciences, see Appendix I; for the requirements applying in the College of Business promotion, see Appendix J; and for the College of Education, see Appendix K. On September 7, or subsequent business day if September 7 falls on the weekend, the promotion and/or tenure credentials file is officially closed.

7.11 EXPECTATIONS FOR THE CONSTITUENTS IN THE PROMOTION AND TENURE PROCESS

Each college has expressed a set of expectations for each of the constituents in the promotion and tenure process. For the expectations expressed by the College of Arts and Sciences, see Appendix I; for the College of Business, see Appendix J; and for the College of Education, see Appendix K.

7.12 THE UNIVERSITY’S EXPECTATIONS FOR THE PROMOTION AND TENURE PROCESS

The University Faculty Affairs Committee (UFAC) is charged with oversight of the promotion and tenure criteria and processes used by all colleges at the University. The goal of this oversight process is to ensure that the promotion and tenure criteria and procedures as established by each college are clearly stated and in parallel with one another. Additionally, the UFAC is charged with ensuring that promotion and tenure criteria and procedures of each college adhere to the guidelines established in the *University Faculty Handbook*, and that any changes undergo an oversight review prior to implementation.

7.12 PROMOTION AND TENURE APPEALS

7.12.1 Appeal of the P & T Committee’s Recommendation When the College P&T Committee submits a recommendation to withhold promotion and/or tenure, the dean shall inform the faculty member of the P&T Committee’s recommendation, of the justifications for the recommendation, and of the faculty member’s right to appeal. Details regarding procedures for appealing the P & T Committee’s recommendation are contained in the relevant appendix outlining the college’s tenure and promotion policy and procedures. For the College of Arts and Sciences, see Appendix I; for the College of Business, see Appendix J; and for the College of
Education, see Appendix K.

7.12.2 Appeal of the Dean’s Recommendation The dean shall review all information and recommendations contained in the promotion and/or tenure credentials file of each faculty member, shall formulate and state in writing his or her recommendations, with reasons, and shall forward these and the promotion credentials files to the Provost. A copy of this letter will be sent to the faculty member and his or her department chair. When the dean recommends that promotion and/or tenure be withheld, the recommendation letter from the dean shall inform the faculty member of his or her right to appeal the dean’s recommendation, in writing, within seven days to the Provost.

7.12.3 Appeal of the Provost’s Recommendation The Provost shall review the recommendation letter from the P & T Committee along with the recommendation letter from the dean. The Provost shall formulate and state in writing his or her recommendation and shall submit this letter to the President. A copy of this letter shall be sent to the faculty member, his or her department chair, and the dean. When the Provost recommends that promotion and/or tenure be withheld, the recommendation letter from the Provost shall inform the faculty member of his or her right to appeal the Provost’s recommendation, in writing, within seven days to the President and the Board of Visitors.

7.12.4 Appeal of the President and Board of Visitors The Board of Visitors (or the Executive Committee thereof) in consultation with the President shall, no later than May 15, review all information of record, as well as any written appeals, and shall render a final decision in the matter and so notify each candidate, his or her department chair, the college dean, and the Provost in writing. Action by the Board of Visitors (or the Executive Committee thereof) shall be final.
Minutes of the Feb. 6, 2012 Meeting of the University General Education Committee

The meeting was called to order at 4:00 PM by the chair.

Present: Dianne Baker (chair), Jim Gaines (sec), Nora Kim, Carole Ann Creque, Rita Dunston, JoAnn Schrass, Susan Colbow

Minutes of the 11/18/11 meeting were discussed and approved.

**Old Business:**

BUAD 000 was reviewed for EL as planned, having originally been presented in fall semester as an optional EL component for BUAD 295. It was noted that students will co-register with BUAD 295 and that BUAD 000 will be offered starting in Fall 2012. The measure was approved unanimously.

**New Business:**

THEA 433, 434 and 435 were considered together in their application for approval in the ALPP category. Discussion centered on the level of the courses under consideration, their availability to non-Theatre majors, the question of pre-requisites and the pertinent precedents from other ALPP courses. It was moved, seconded, and unanimously approved that all three courses be given ALPP status.

Re-evaluation of transfer credit was done for the following cases: *(student names have been removed from minutes for this report)*

- Petition for HES —the case having been originally submitted in Fall 2011 and all subsequent information having been obtained, it was moved, seconded, and unanimously approved that HES credit be awarded for the course submitted, Psy 266 at Virginia Wesleyan.
- Petition for ALPP—the application for ALPP credit for Art History 150 at Michigan State University was approved.
- Petition for GI — the application for GI credit for Fin 248 taken at NVCC was unanimously approved.

The meeting was adjourned at 4:30 PM

The next meeting will be Feb. 24, 2012 in 313 Jepson
University Student Affairs and Campus Life Committee

Meeting Minutes

18 November 2011

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

The meeting was called to order at 11h57 in the Underground, and the minutes of the last meeting were approved by those present.

Discussion centered on whether there should be a “dedicated” committee for the purpose of issues dealt with by this committee, and whether and how administrators should be a part of such a committee. The problems of imbalance and overload for faculty from COE and COB were noted, as well as the lack of connections and “alignment” from the college to university committees. The importance of student support was highlighted, as well as the need for a liaison group between faculty and administrators. One suggestion was that regular administrative “guests” should visit the committee.

Consensus was reached that there needed to be a more “holistic” view of students than is now being received by the faculty, and that there is the “need for something” to provide regular reporting and to serve not only as a conduit of information disseminated to the faculty, but also as a way to dispel destructive rumors.

The meeting adjourned at 12h51, with the next meeting scheduled for 6 February 2012 at a time and place to be determined.
Report from the James Farmer Multicultural Center Advisory Committee
January 27, 2012
Members in Attendance: Julius Esunge (chair), Greta Franklin, Leanna Giancarlo, Connie Smith, Charlie Girard, Marjahm Goodman, and Marion Sanford

The committee met on Monday, January 27, 2012 at 4:00 p.m. Leanna Giancarlo read the minutes from the previous meeting on November 21, 2012. The group approved the minutes.

Marion Sanford, Director of the JFMC provided the committee with several updates.
- The director told the committee that there are currently about a dozen applicants for the mentor program, and the RISE program is aiming for 25 mentors for full implementation for the fall of 2012.
- The director announced that the University concluded campus interviews for the candidates for the Assistant Director of the James Farmer Multicultural Center and the goal is for the position to be filled in February.
- The director reminded the committee that the Brown Bag Lunch Series will resume on February 8th during the Black History Month Celebration.
- The director also informed the committee that the Islamic Cultural Banquet was a success and well-attended.
- The director talked to the committee about the James Farmer Essay Contest, and informed the committee that the contest is still in the planning stages. The director anticipates that this will not happen until at least next year.
- In regards to previous discussions about an alumni database for the JFMC, the center has an intern this semester who will be working on the Alumni Database.
- Julius Esunge asked the director about the Multicultural Leadership Council, and their next meeting is February 7th at 6pm. The MLC will be discussing the Peer Mentor Program, running tables at the Multicultural Fair, and selecting seniors for the JFMC Senior Recognition Program.
- It was shared that they (Res. Life) are creating a Social Justice Living/Learning Community in which Matt Johnson would play an integral role.

Greta Franklin provided an overview of the upcoming Black History Month events. The first event is Wednesday, February 1st at 7:00 p.m. in the Great Hall.

The advisory committee meeting ended at 4:40 p.m.

The next meeting of the JFMC Committee is scheduled for February 20th, 2012 at 4:00 p.m. in the JFMC.

Charles Girard
Report from the James Farmer Multicultural Center Advisory Committee
February 20, 2012
Members in Attendance: Julius Esunge (chair), Dave Baker (secretary) Leanna Giancarlo, Dianne Baker, Charlie Girard, and Marion Sanford

The Committee met on Monday, February 20, 2012 at 4:00 p.m. As the first order of business, the committee approved the minutes from the January 27, 2012 meeting. The meeting began with a report from Marion Sanford, JFMC Director.

- The director highlighted some of the major events that have taken place as part of Black History Month Celebration. One of the highlights of Black History Month was the keynote speaker, Angela Davis, Visiting Professor Lecturer, who spoke to approximately 600 students, staff, and citizens at Dodd Auditorium on February 15th.
- The director reminded the committee of several culminating events as part of Black History Month Celebration scheduled for the end of the February including: The Color of Sisterhood (February 22, Combs Hall), 22nd Annual Step Show and Competition (February 25, Dodd Auditorium) and a Film Discussion: Brother Outsider: The Life of Bayard Rustin (February 28, Chandler Hall).
- The director provided the committee with a brief summary of the scheduled events associated with the 2012 Women’s History Month Celebration, Women’s Education – Women’s Empowerment. This year’s celebration includes 16 events during the month of March.
- The director updated the committee on the status of the Mentoring Program. Since the January 27th meeting, the center has received additional mentor applications and is in the process of conducting interviews of each applicant. The center is tentatively planning to facilitate the mentor training at the end of March.
- The center continues to work on developing an alumni data base. Currently the center is utilizing the help of a student to consolidate the data base.

Julius Esunge reminded the committee members that decisions regarding the 2012-2013 JFMC Advisory Committee will need to be made within the next two months. Several questions were raised related to the structure of the committee, length of the terms for committee members, and the requirements for chairing the committee. Julius said he would find out the answers to these questions and report back to the full committee in March.

The advisory committee meeting ended at 4:45 p.m.

The next meeting of the JFMC Committee is scheduled for March 23, 2012 at 4:00 p.m.

David Baker
Secretary
Kwanzaa Celebration – December 5

- Kwanzaa is a weeklong celebration that takes place in the United States. It is observed from December 26 thru January 1. This year, the James Farmer Multicultural Center along with the Black Student Association, held Kwanzaa on December 5, 2011. The purpose of Kwanzaa is to educate and entertain the members of the University of Mary Washington community about the culture of Kwanzaa. During the Kwanzaa event, attendees are informed about Kwanzaa’s seven principles, libations, and Zawadi (gift giving). Kwanzaa allows for an opportunity to focus on the importance of family and community.

Like previous years, Kwanzaa is geared to all members of the UMW community. This year we had a good attendance by students, faculty, and administration as well as community members within Fredericksburg. Each year the faculty, staff, and administration are invited to serve as an Elder in the program in order to foster a more diverse community and emphasize the importance of Kwanzaa’s culture. Their presence is an essential part of the program because it symbolizes the significance of Kwanzaa. The Voices of Praise singing group and the Praise Dance Club both performed during the program.

Martin Luther King, Jr. Week Celebration – January 17 – 21

- In collaboration with the Office of the President, Office of the Special Assistant to the President for Diversity and Inclusion, Office of Community Service, and the MLK Planning Committee, the JFMC assisted in coordinating a series of programs to celebrate Dr. King. The campus and local community were invited to journey and reflect during this celebration on how Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr. has affected your life, your community, and your future. Programs during this week included: MLK Keynote Speaker featuring Dr. Marc Lamont Hill; Film and Discussion sponsored by Fredericksburg Alumnae Chapter of Alpha Phi Alpha Fraternity, Inc., and the MLK Campus-Wide Day of Service - a day-long coordination of community service projects and activities. Due to inclement weather that day, the number of scheduled projects was significantly reduced, which limited the opportunities for students to participate.
Black History Month Celebration – February 2012

- The successful implementation of the 2012 Black History Month Celebration involved the collaboration of the Planning Committee, the JFMC, BSA, and several other departments and student organizations on campus. In addition, a few of the programs involved local community organizations and agencies, such as the American Red Cross.

The theme for the month is “My Black is Beautiful: Footprints, Reflections, and Paths.” Each program was designed to reflect the theme in one aspect or another. The goal of the Black History Month Celebration was to honor, celebrate, and educate everyone about the contributions of African Americans to American history and culture. The month-long celebration included a social justice lunch discussion, film and discussion programs, social and entertaining events representative of the Black cultures, as well as two meals in Seacobeck Dining Hall highlighting cuisines of various Black cultures. A significant and exciting highlight of the month-long celebration is the James Farmer Visiting Professor Lecturer and Black History Month Keynote speaker, Dr. Angela Davis.

- Academic Collaborations
  - Co-sponsored with the Diversity Leadership Council on the Black History Month Kick-off Celebration, “Ewabo Caribbean Steel Drum Band,” on Wednesday, February 1, 2012 in Great Hall, Woodard Campus Center.
  - Co-sponsored with Dr. Matthew Johnson a film and discussion program featuring Mr. Andre Robert Lee. The film was a documentary entitled, Prep School Negro. This program took place on Wednesday, February 8, 2012 at 6:00 p.m. in Combs Hall, Room 139.
  - Joint venture with Dr. Doug Gately and the Music Department on “A Night of Jazz: Performance and Discussion,” on Thursday, February 9, 2012 at 8:00 p.m. in the Underground.
  - Co-sponsored with the James Farmer Visiting Professor Committee and the AT&T Student Leadership Colloquium on the James Farmer Visiting Professor Lecturer and Black History Month Keynote Speaker, Dr. Angela Davis, on Wednesday, February 15, 2012 at 7:00 p.m. in Dodd Auditorium.
University Academic Resources Advisory Committee

Meeting, February 24, 2012

The University Academic Resources Advisory Committee met and discussed the following:

1. Electronic books and electronic textbooks

   The UMW Libraries have a number of electronic book collections, but the Libraries have not licensed collections that can be downloaded to an e-book reader. The committee will look at the options available for such services.

2. Student attendance at university events

   The committee discussed how students might be encouraged to attend university events on campus. This will be a part of the First-Year Experience program being developed as the university’s Quality Enhancement Plan. The committee will be interested in seeing how participation is included in the FYE.

3. Evaluation of UMW Libraries

   Rosemary Arneson shared with the committee an evaluation she and the library staff completed. This evaluation used the ACRL Standards for Academic Libraries to compare the UMW Libraries against our COPLAC and aspirant peer groups.

The next meeting of the committee is scheduled for Monday, March 19.
WI Committee Meeting January 27, 2012

Attendance:
Brooke Di Lauro
Surupa Gupta
Gwendolyn Hale
Joe Nicholas
Mary Rigsby

The meeting began at 3:01pm.

- The committee discussed a proposal for new writing intensive guidelines. The underlying logic of the proposal is that almost all Writing Intensive courses at UMW require that students write more than the 12 pages that are required for WI designation. If we are requiring our students to write more, then that should get reflected in the Writing Intensive program description and requirements. A further basis for this is to see what peer institutions (COPLAC, SCHEV lists) are doing. Gwen provided information on some of their requirements. The committee decided to move on this issue only after viewing the completed lists from COPLAC schools and SCHEV schools. Gwen will work on completing those lists.

- The committee also discussed whether to add informal writing to the requirements for a Writing Intensive course. All agreed that including informal writing is a good idea.

- The committee discussed whether students need more writing in lower-level courses, such as FSEMs. In this context, it further discussed surveying faculty to assess how well faculty feel students are prepared to write. Schools can teach writing through the following programs: freshman writing, writing across curriculum (WAC) and writing within the discipline (WID). Many schools have all three of these. UMW has WAC and WID but it no longer requires freshman writing. Many students come to third year writing intensive courses without ever taking much writing in their first and second years. Does faculty view this as a problem, now that the current writing requirements have been in place for a few years?

- The committee also discussed a writing sequence independent of the English department. This could be a “writing within the discipline” course targeted to freshmen/sophomores. There was no agreement on this discussion.
• The committee considered topics for the Faculty Workshop this year. The faculty responded that they wanted incorporating informal writing to at least be one component of the workshop.

• The committee discussed the assessment process for the WI program. Some faculty suggested inserting sample essays into the final report that exemplified excellent, satisfactory, or poor writing. The committee, as a whole, agreed that this should be done. The committee would consider the question of the narrative after looking at the sample essays.

The next meeting will be February 20, 2012 at 4:00pm. The meeting adjourned at 4:30.
Library Advisory Committee

The role of the Library Advisory Committee is to offer advice to the University Librarian on issues of importance in the development of the Libraries’ resources, policies, and services by:

- Advising the University Librarian on the library resources and services needed to support UMW faculty and students in their teaching, research, and creative endeavors and on the allocation of funds available to provide these resources and services.

- Advising on general policies related to the quality/depth of collections, services, instruction program, and infrastructure, as well as on major new initiatives and assessment processes.

- Participating in strategic planning for the UMW Libraries.

- Considering broad national issues relating to academic libraries.

- Facilitating communication between the library administration and the academic community.

- Acting as advocates of the Libraries in university-wide decision-making groups.

Reports to UFC

Membership – representation from each college, as deemed appropriate by UFC

At least 1 student representative, appointed by student government

University Librarian, *ex officio*
Proposed Revisions to University Faculty Handbook, Section 2
As Approved by the University Faculty Council
March 13, 2012

2.1 THE GENERAL FACULTY [no changes recommended]

2.2 ROLE OF THE FACULTY IN UNIVERSITY GOVERNANCE [no changes recommended]

2.3 THE UNIVERSITY FACULTY COUNCIL

2.3.1 Purpose of the University Faculty Council (UFC) 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.

2.3.2 UFC Duties The duties of the University Faculty Council are to:

2.3.2.1 Serve as the policy-review body on University-level matters related to curriculum, faculty affairs and welfare, support services, and student affairs; discharge the responsibilities of the faculty in matters of university-wide concern, consistent with the authority of the faculty as stated in section 2.2.1.

2.3.2.2 Communicate regularly with all constituencies of the University Faculty in order to have a clear university-level perspective on issues of interest and significance to the University faculty.

2.3.2.3 Advise and communicate with the President, Provost, and Board of Visitors with regard to the interests of the University faculty and other matters of University-wide importance.

2.3.2.4 Monitor the development and approval of changes to the University Faculty Handbook, and work with the Office of the Provost to ensure that any changes are approved in accordance with the procedures set forth in section 1.12 and incorporated into the Faculty Handbook once all necessary approvals are obtained. Any changes to section 2.3.4 must be approved by majority
votes of the faculty governing bodies of each college through procedures determined by each college.

2.3.2.5 Provide oversight to ensure that the policies and actions of each College are in accordance with the University Faculty Handbook and consistent with University goals, values, and mission.

2.3.2.6 Oversee and monitor University-level committees and make suggestions for changes needed to discharge the duties of the University Faculty Council and to exercise the authority delegated to the faculty at the University level under section 2.2.1. The University-level committee structure is outlined in §§2.4 - 2.8.

2.3.2.7 Represent the faculty to the public at times when such representation is desirable and appropriate.

2.3.3 UFC Authority The UFC has the authority to propose modifications to its membership and organization as outlined in section 2.3.4; such changes must first be approved by majority votes of the faculty governing bodies of each college before being incorporated into the Faculty Handbook.

2.3.4 Membership and Organization of the UFC The UFC is 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 serve as nonvoting ex officio members.

2.3.4.1 Eligibility Election to the UFC is open to instructional faculty holding full-time appointments who have served at UMW for a minimum of three years at the time of election.

2.3.4.2 Terms of service Elected members of the UFC serve staggered two-year terms.

2.3.4.3 Elections University Faculty Council members representing each college are elected by procedures determined by the governing bodies of their respective colleges. Elections of at-large members are conducted by the University Faculty Organization Committee. Candidates for at-large members of the UFC are required to present a brief written statement, introducing themselves and describing their preparation for service on the UFC. These statements must be made available along with the ballot.

2.3.4.4 Temporary Replacements for Members of University Faculty Council Faculty members who are unable to serve part of a term on the University Faculty Council (due to such factors as academic leave or illness) must, in a timely manner, notify the Chair of the expected duration of their absence. Whenever practical, the replacement of a member will take place within 10 working days of notification of the member’s absence. Replacements for members representing the colleges will be selected by procedures determined by the governing bodies of the respective colleges. Election of replacements for at-large members will be conducted by the
University Faculty Organization Committee following the procedures in section 2.3.4.3. Upon their return, absentee faculty members complete their original term. Service as a temporary replacement member of the University Faculty Council does not limit a faculty member’s eligibility for election to a consecutive full term.

2.3.5 UFC Officers From among its membership, the UFC annually elects officers at an organizational meeting to be held within 30 days of elections. Whenever practical, the officers should represent different colleges of the University:

2.3.5.1 UFC Chair, Prepares the agenda for UFC meetings and presides over the meetings. The Chair also represents the faculty at meetings of the Board of Visitors.

2.3.5.2 UFC Secretary, Responsible for taking the minutes of each meeting, which are to be distributed to the University faculty after being approved by the UFC, and serving as Chair in the absence of the Chair.

2.3.5.3 The UFC Chair, Secretary and one member elected from the Council will represent the faculty in meetings with the President’s cabinet and with the Executive Committee of the Board of Visitors.

2.3.5.4 The UFC Chair, or his or her designee, will serve as one of the two UMW representatives to the Faculty Senate of Virginia. The UFC will appoint its other representative from among its elected members.

2.3.6 UFC Meetings Meetings of the UFC are held and conducted according to the rules of order in Appendix L of this Handbook. Meetings of record of the UFC are held at least once a month during the academic year according to a schedule prepared by the Provost’s office in collaboration with the UFC leadership and the presiding officers of the college governing bodies. This schedule will be announced by July 1 of each year. Special meetings of the UFC may be called by the Chair or by any three or more members of the UFC representing each of the three colleges. Any special meetings of record must be announced to all faculty. Attendance at UFC meetings is open to all members of the University community, and their participation is governed by the rules of order (see Appendix L).

2.4 UNIVERSITY FACULTY COMMITTEES

The University faculty committee structure is designed to provide for a coherent University-wide system of shared governance on matters delegated to the faculty (see §2.2.1), while also ensuring active input from the colleges and providing colleges the autonomy to develop as they see fit. In general, the University faculty committees handle matters of central import to the University’s academic mission and to general faculty and student welfare. The faculty committees established by the University Faculty Council consist of three types: standing, faculty advisory, and ad hoc. The University standing committees and faculty advisory committees report to the University Faculty Council and may be established or eliminated only by the UFC (see §2.3.2.6). Other University committees on which faculty may serve include administrative advisory committees,
boards, and councils (see sections 2.4.4-2.4.7). Service on University committees is a service obligation and provides the faculty member with an opportunity to shape University policy and participate directly in the shared governance of the University. No faculty member should be burdened with excessive committee responsibilities. Usually, two concurrent University committee assignments, one standing committee, and either one faculty advisory committee or one ad hoc committee, constitute the maximum University committee service expected of an individual faculty member.

2.4.1 Organization of University Standing Committees and Faculty Advisory Committees

University faculty committee members representing each college will be selected by procedures determined by the faculty of the respective colleges. The selection of at-large members is coordinated by the University Faculty Organization Committee. A faculty member may be not be appointed or elected as an at-large representative to more than one standing committee. As specified in their charges (§§2.6 and 2.8), these committees may include ex officio members and/or student members. Voting privileges do not extend to any ex officio members of these committees. Election or appointment of the at-large faculty members of these committees is scheduled by the UFOC as specified in sections 2.5 and 2.7. Each committee shall convene an organizational meeting, prior to the first scheduled UFC meeting of the academic year, at which a quorum of the newly constituted committee is present. The purpose of the organizational meeting is to elect officers for the following year. Each committee elects a chair and a secretary, and other officers as needed to carry out its duties and notifies the Chair of the University Faculty Organization Committee of the new officers. The chair must be a voting member of the committee. The secretary may be a voting member or an ex officio member. Ideally, chairs shall have served at least one year on the committee prior to election as chair. No member may serve as chair for more than two years during any single term of service.

2.4.2 Authority of University Standing and Faculty Advisory Committees

These committees have the authority to consider matters delegated to the faculty under section 2.2 of this Handbook and to carry out their duties as defined in sections 2.6 and 2.8. In most matters, these committees report to the UFC (see §2.4.3.4), and their actions become final upon approval by the UFC. When a committee’s charge so specifies, its decisions in carefully defined areas are binding unless overruled by specific action of the President, the UFC, or a decision in a meeting of the general faculty (see §2.1).

2.4.3 Meetings of University Standing and Faculty Advisory Committees

University faculty committees consider issues mandated by their written charges or in response to motions made at meetings of the UFC. Additional items of business for consideration at any meeting of these committees may be brought, in writing, to the appropriate committee chair by the UFC, the college governing bodies, related committees of the colleges, individual members of the UMW faculty, or administrators of related offices. The committee’s decisions in response to such items of business shall be communicated to the individual or body that initiated the item of business and recorded in the committee’s minutes. In carrying out their business, University committees should be mindful of the constraints imposed by the overall University governance structure and approval timelines. Because the main task of these committees is to advise the UFC, each such committee is obligated to deal promptly with issues referred to it by the UFC.
2.4.3.1 Meeting Schedules  University committees determine their own meeting schedules. Committee meetings should be coordinated with the UFC and the college faculty meeting schedule that is developed by the Provost’s office in collaboration the UFC leadership and the presiding officers of the college governing bodies. The schedule of UFC and college governing body meetings is announced by July 1 of each year. The committee chairs will announce the schedule for their meetings no later than August 30 each year. Each committee’s meeting schedule must be published and communicated to all faculty, preferably by posting of the meeting dates on the committee’s web page. Announcements of a committee’s meeting place and time must be communicated to all committee members no later than one week prior to the meeting date. Any changes from the established meeting schedule must be communicated at least one week in advance to all committee members, to the UFC chair, and to the presiding officers of the college governing bodies. Each University committee must conduct a meeting of record at least once during the academic year.

2.4.3.2 Special Meetings  Special meetings of record of the standing and faculty advisory committees may be called by their chairs or by any two voting members of the committee. Notice of special meetings of record should be issued to committee members, to the Chair of the UFC, and to the presiding officers of the college governing bodies at least one week in advance.

2.4.3.3 Rules of Order  In order to have consistency among the standing and faculty advisory committees, all such committees should follow consistent rules of order to the extent possible. The general rules of order should be as follows:

.1 The chair shall convene the meeting, and the secretary shall record the minutes.

.2 A simple majority of the voting members of the committee shall constitute a quorum.

.3 An agenda of items to be addressed at the meeting should be communicated to the members at least three days prior to the meeting.

.4 Attendance at committee meetings is to be open to all faculty, administrators, and students, except during required closed sessions. If a committee is required by any provision in this Handbook to meet in closed session, this will be reflected in the minutes of the meeting.

.5 Unless otherwise stated, Robert’s Rules of Order, as recently revised, should be used for the process of business.

2.4.3.4 Reporting  Actions and decisions of the standing and faculty advisory committees, including all motions passed by the committee, must be reported in writing to the Chair of the UFC for inclusion in the UFC agenda. Within 10 working days after a committee meets, it must submit a report or minutes containing the motions passed and summarizing any other actions taken and decisions rendered by the committee since its previous report to the UFC. All such documents must be posted on each committee’s respective page on the University Faculty Governance website by the required deadline in order to provide the University community and the college governing bodies the opportunity to submit advice and comments to the UFC. When appropriate, courtesy copies of any reports from the committees to University administrators
shall be sent to the Chair of the UFC. If so requested by the UFC chair, a committee’s chair shall also present an oral report to the UFC. Unless otherwise specified in section 2.6 or 2.8, no action by a committee may be implemented until it has been accepted at a UFC meeting. Actions of these committees stand subject to a call for review by any member of the UFC during the meeting at which they are announced. Prior to the end of each fiscal year (June 30), secretaries of these committees must deposit copies of committee minutes for the previous academic year in the University Archives.

2.4.3.5 Subcommittees  A standing committee or faculty advisory committee may form a subcommittee for a particular purpose if it cannot, for practical reasons, consider a matter under its normal purview as a full committee. If a committee forms a subcommittee, it shall record the subcommittee’s membership and duties in its minutes. The subcommittee must have, as voting members, at least two members of the committee that formed it. Additional members of the subcommittee are appointed by the committee that established it. The term of service for any additional subcommittee member ends when the specific issue before the subcommittee is resolved. The chair of the subcommittee must be a member of, and must be appointed by, the committee that formed it. The subcommittee reports directly to the committee that formed it.

2.4.4 University Ad Hoc Committees  Ad hoc committees of faculty are formed for specific purposes to deal with matters that do not fall under the purview of any standing committees or other advisory and special interest committees. The authority and responsibilities of ad hoc committees are defined by the action or ruling that established them. Such committees expire upon the fulfillment of their charge and may in no case continue beyond the second full academic year unless, by vote of the University Faculty Council, their charges are extended.

2.4.4.1 Formation of University Ad Hoc Committees  Ad hoc committees may be formed in one of two ways: (1) the UFC Chair rules that a duly-made and seconded motion in a University Faculty Council meeting must be referred to an ad hoc committee, because the subject matter of the motion does not come under the purview of any standing committee or other University advisory and special interest committee, or (2) the University Faculty Council passes a motion that includes the formation of an ad hoc committee in order to address a matter that does not fall under the purview of any standing committee or faculty advisory committee. A charge describing the membership, duties, and duration of an ad hoc committee must be determined by the UFC, or by the UFOC and communicated in writing to the UFC, before any new ad hoc committee conducts its first meeting. All University ad hoc committees report to the University Faculty Council, and the motion or ruling establishing a given ad hoc committee may also call for reporting to the President, the Provost, or another administrative officer of the University. The establishment motion or ruling may also specify the type of membership for the committee and the method of choosing its members. If the motion does not so specify, the University Faculty Council appoints committee members. The chair of an ad hoc committee must be a faculty member and be elected by the committee’s members. Minutes of ad hoc committees are taken by the committee secretary, who may be elected by the committee members or appointed by the committee chair. All current and future ad hoc committees’ charges, membership, officers, and terms must be reported to the UFC by using the Ad Hoc Committee form (see Appendix L) for posting on the University Faculty Governance website.
2.4.4.2 *Ad Hoc Committee Meetings*  
*Ad hoc* committees determine, and submit to the UFC, their meeting schedules as needed to carry out their charges.

2.4.5 *Administrative Advisory Committees*  
An *administrative* advisory committee is a group which advises an administrator or program director. *Such committees*, on which faculty may sit, are established by an administrator or program director in consultation with the UFOC. An *administrative* advisory committee also may be terminated by the appropriate administrator or program director.

2.4.5.1 *Authority of Administrative Advisory Committees*  
*Administrative* advisory committees do not have authority in any academic area; they merely advise an administrator or program director. The responsibilities of these committees are determined by the administrators or program directors who appoint them. *Administrative* advisory committees report to administrators or program directors, not to the University Faculty Council. The administrators or program directors report to the University Faculty Council when such a report is warranted.

2.4.5.2 *Faculty Participation on Administrative Advisory Committees*  
Faculty members are not required to sit on *administrative* advisory committees. Service on such committees does not affect a faculty member’s eligibility for appointment to a standing committee, but it may influence standing committee nominations and appointments in that no faculty member should be burdened with excessive committee responsibilities.

2.4.6 *Councils*  
A presidential council is a group which advises the President. Councils are established by the President and may be terminated by the President. The authority of a council does not duplicate or supersede that of faculty committees. Councils report to the President, not to the University Faculty Council.

2.4.7 *Boards*  
A board is a group which has specific authority in a non-academic area (e.g., Student Conduct Hearing Board).

2.5 *Organization of Standing University Faculty Committees*

2.5.1 *Appointment of Members to Standing Committees*  
Appointed faculty members of all standing committees serve staggered three-year terms beginning the fall after appointment and are not eligible for reappointment to the same committee for two academic years following a term of service. All appointments of faculty to University standing committees are coordinated by the University Faculty Organization Committee following the criteria for committee membership stated in section 2.6 of this *Handbook* and its subsections. The process of coordination should ensure that the requirements for staggered terms are met, as described above. The *at-large members* of standing committees, unless elected (see §2.5.2), are appointed by the University Faculty Organization Committee on or before its regularly scheduled meeting in April of each year. The appointed *members representing each college* shall be selected by procedures determined by the *governing bodies* of the respective colleges and according to a schedule provided in advance by the UFOC. In making its appointments for at-large positions,
the UFOC annually polls members of the faculty of each college to ascertain their preferences for possible appointment to standing committees. In addition to these expressed preferences and the membership requirements specified in section 2.6, the UFOC considers: balance among committee members of discipline, rank, gender, and length of service; time since previous committee service; current service on other committees; and any expertise or experience of the potential appointee that can serve the committee in carrying out its charge. All at-large appointments to the committees are announced to the faculty by the chair of the UFOC prior to the final day of classes in the Spring semester.

2.5.2 Election of Members to Standing Committees  Elected faculty members of all standing committees serve staggered three-year terms beginning the fall after election and are not eligible for reelection to the same committee for two academic years following a term of service. All elections of at-large members on University standing committees are coordinated by the University Faculty Organization Committee following the criteria for committee membership stated in section 2.6 of this Handbook and its subsections. The process of coordination should ensure that the requirements for staggered terms are met, as described above. The representatives from each college shall be selected by procedures determined by the faculty of each respective college and according to a schedule provided in advance by the UFOC. Nominations and elections of at-large representatives on University standing committees are coordinated by the University Faculty Organization Committee following its charge in section 2.6.6 and the criteria for committee membership stated in section 2.6 of this Handbook and its subsections.

Any member of the faculty who meets the stated criteria for membership may be nominated for an at-large position on a University standing committee, except for the limitations on membership stated in sections 2.4 and 2.4.1 above. The UFOC is responsible for scheduling nominations and elections for at-large committee membership so that results can be announced to the faculty by the chair of the UFOC prior to the final day of classes in the Spring semester.

2.5.2.1 Procedures for Selecting Nominees for Elected Committee Positions  During the spring term, the UFOC solicits nominations for the at-large committee seats to be filled by election. Nominated faculty must accept nomination before their names are placed on the ballot. Nominations run for five (5) business days. On the third business day of nominations, the UFOC sends out a preliminary sample ballot to the entire faculty indicating who has been nominated for each open position.

2.5.2.2 Procedures for Committee Elections  Once nominations close, the UFOC distributes ballots to all voting-eligible faculty. Faculty will have at least five business days after distribution to return their ballots to the UFOC. Elections will be conducted in a manner that assures anonymity. Ballots shall solicit rankings of candidates by voters, with lower numbers indicating greater preference. Ties shall be permitted on individual ballots.

2.5.2.3 Procedures for Determining Winners of Committee Elections  In order to be elected to an at-large position on a standing committee, a nominee must be the winner of a Condorcet method calculation. If more than one position on a committee is being filled in an election, those positions shall be filled in order of Condorcet ranking.

2.5.3 Temporary Replacements for Members of Standing Committees  If faculty members are unable to serve part of a term on a committee (due to such factors as academic or illness),
temporary replacements are elected or appointed for the duration of their absences. Replacements for committee members representing the colleges will be selected by procedures determined by the faculty governing bodies of the respective colleges. Replacements for at-large members are appointed or elected by the UFOC, which shall do so, whenever practical, in accordance with the principles and procedures in sections 2.5.1 or 2.5.2, respectively. Upon their return, absentee faculty members complete their original term. Service as a temporary replacement member of a standing committee shall not limit a faculty member’s eligibility for appointment or election on the same or another University faculty committee.

2.6 MEMBERSHIP AND DUTIES OF UNIVERSITY STANDING COMMITTEES

This section of the Handbook lists standing committees of the faculty of the University, outlines their membership, and describes their areas of responsibility.

2.6.1 University Academic Affairs Committee The committee consists of five faculty members: one representative from each college and two appointed from the faculty at-large. The committee also includes the following nonvoting ex officio members or their designees: the Provost and the Associate Provost for Enrollment Management. In addition, two students appointed by the President serve as nonvoting members. The committee’s duties are to:

.1 Evaluate academic policies, procedures, and standards on an ongoing basis, formulating recommendations as necessary to maintain policy consistency among colleges, fair and equitable treatment of all students, and the overall academic integrity of the University;

.2 Study and recommend actions concerning all matters of academic policy including, but not limited to, the policies governing academic standards, grading, course registration, transfer credit, and international academic affairs;

.3 Recommend changes in the academic policies to the University Faculty Council;

.4 Evaluate and recommend actions concerning all university academic services including, but not limited to, academic advising and retention programs, disabilities resources, and international student services;

.5 Review admissions practices of the University; and

.6 Perform other duties consistent with its charge as assigned by the University Faculty Council.

2.6.2 University Curriculum Committee The committee consists of the Chairs of the CAS, COB and COE Curriculum Committees or their designees and one member of the University Faculty Council. The committee also includes the following nonvoting ex officio members or their designees: the Provost and the Registrar. 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 University policies and procedures for curriculum development and implementation;

.3 Provide clear direction for the college-level curriculum committees as to which curricular actions require University-level oversight and which do not, so as to prevent course and/or program duplication;

.4 Review, approve, or reject curricular proposals and initiatives (including proposals for new degree programs and proposals to eliminate degree programs) from college governing bodies and from special committees constituted to work on specific curricular issues;

.5 Review, approve, or reject proposals for changes in the relationship between programs or departments (for example, dissolution, division, or mergers);

.6 Work with the Assistant Provost for Institutional Analysis and Effectiveness to ensure that curriculum changes take into account assessment findings;

.7 Communicate to the University community through appropriate means all curricular changes; and

.8 Perform other duties consistent with its charge as assigned by the University Faculty Council.

2.6.3 University Faculty Affairs Committee The committee consists of six full-time faculty members with a minimum of three years’ affiliation with the University at the commencement of service: one representative from each College and three elected from the faculty at-large. Members representing each college shall be tenured or tenure-track. One at-large member shall be from the renewable term or adjunct faculty ranks as described in sections 3.3 and 3.5 of this Handbook. The committee’s duties are to:

.1 Serve as the liaison between the Colleges and the University Faculty Council on matters relating to faculty affairs;

.2 Ensure that criteria and procedures for evaluation, promotion and tenure of each College (as approved by each College) adhere to the guidelines established in the University Faculty Handbook;

.3 Study and recommend changes in University-level promotion and tenure policies and procedures to the University Faculty Council;

.4 Study and recommend changes in University-level policy and procedures on faculty evaluation and merit pay to the University Faculty Council;
.5 Study and recommend to the University Faculty Council action concerning University-level policies on faculty welfare and formulate and present to the University Faculty Council recommendations concerning workload distribution, academic leave, compensation, and employee benefits; and

.6 Perform other duties consistent with its charge as assigned by the University Faculty Council.

2.6.4 University Faculty Appeals and Grievance Committee  The committee consists of five tenured members of the Faculty: one representative from each College and two elected from the faculty at-large. All members must have attained the rank of Associate Professor or above with tenure. Members may not simultaneously serve on the University Faculty Council or on the Faculty Affairs, the Budget Advisory, or the Sabbaticals, Fellowships and Faculty Awards committees. Members may simultaneously serve as department chairs or on College committees whose decisions might be appealed to this committee, but must recuse themselves in any case that might present a conflict of interest. This committee meets when it has an appeal or grievance to consider. At the end of each academic year, the committee prepares for the University Faculty Council an annual summary of actions taken that year and of procedural issues that need to be addressed. The committee’s duties are to:

.1 Hear faculty appeals, review evidence, and evaluate the procedures followed in cases of dismissal or termination prior to the end of term specified in the current contract or of a tenured appointment, including terminations for cause, financial exigency, or discontinuance of a program (see §4.2);

.2 Hear evidence regarding and make recommendations concerning faculty grievances as defined in section 5.8 of this Handbook. This committee will not hear grievances that are dealt with by their own specific policies and procedures, including an appeal process, as outlined elsewhere in the Handbook, even if such grievances satisfy the definition in section 5.8.1. These include: decisions regarding the awarding or withholding of tenure; actions awarding or withholding promotions; any action related to evaluation of performance or salary adjustment; and disciplinary action taken as a consequence of a determination of racial, sexual, or other forms of discriminatory actions or the creation of an intimidating, hostile or offensive work or study environment. (Also see §5.8.3 for what are considered non-grievable actions.)

.3 Hear evidence, consider procedures followed, and make recommendations in those cases where appeal to this committee has been specified in the Faculty Handbook (e.g. denial of requests for medical leave, leave without pay, etc.)

.4 Serve as the academic freedom committee in cases involving faculty members, as specified in Appendix C.2; and

.5 Perform other duties consistent with its charge as assigned by the University Faculty Council.

2.6.5 University Faculty Organization Committee  The committee consists of five faculty members: one representative from each college, and two elected from the faculty at-large. The committee’s duties are to:
 Coordinate elections of at-large members to University-level committees;

Oversee appointments to University-level committees. The committee shall ensure appropriate representation of each college;

Consult with administrators and program directors regarding formation of University-level standing, faculty advisory and ad hoc committees and make appropriate recommendations to the University Faculty Council;

Periodically review the University-level system of faculty governance and make recommendations to the University Faculty Council for revision as needed to ensure fairness and efficiency;

Periodically review the systems of faculty governance in each College to ensure that they function in accordance with section 2.9.2 of this Handbook;

Review and recommend for University Faculty Council action proposals for new faculty committees and for any changes in the University-level committee structure;

Monitor operation of a digital or electronic archive of all University-level committee reports; and

Perform other duties consistent with its charge as assigned by the University Faculty Council.

2.6.6 University General Education Committee  The committee consists of five faculty members appointed at-large. In addition to the criteria for committee member balance as outlined in section 2.5.1, the University Faculty Organization Committee also considers experience with the general education program as a factor when making appointments to this committee. The committee also includes the following nonvoting ex officio members or their designees: the Provost, the Associate Provost for Enrollment Management, and the Assistant Provost for Institutional Analysis and Effectiveness. The committee’s duties are to:

Maintain the philosophy, for all undergraduate degrees, of the general education curriculum as a fundamental component of a liberal arts education;

Establish procedures and criteria for the approval, deletion, and alteration of courses fulfilling the requirements of the general education curriculum;

Review and approve or reject proposals for courses to be designated general education courses, once those courses have been approved by the University Curriculum Committee;

Review and evaluate general education courses on a scheduled and on-going basis to ensure that courses continue to fulfill the relevant general education course criteria, making suggestions for course revisions or removal from the general education curriculum as appropriate;
.5 Review the adequacy of general education offerings and make recommendations regarding the adequacy of general education course supply in particular requirement areas;

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

.7 Perform other duties consistent with its charge as assigned by the University Faculty Council.

2.6.7 University Sabbaticals, Fellowships, and Faculty Awards Committee  The committee consists of five faculty members: one representative from each college and two elected from the faculty at-large. The committee also includes the Associate Provost for Academic Affairs as a nonvoting ex officio member. The committee’s duties are to:

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

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

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

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

.5 Perform other duties consistent with its charge as assigned by the University Faculty Council.

2.7 FACULTY ADVISORY COMMITTEES

2.7.1 General Duties of Faculty Advisory Committees  These committees report to and advise the University Faculty Council on specific areas of policy concerning relevant areas of the University’s curriculum or on other matters pertinent to the University’s mission. Additional responsibilities of these committees, including those for conducting meetings and reporting actions to the UFC, are explained in sections 2.4 through 2.4.3.5.

2.7.2 Appointments to Faculty Advisory Committees  Except as otherwise indicated in section 2.8, faculty members of these committees are appointed by the University Faculty Organization Committee from the faculty at-large with the condition that they represent a balanced range of disciplines and are active in the program or work of the committee.
2.7.3 Membership Terms on Faculty Advisory Committees  Members of all University faculty advisory committees serve staggered three-year terms beginning the fall after appointment and are not eligible for reappointment to the same faculty advisory committee for two academic years following such a term. Faculty may not serve on more than one faculty advisory committee concurrently.

2.7.4 Chairs of University Faculty Advisory Committees  Chairs of faculty advisory committees are elected at an annual organizational meeting following procedures in section 2.4.1.

2.7.5 Interruptions in a Term of Service  If a faculty member is unable to serve part of a term on a faculty advisory committee (due to such factors as academic leave or illness), a temporary replacement is appointed by the UFOC or by the college he or she represents on the committee. The committee chair must be notified of the replacement in a timely manner. This replacement serves for the duration of the faculty member’s absence. Upon return, an absentee faculty member completes the original term. Faculty members who are appointed as temporary replacements on faculty advisory committees are eligible for appointment to the same or another faculty advisory committee.

2.7.6 University Faculty Advisory Committees and Faculty Service  As with all faculty committees, membership on faculty advisory committees is regarded as an integral part of a faculty member’s professional responsibility to the University and counted as part of the faculty member’s service obligation.

2.8 MEMBERSHIP AND DUTIES OF FACULTY ADVISORY COMMITTEES

2.8.1 Budget Advisory Committee  The committee consists of seven faculty members: one representative from each college and four appointed from the faculty at-large by the Faculty Organization Committee. The committee’s duties are to:

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

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

.3 Communicate the committee’s recommendations to the UFC in a report no later than mid-March and the results of the President’s decisions to the UFC in a report as soon as possible;
In times of financial exigency, the Budget Advisory Committee assists the President, Provost, and Vice Presidents in developing principles and setting priorities for budget reductions; and

Perform other duties consistent with its charge as assigned by the University Faculty Council.

2.8.2 Distance and Blended Learning Committee  

The committee consists of five faculty members appointed as described in section 2.7.2. The committee also includes the following nonvoting ex officio members or their designees: the Chief Information Officer, the Vice President for Student Affairs, the University Librarian, the Director of Teaching and Learning Technology, and the Director of the Teaching Center. The committee’s duties are to:

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

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

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

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

5. Make information available regarding the procedures and deadlines for proposing courses to the appropriate standing committee; and

6. Perform other duties consistent with its charge as assigned by the University Faculty Council.

2.8.3 First Year Seminar Committee  

The committee consists of five faculty members appointed as described in section 2.7.2. The committee also includes, as a nonvoting ex officio member, a representative from the Office of the Provost (named by the Provost). The committee’s duties are to:

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

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

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

4. Make information available regarding the procedures and deadlines for proposing courses to the general education committee; and
Perform other duties consistent with its charge as assigned by the University Faculty Council.

2.8.4 Honors Program Committee The committee consists of five faculty members appointed as described in section 2.7.2 and the Director of the Honors Program. The committee chair is the faculty director of the Honors Program or one of the appointed faculty members of the committee. The committee’s duties are to:

.1 Study and recommend to the University Faculty Council procedures and criteria for approval, deletion, and alteration of course offerings meeting the Honors Program requirement;

.2 Review and approve or reject proposals from the various departments for courses to be designated as Honors courses;

.3 Approve exceptions to the Honors Program curriculum including the contract-based honors courses;

.4 Develop and maintain a list of approved co-curricular and service opportunities for students participating in the Honors program;

.5 Review at its discretion the frequency of offering and general relevance of Honors Program courses and make recommendations for changes as appropriate;

.6 Make information available regarding the procedure and deadlines for proposing courses to the Honors Program Committee; and

.7 Perform other duties consistent with its charge as assigned by the University Faculty Council.

2.8.5 James Farmer Multicultural Center Advisory Committee The committee consists of five faculty members appointed as described in section 2.7.2. The committee also includes, as a nonvoting ex officio member, the Director of the James Farmer Multicultural Center. In addition, two students appointed by the President serve as nonvoting members. The committee’s duties are to:

.1 Work in an advisory fashion with the Director and staff of the Multicultural Center on planning and setting priorities;

.2 Work in an advisory fashion with the Director and staff of the Multicultural Center to enhance opportunities for multicultural learning through student programming;

.3 Work in an advisory fashion with the Director and staff of the Multicultural Center on leadership development opportunities for all students, including historically underrepresented students;
.4 Facilitate communication and coordination between faculty and the Multicultural Center toward enhancing the intersection of coursework, student programming, and community involvement;

.5 Communicate Multicultural Center programming and policy decisions to faculty via the UFC, and faculty concerns and ideas back to the Director of the Multicultural Center. Faculty concerns and ideas will be communicated to the Vice President for Student Affairs via the Director of the Multicultural Center; and

.6 Perform other duties consistent with its charge as assigned by the University Faculty Council.

2.8.6 Speaking Intensive Committee  The committee consists of five faculty members appointed as described in section 2.7.2 and the Director of the Speaking Intensive Program. The committee also includes, as a nonvoting *ex officio* member, the Director of the Speaking Center. The committee chair is the faculty director of the Speaking Intensive Program or one of the appointed faculty members of the committee. The committee’s duties are to:

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

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

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

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

.5 Perform other duties consistent with its charge as assigned by the University Faculty Council.

2.8.7 Student Affairs and Campus Life Advisory Committee  The committee consists of five faculty members appointed as described in section 2.7.2. The committee also includes, as a nonvoting *ex officio* member, the Vice President for Student Affairs (or his or her designee) and two nonvoting student members appointed by the President to represent the Fredericksburg and Stafford Campuses, respectively. The committee’s duties are to:

.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 experiences;
.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; and

.3 Perform other duties consistent with its charge as assigned by the University Faculty Council.

2.8.8 Teaching Center Advisory Committee  The committee consists of five faculty members appointed as described in section 2.7.2. The committee also includes the following nonvoting ex officio members or their designees: the University Librarian, the Director of the Teaching Center, and the Director of Teaching and Learning Technology. The committee’s duties are to:

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

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

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

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

.5 Perform other duties consistent with its charge as assigned by the University Faculty Council.

2.8.9 Writing Intensive Committee  The committee consists of five faculty members appointed as described in section 2.7.2. The committee also includes the Director of the Writing Center as a nonvoting ex officio member. The committee’s duties are to:

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

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

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

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

.5 Perform other duties consistent with its charge as assigned by the University Faculty Council.

2.9 COLLEGE GOVERNANCE
2.9.3 Meeting Schedule for College Governing Bodies  The meeting schedule for college faculty governing bodies is developed each year by the Provost’s office in collaboration the UFC leadership and the presiding officers of the college governing bodies. This schedule will be announced by July 1 of each year. Any changes from the established meeting schedule must be communicated at least one week in advance to all of the college’s faculty members, to the UFC chair, and to the Presidents of the other college governing bodies.
The University Academic Affairs Committee met on Wednesday, January 25th, 2012 and conducted some business via email.

The committee continued our discussion on clarifying our policy for transfer credit for Cambridge A-level Examinations. We ask that UFC consider the following motion:

**Motion:** To specify the following course equivalencies for credit based on Cambridge A-Level Examinations:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cambridge Exam</th>
<th>Acceptable Scores</th>
<th>Course Credit Hours</th>
<th>Course Credit</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Accounting</td>
<td>A, B</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>BUAD 131 and BUAD 132</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Art and Design</td>
<td>A, B, C</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>depends on area of specialization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biology</td>
<td>A, B</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>BIOL 121 and BIOL 122</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>C</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>BIOL Not Major</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business Studies</td>
<td>A, B</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>BUAD 105</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chemistry</td>
<td>A, B</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>CHEM 111 and CHEM 112</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>C</td>
<td>4 or 7</td>
<td>CHEM 111 or CHEM 105/107, with departmental permission</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Computing</td>
<td>A, B</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>COMP 110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Design and Textiles</td>
<td>A, B</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>THEA 242 and THEA Not Major</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economics</td>
<td>A, B</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>ECON 201 and ECON 202</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English - Literature</td>
<td>A, B</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>ENGL 381 and ENGL 382</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental Management</td>
<td>A, B</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>GEOL 221</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geography</td>
<td>A, B, C</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>GEOG 102, GEOG 110, GEOG 111</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Global Perspectives</td>
<td>A, B</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>PSCI 102</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>History</td>
<td>A, B</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>HIST Not Major</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marine Science</td>
<td>A, B</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>EESC/GEO 210</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mathematics</td>
<td>A, B</td>
<td>6 or 9</td>
<td>MATH 121 and Math 122, MATH 200 awarded if S1 and S2 tests completed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mathematics - Further</td>
<td>A, B</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>MATH 200-level elective credits</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychology</td>
<td>A, B</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>PSYC 100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sociology</td>
<td>A, B</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>SOC 105</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Rationale:** The Code of Virginia (23-9.2:3.8) has been amended to include Cambridge Advanced level examinations as given below:

23-9.2:3.8 requires institutional governing boards to implement policies that “grant undergraduate course credit to entering freshman students who have successfully taken one or more International Baccalaureate (IB), Advanced Placement (AP, or Cambridge Advanced (A/AS) examinations” (emphasis added to indicate change). With regard to the addition of the Cambridge exams, institutional policies shall satisfy the following requirements:

- Each institution shall outline the condition necessary to grant IB, AP, or A/AS credit, including minimum required scores on examinations for courses.
• Policies for granting credit for standard and higher level IB or A/AS examinations shall be comparable to those for AP examinations.
• Governing boards shall report adopted policies to the State Council of Higher Education and publicize such policies on the institution’s website.

The table given as part of the motion above is the result of a review process conducted by the committee with consultation from the respective departments as to course equivalencies and acceptable scores.

We also discussed a motion submitted from the SGA regarding the number of credit hours required for a student to complete an internship. We ask the UFC to consider the following motion:

**Motion:** Students completing internships must have a UMW GPA of 2.0. Remove the 58-hour credit requirement, including the provision that 12 be credits earned at UMW.

**Rationale:** This motion is in response to students’ interests in completing internships earlier in their academic careers. In addition, some internship-granting institutions require, for liability reasons, that students complete the internship for credit. As to the intent behind the credit hour limit, to ensure that students are prepared to successfully complete the internship and represent UMW off-campus, there are GPA requirements in place and students will still have to receive approval from a faculty sponsor in order to participate in the internship experience.

The final issue on our agenda was a proposal submitted from the Provost’s Office for a Co-Enrollment Agreement with Germanna Community College. The pertinent files, including the Co-Enrollment Agreement itself, are included as separate documents. We ask the UFC to consider the following motion:

**Motion:** To accept the Co-Enrollment Agreement with Germanna Community College as submitted.

**Rationale:** As part of Virginia's Higher Education Restructuring Act, four-year institutions have been charged with creating "co enrollment" agreements with community colleges. This agreement is modeled on one used by the College of William & Mary with six VCCS schools. The basic idea is that a Germanna Community College (GCC) student, once accepted into co-enrollment, could take 5 classes at UMW while the student was also enrolled in GCC. The UMW courses would transfer back to GCC and be part of the student's completion of an associate's degree. The administration at both institutions are in support of the proposal.

Respectfully submitted,

Nicole Crowder, Chair of the University Academic Affairs Committee
Germanna Community College
Co-Enrollment Agreement
Student Letter of Intent

Name: ___________________________________________ GCC Student ID ________________

Address: ________________________________________________________________

City: __________________________________ State: ________________ Zip: _________________

Date of Birth ___________________ GCC Email _______________________________________

mm/dd/yy Phone (Home) __________________ Phone (Work or Cell) _______________________

Upon completion of the degree at GCC, if I have met the requirements for admission outlined in this articulation agreement (below), I intend to enter UMW in the ____ fall ____ spring semester of ________ (year) to pursue a major in _________________________________.

Deadline for submitting letter of intent: March 1 (fall semester enrollment), November 1 (spring semester enrollment)

My signature below indicates that I understand and agree to the following requirements of the Co-Enrollment Articulation Agreement between UMW and GCC:

• I have completed a minimum of 15 credit hours of approved general education coursework with a minimum 3.25 GPA (attach copy of official transcript). This coursework was taken at GCC since my graduation from high school and the course work applies toward the Associate of Arts, Associate of Science, or Associate of Arts and Sciences, degree at GCC.
• I understand that as a co-enrolled student I may take a maximum of five (5) courses at UMW that may be applied towards the associate degree I am pursuing at GCC.
• I am aware of the UMW Honor Code and acknowledge that I will be held to its standards.
• In order to remain eligible for the co-enrollment agreement, I must remain continuously enrolled at GCC following the date at which I am accepted as a co-enrolled UMW student.
• Courses taken at UMW while a student is co-enrolled will be treated as transfer credits at GCC, and grades in these courses will not count toward my GCC GPA nor will they establish a GPA at UMW.
• If I remain continuously enrolled at GCC and complete the Associate Degree at GCC with a minimum 3.25 GPA, I will be admitted to UMW starting in the semester indicated above. If unable to begin at UMW in this semester, I understand that I must notify the authorized officer at GCC at least one semester in advance of the stated UMW matriculation date.
• I understand that acceptance in some degree programs at UMW is competitive and admission into UMW through the co-enrollment agreement does not imply admission to these programs without further acceptance by the program or department offering the program.
• If I do not meet the terms of admission outlined in this agreement, I understand that may apply for admission to UMW through the normal transfer application process or the Guaranteed Admission Agreement.
• By signing this form, I certify that the above information is truthful. I give permission to UMW and GCC to release information to one another concerning my academic performance as well as to report any judicial or honor violations.

Student Signature ___________________________________________ Date _____________________

To Be Completed By a GCC Counselor

Student’s GPA in approved GCC general education courses (at least 15 credits completed): ________________
Student’s cumulative GCC GPA: ________________
GCC Counselor Signature ___________________________ Print Name: ___________________________
Counselor Phone: ___________________________ Counselor Email: ___________________________

Remit to: UMW Office of Admissions  admit@umw.edu
1301 College Avenue  www.umw.edu/admissions
Fredericksburg, VA 22401-5300  (800)468-5614 or (540)654-2000
Fax: (540)654-1857
PROPOSED FACULTY HANDBOOK SECTION 1 REVISION

(Changes proposed are in red)

1.9 ROLE OF DEPARTMENT CHAIRS

1.9.1 Appointments, Terms, and Compensation
Chairs are nominated by their respective departments by means of a majority vote. The nominee must be tenured, unless the President makes a specific exception to this general rule. The nomination requires the concurrence of the dean and the Provost, and constitutes a recommendation to the President who shall make the final decision and formal appointment. The term of office is three years. Chairs are not usually appointed for more than two consecutive terms (six years); exceptions may be requested of the President by majority vote of the department. Chairs receive a reduced teaching load and a salary supplement, approved annually by the Board of Visitors. Both the release time and the salary supplement vary according to the size of the department. Chairs are expected to ensure that essential departmental operations are carried out as needed throughout the calendar year.

1.9.2 Duties
The implementation of academic programs is vested mainly in the academic departments, and the administration of these departments is the responsibility of the chairs. Major aspects of departmental administration include providing academic leadership; presiding over department meetings; scheduling classes and assigning faculty to them; allocating department space; administering the departmental operating budget; coordinating curriculum, program, outcomes assessment, and accreditation reviews as required; reviewing and correcting departmental information in the University academic catalogs; taking the lead in recruiting, hiring (or terminating), evaluating, and rewarding the department’s faculty; recommending faculty reappointments, promotions, and tenure (see §7 and relevant appendices); and performing other duties as determined by the Dean and the chair in consultation. As part of the shared responsibility for academic governance, faculty committees are often formed in departments to make recommendations and otherwise assist the chair and the department faculty in the conduct of business required to effectively carry out departmental administration. The size of the department, and the nature and complexity of its administration and organization, will influence the kinds of departmental committees constituted. Department chairs meet as a group with the dean when he/she deems it appropriate for the purpose of discussing educational issues and advising the dean on matters relevant to planning, implementation, evaluation, and improvement of the educational program. Chairs also meet individually with the dean at least once per academic year.

1.9.3 Reporting and Evaluation
Department chairs in each college report directly to their respective college deans on all matters related to the programs of the colleges, and the deans are responsible for the annual evaluation of department chairs within their college (following procedures outlined in §§1.8.3 and 6.1). Chairs are evaluated annually, with written input from all departmental faculty members. These evaluations take place during the same period of time in the fall semester over which annual faculty evaluations are conducted (see §6.1).

1.9.4 Continuity and/or Termination of Department Chair Appointments
In the event that a department chair is approved for a sabbatical or other planned leave during
his or her term as chair, a temporary department chair who will serve in that capacity for the duration of the department chair’s leave may be appointed. The temporary chair should meet the qualifications required for serving as a department chair. The department chair nominates the temporary chair replacement, subject to the approval of the College Dean, the Provost, and the President. The replacement chair will receive the authorized salary supplement and teaching load reduction during the chair’s period of leave, prorated to the duration of the leave period.

.2 In the event of an emergency leave of absence or a sick leave that would interfere with the chair being able to exercise his or her expected duties, the College Dean will request that the department nominate a person to serve as acting chair until the chair is able to return to duty. The replacement chair will receive the authorized salary supplement and teaching load reduction during the chair’s period of leave, prorated to the duration of the leave period.

.3 A department chair may resign the appointment at any time during its duration, subject to the acceptance of the College Dean and the Provost.

.4 A department chair’s appointment may be terminated by the College Dean at any time during its duration subject to the approval of both the Provost and the President. The reasons for the Dean's recommendation to terminate the chair's appointment must be presented in writing to the chair. A chair wishing to contest the Dean’s recommendation may write a letter of exception to the Provost. The letter of exception is due one week after the date of the Dean's written recommendation that the chair's appointment be terminated. After reviewing the Dean's recommendation and the letter of exception (if any), the Provost will render a decision on the Dean's recommendation and will present that decision in writing with copies to the department chair and the Dean. If the Provost disagrees with the Dean’s recommendation, the review process stops. Should the Provost agree with the Dean's recommendation, the chair may write a letter of exception to the Provost’s decision. The letter of exception to the Provost's decision is due one week after the date of the Provost’s written recommendation supporting the Dean’s recommendation that the chair's appointment be terminated. Before making a final determination about ending a department chair’s appointment as chair, the President will review the recommendations from the Dean and the Provost and all letters of exception from the chair before rendering a decision. The President’s decision, which is final, must be presented in writing with copies to the department chair, the Dean, and the Provost.

Rationale for the changes.

1. The change in 1.9.1 points out that department business occurs year round and that chairs need to be attentive to departmental needs when they occur.

2. The changes in 1.9.2 more accurately delineate duties of department chairs (duties that chairs have, in fact, mostly been doing).

3. The addition of “performing other duties as determined by the Dean and the chair in consultation” reflects the reality that no list of duties can anticipate every situation and there may be times when tasks other than those specified will need to be completed. This language is similar to a statement that appears in the list of duties for all faculty committees (other duties as assigned).

4. §1.9.4.1-.4 outlines procedures to be followed when the chair needs to be replaced. Provisions .1 -.3 put in writing practices that have been followed in the past when those cases arose (sabbaticals, other leaves, or a chair’s request to step down). The last item outlines the steps to be followed in the event that a department’s chair performance requires that he/she be replaced before the term has expired. The letters of exception, and the multiple steps involved in the review of such an action, provide for due process for the chair.
1.9.4 Continuity and/or Termination of Department Chair Appointments

.1 In the event that a department chair is approved for a sabbatical or other planned leave during his or her term as chair, and the chair elects to step down as chair during the term of the sabbatical or other planned leave, a temporary department chair who will serve in that capacity for the duration of the department chair’s leave, may be appointed. The temporary chair should meet the qualifications required for serving as a department chair. The department chair nominates the temporary chair replacement. The College Dean will request that the department nominate a person to serve as acting chair until the sabbatical or leave concludes, subject to the approval of the College Dean, the Provost, and the President. The replacement chair will receive the authorized salary supplement and teaching load reduction during the chair’s period of leave, prorated to the duration of the leave period.

.2 In the event of an emergency leave of absence or a sick leave that would interfere with the chair being able to exercise his or her expected duties, the College Dean will request that the department nominate a person to serve as acting chair until the chair is able to return to duty. The replacement chair will receive the authorized salary supplement and teaching load reduction during the chair’s period of leave, prorated to the duration of the leave period.

.3 A department chair may resign the appointment at any time during its duration, subject to the acceptance of the College Dean and the Provost.

.4 In the unusual event that a department chair’s performance requires that he/she be replaced before the term has expired, a department chair’s appointment may be terminated. Termination procedures may be initiated either by the faculty of the department or by the College Dean at any time during the chair’s term. Termination is subject to the approval of both the College Dean, the Provost and the President. The reasons for the Dean’s recommendation to terminate the chair’s appointment must be presented in writing to the chair. A chair wishing to contest the Dean’s recommendation may write a letter of exception to the Provost. The letter of exception is due one week after the date of the Dean’s written recommendation that the chair’s appointment be terminated. After reviewing the Dean’s recommendation and the letter of exception (if any), the Provost will render a decision on the Dean’s recommendation and will present that decision in writing with copies to the department chair and the Dean. If the Provost disagrees with the Dean’s recommendation, the review process stops. Should the Provost agree with the Dean’s recommendation, the chair may write a letter of exception to the Provost’s decision. The letter of exception to the Provost's decision is due one week after the date of the Provost’s written recommendation supporting the Dean’s recommendation that the chair’s appointment be terminated. Before making a final determination about ending a department chair’s appointment as chair, the President will review the recommendations from the Dean and the Provost and all letters of exception from the chair before rendering a decision. The President’s decision, which is final, must be presented in writing with copies to the department chair, the Dean, and the Provost.
Dear Norah,

During its March 13 meeting, the UFC received a motion to amend section 7 of the Faculty Handbook, which specifies university-wide procedures for promotion and tenure of faculty. The impetus for these proposed revisions is to ensure that comparable due processes for faculty seeking tenure are followed by all three colleges. Equitable university-wide tenure procedures across all three colleges must be maintained because tenure represents a “professional transaction” between the individual faculty member and the University, not between faculty and particular colleges (section 7.6.1: “Tenure creates a mutual obligation between the University and the individual faculty member”.)

One particular discrepancy noted by the UFC between the College of Education’s procedure and those followed by the other colleges is its tenure appeal process (section K.5.7 Appeal of Committee Decision). The UFC would like the College of Education to review its tenure appeal process, procedure for how the tenure appeal advisory committee is appointed, and the composition of this committee. Furthermore, the UFC would like the COE to propose revisions which will create an appeal process comparable to those used by the other colleges.

Please provide an interim report to the University Faculty Affairs Committee. The UFC will be prepared to consider your final report, and either accept or reject it, during its April 10 meeting. The UFC will also have the option to act on the UFAC’s motion to amend Faculty Handbook section 7, which we tabled last evening (March 13). I have attached the UFAC’s February 22 report, which contains this motion, for your convenience.

Please let me know if you have any questions.

Best wishes,

Andrew Dolby, UFC Chair
Draft #3 Changes to the Guidelines for Submitting Course and Curriculum Proposals Document

1. A section titled “Shared Curriculum Governance at the University of Mary Washington” was added to provide an overall framework for the curriculum change process. This section stresses that both the faculty and the administration have important roles in the curriculum change process. It further notes that the primary responsibility for curriculum development rests with the faculty. Curriculum development and change is to be carried out in an environment of open discussion. The opportunity to address differences of opinion and to revise and resubmit proposals for further consideration is assured.

2. There are now four categories of curriculum proposals: (a) Expedited Curriculum Actions; (2) New Course Proposals; (3) Educational Program Actions – State Approval Not Required; and (4) Educational Program Actions – State Approval Required. This change helps to better differentiate the varying levels of approval required for each type of curricular action.

3. The level of approval for curricular actions has been modified to the following:

   * Expedited Curriculum Actions require faculty approvals only
   * New Course Proposals require faculty approvals only
   * Educational Program Actions, State Approval Not Required
     -- Changes to existing programs (adjustments in existing majors and minors) require faculty and Dean approvals
     -- New programs (like new minors or new concentrations in existing majors, the educational program changes that do not go to SCHEV) require faculty, Dean, and Provost approvals
   * Educational Program Actions, State Approval Required -- faculty, Dean, Provost, and BOV approvals are required

4. The outline of the paths for review and approval (the steps to be followed) for each type of curricular action were revised to reflect the approach outlined in item #3 (above). The consultation with the Dean step was removed for Expedited and New Course proposal. This step was retained in the Educational Program Actions processes.

5. A number of typos were corrected. In the interest of consistency, the terms “working days” and “business days” were replaced by class days.

6. The various cover sheets were updated by changing the level of approvals listed on each form to correspond with the description in item #3 (above).

7. One suggestion that was not incorporated at this time was the idea of requiring that the reasons for rejection of a proposal be posted at the UCC curriculum web site. This topic needs more discussion by the UFC before it is folded in to the proposal.

March 2012
GUIDELINES FOR SUBMITTING COURSE AND CURRICULUM PROPOSALS TO THE UNIVERSITY CURRICULUM COMMITTEE AT UMW

This document outlines the guidelines for curriculum approval actions. Please follow the guidelines appropriate to the action you are seeking from the University Curriculum Committee (UCC). Adherence to the procedures listed below will allow the Committee to act quickly on a proposal or to identify potential problems that will require correction before making a decision. The goal of these procedures is to shorten the time between submission and decision without compromising the effectiveness of the reviewing process. The Committee will return for revision any proposal that does not follow these guidelines.

SHARED CURRICULUM GOVERNANCE AT THE UNIVERSITY OF MARY WASHINGTON

The curriculum review and approval process at UMW is grounded on the principle of shared governance, recognizing that both the faculty and the administration have important roles to play in the process of approving educational programs. The primary responsibility for curriculum development rests with the faculty. Curriculum proposals begin with action by individual faculty and departments. Faculty curriculum committees at the college and the university level are central to the review and approval process. The college and university faculty governance bodies have an explicit review and approval step. Involvement, review, and approval by the faculty ensures that (1) programs contain content and approaches that reflect current thinking within a field of study, and (2) that the curriculum is appropriate for the students enrolled. Administrative review and approval ensures that educational programs are consistent with the mission of the institution and that the resources, organization, and commitment necessary to carry out those programs are available.

Within this system of shared curriculum governance, each constituency carries out its separate but complementary roles and does so in an environment of open discussion. Whenever one level of review disagrees with a proposed action, the reasons for the disagreement must be communicated in writing to the prior level of review at the time when the disapproval is made known. The opportunity to address differences of opinion and to revise and resubmit a proposal for further consideration is assured. For example, should a dean disagree with the decision of a College Curriculum Committee (CCC) regarding approval of a change in an educational program, the first step would be for the dean to informally review concerns with the Committee in the effort to reach agreement. Should the collaboration step not result in agreement, and the dean ends up rejecting the proposal, the dean must provide the Committee with a written explanation of the reasons why the proposal was not accepted. This written explanation must be provided at the same time as when the dean formally informs the Committee of the decision not to support the proposal. The Committee then has the opportunity to review the dean’s concerns, decide how to address them, and to resubmit the proposal for additional review.

GENERAL CURRICULUM APPROVAL PROCEDURES

Curriculum actions and changes will take effect in the fall semester. For a curriculum action to be implemented in the fall, it must have received all required approvals no later than February 15. This deadline ensures that there will be adequate time to update the academic catalogs to reflect the changes, and to post the new Academic Catalogs on line in corrected HTML and PDF versions.

The entire curriculum approval process will be electronic (see page 8). Depending on the action
desired, the approval process may include a separate step for approvals by the Dean and the Provost. For proposals to change to existing courses, or to create a new course, there is no approval step by either the Dean or the Provost. These curricular actions are entirely within the hands of the faculty. Proposals to change existing educational programs (minors, majors, concentrations, certificates) require approval by the Dean of the college in which the educational program resides. Proposals to create new educational programs require approval of the Dean and the Provost. For any of the program actions that must be submitted to the State Council of Higher Education for Virginia (SCHEV), approval from the Rector and Visitors of the University of Mary Washington is required before the proposal is advanced to SCHEV.

The guidelines listed below state the order of steps to be followed with respect to the particular types of curriculum actions. The actions are grouped into four categories: (1) Expedited Curriculum Actions, (2) New Course Proposals, (3) Educational Program Actions – State Review Not Required, and (4) Educational Program Actions – State Review and/or Approval Required.

**EXPEDITED CURRICULUM ACTIONS**

1. This category of curriculum changes proceeds through an approval process at the college level. Once the College Curriculum Committee (CCC) and the College Faculty Body has approved the change, the proposed change is posted on the University Curriculum Committee (UCC) website and is available for comment by all members the university faculty.

2. The following curriculum actions are the only ones handled in the expedited manner:
   - Change to a course’s number
   - Change to a course’s title
   - Change to a course’s credit hours
   - Change to a course’s catalog description
   - Change to a course’s prerequisites
   - Deletion of a course

3. The following steps are required to submit an Expedited Course Proposal Action:

   **A.** The proposer downloads the “Expedited_Course_Change_Proposal” cover sheet from the UCC website. The form is filled out completely, and attachments required are added.

   **B.** The proposal moves through whatever procedures are standard for curricular actions within the faculty member’s department. When department approval is secured, the proposal moves to the College Curriculum Committee (CCC). (If the college permits proposals to go directly to the CCC, the departmental review step may be ignored.) The department chair’s name on the proposal form indicates either department approval of the submission or acknowledgement of the submission in cases where a college allows faculty to submit proposals directly to its CCC.

   **C.** Following CCC approval, the CCC Chair reports the curriculum actions approved to the College Faculty Body. Should the College faculty Body not approve an expedited curriculum proposal, the proposal is returned to the CCC with a written statement of the reasons why the proposal was not approved. After addressing the issues causing the proposal to be returned, the CCC resubmits the action to the College Faculty Body.
D. Once the proposal clears through the College Senate/Faculty Assembly meeting, the CCC Chair posts proposal at the UCC web site for a required two-week (10 class days) public posting period.

E. If no objections are raised after the two-week (10 class days) posting period ends, the curriculum action is approved and it takes effect at the start of the fall semester in the year stated on the proposal. Expedited proposals that pass through the posting period without comment are noted as “Approved” at the UCC curriculum approval website. The UCC chair adds the date that the action was finalized and the completed proposal form is placed in electronic archive at the UCC web site.

F. If the UCC discovers problems with any expedited action approved by a college, it will identify the problem and return the proposal to the CCC and request that the problem be addressed before the proposal is posted for public review and comment. Once the CCC has addressed the issues raised by the UCC, the expedited proposal will be posted for the required two-week (10 class day) comment period. Once the proposal passes through the comment period, it is noted as approved at the UCC website, the proposal form is updated by the UCC chair, and the proposal is filed in the electronic archive.

G. If objections are raised during the two-week (10 class days) comment period, the UCC may either return the proposal to the CCC or may elect to consider the proposal at a regularly scheduled UCC meeting. For any expedited proposal that the UCC decides to review, the action taken will be reported to the UFC as part of the UCC regular report to that group. Expedited proposals approved by the UCC are noted as “Approved” on the UCC curriculum website; any proposals not approved are returned to the relevant CCC. The proposal sheet for any Expedited Proposals approved by the UCC is updated by the UCC Chair; the approval date is the date of the UCC meeting where the proposal was approved. The completed proposal document is then filed in the electronic archive.

NEW COURSE PROPOSALS

The following steps are required to propose to add a new course to the curriculum:

1. The proposer downloads the “New_Course_Proposal” cover sheet from the UCC website. The form is filled out completely, and any attachments as required are added.

2. The proposal moves through whatever procedures are standard for curricular actions within the department. When department approval is secured, the proposal moves to the College Curriculum Committee (CCC). (If the college permits proposals to go directly to the CCC, the departmental review step may be ignored.) The department chair’s name on the proposal form indicates either department approval of the submission or acknowledgement of the submission in cases where a College allows faculty to submit proposals directly to its CCC.

3. **Important reminders about particular types of new course proposals:**
   a. **Interdisciplinary (IDIS) course proposals** – to add a new IDIS course, the same new course proposal form is to be completed. IDIS courses are normally designed by groups of self-selected faculty. Proposals for new IDIS courses will only be accepted from established departments. Therefore, faculty who wish to teach IDIS courses must find a department that will accept "responsibility" for the
course. This department will be called the "host" department. Typically the host department will be the one that houses one of the faculty members involved in the design of the IDIS course. A memo from the department chair from the host department should be attached to the course proposal, along with a memo of support from the chairs of all departments of the faculty who are proposed as teachers of the new IDIS course. (Even after permanent status is achieved, IDIS courses will require a host department. Host departments may change over time. A short memo from the new host to the Office of the Registrar will be sufficient to register the change.)

b. Converting a Special Topics Course to a New Course – In 1998, the Faculty voted "that a [topics] course may be taught no more than three times before it is approved by the Curriculum Committee [as a regular course]." A department must submit a new course proposal to the Curriculum Committee for approval before such a course is taught for the fourth time.

4. Following CCC approval, the CCC Chair reports the curriculum actions approved to the College Faculty Body. Once the College faculty Body has accepted the proposal, the CCC Chair sends the proposal to the UCC.

5. If the UCC discovers problems with any new course proposal approved by a college, it will identify the problem and return the proposal to the CCC and request that the problem be addressed before the proposal is reviewed by the UCC. Once the CCC has addressed the issues raised by the UCC, the proposal is returned to the UCC for action.

6. New courses approved by the UCC are reported to the UFC as part of the UCC’s regular report to that group. Once the UFC has accepted the UCC’s actions, the new courses are noted as "Approved" on the UCC curriculum website; any proposals not approved are returned to the relevant CCC. The UCC Chair updates the new course proposal cover sheet, and the proposal document is filed in the electronic archive.

EDUCATIONAL PROGRAM ACTIONS – STATE ACTION NOT REQUIRED

For these curricular actions, formal review and action by the UCC is required in all cases. Once approved by all levels at UMW, the action need not be reported to or approved by the State Council of Higher Education for Virginia (SCHEV). Proposals requiring full UCC review without subsequent action by SCHEV are:

- Change an existing major, minor, certificate, concentration, or degree program
  * Add a new major, minor, certificate, concentration, or degree program

Because the procedures required for each of these actions vary somewhat, steps for each action are described in detail below.

1. Change an existing major, minor, concentration, or certificate

The following steps are required to propose changes to existing majors, minors, concentrations, or certificates:

A. The proposer downloads the “Program_Proposal” cover sheet from the UCC website. The form is filled out completely, and any attachments as required are added.
B. The proposal moves through whatever procedures are standard for curricular actions within the department. When department approval is secured, the proposal moves to the College Curriculum Committee (CCC). (If the college permits proposals to go directly to the CCC, the departmental review step may be ignored.) The department chair’s name on the proposal form indicates either department approval of the submission or acknowledgement of the submission in cases where a College allows faculty to submit proposals directly to its CCC.

C. Prior to submitting the proposal to the CCC, the proposer/department may meet with the College Dean for an initial consultation about the proposed new course. This initial consultation step will help to identify and address potential problems and will help promote a smooth proposal review process.

D. Following CCC approval, the CCC chair sends the electronic copy of the course proposal with all attachments to the Dean. At the same time, the CCC Chair reports the curriculum actions approved to the College Faculty Body. The Dean has five (5) class days to approve or reject the curriculum proposal. If the Dean approves, the proposal is returned to the CCC Chair. Once the College faculty Body has accepted the proposal, the CCC Chair sends the proposal to the UCC. If the Dean rejects the proposal, it is returned to the CCC Chair with a written explanation of the reasons why the proposal was not accepted.

E. If the UCC discovers problems with any new course proposal approved by a college, it will identify the problem, return the proposal to the CCC, and request that the problem be addressed before the proposal is reviewed by the UCC. Once the CCC has addressed the issues raised by the UCC, and with the approval of the College Dean, the proposal is returned to the UCC for action.

F. Changes to majors, minors, concentrations, or certificates approved by the UCC are reported to the UFC as part of its regular report to that group. When program changes are accepted by the UFC, the proposal is noted as “Approved” on the UCC curriculum website. The UCC Chair updates the new proposal cover sheet, and the proposal document is filed in the electronic archive.

2. Add a new major, minor, concentration, certificate, or a new major within an existing degree program*

* This option is to be used in these cases only: for interdisciplinary majors that will be grouped as part of the “Special Majors/General Liberal Arts and Sciences” degree (CIP Code 24.0101) or reported as a BLS degree (CIP Code 24.0199). All other new major proposals must be reviewed and approved by SCHEV because they result in awarding a new degree.

The following steps are required to propose changes to existing majors, minors, concentrations, or certificates:

A. The proposer downloads the “Program_Proposal” cover sheet from the UCC website. The form is filled out completely, and any attachments as required are added.

B. The proposal moves through whatever procedures are standard for curricular actions within the department. When department approval is secured, the proposal moves to the College Curriculum Committee (CCC). (If the college permits proposals to go
directly to the CCC, the departmental review step may be ignored.) The department chair’s name on the proposal form indicates either department approval of the submission or acknowledgement of the submission in cases where a College allows faculty to submit proposals directly to its CCC.

C. **Prior to submitting the proposal to the CCC**, the proposer/department may meet with the College Dean for an initial consultation about the proposed new course. This initial consultation step will help to identify and potential problems and will help promote a smooth proposal review process.

D. Following CCC approval, the CCC chair sends the electronic copy of the course proposal with all attachments to the Dean. **At the same time**, the CCC Chair reports the curriculum actions approved to the College Faculty Body. The Dean has five (5) class days to approve or reject the curriculum proposal. If the Dean approves, the proposal is returned to the CCC Chair. Once the College faculty Body has accepted the proposal, the CCC Chair sends the proposal to the UCC. If the Dean rejects the proposal, it is returned to the CCC Chair with a written explanation of the reasons why the proposal was not accepted.

E. If the UCC discovers problems with any new course proposal approved by a college, it will identify the problem, return the proposal to the CCC, and request that the problem be addressed before the proposal is reviewed by the UCC. Once the CCC has addressed the issue raised by the UCC, and with the approval of the College Dean, the proposal is returned to the UCC for action.

F. New minors, concentrations, certificates, or majors in existing degree programs (as restricted above) approved by the UCC are reported to the UFC as part of its regular report to that group. **Simultaneously**, the UCC chair sends the proposal document with all attachments to the Provost. The Provost has five (5) class days to approve or reject the proposal. If the Provost approves, the proposal is returned to the UCC Chair. If the Provost rejects the proposal, it is returned to the UCC Chair with a written explanation of the reasons why the proposal was not accepted.

G. When new minors, concentrations, certificates, or majors in existing degree programs (as restricted above) are approved by the Provost and also accepted by the UFC, the proposal is noted as “Approved” on the UCC curriculum website. The UCC Chair updates the proposal cover sheet, and the proposal is and the proposal document will be filed in the electronic archive.

**EDUCATIONAL PROGRAM ACTIONS – STATE REVIEW/APPROVAL REQUIRED**

For these educational program actions, formal review and action by the UCC are required in all cases. Once approved by all levels at UMW, the action must be either approved by or reported to the State Council of Higher Education for Virginia (SCHEV). Proposals requiring full UCC review and subsequent action by SCHEV are:

- Add a new degree program
- Add a new certificate program
- Change program title
- Merge program
- Delete certificate or major
Each of these proposals will go through the same set of steps for UMW approval, after which the approved proposal is sent to SCHEV in accordance with their requirements. **SCHEV estimates that it needs nine months lead time to review and approve a new program before it may begin implementation. Lead-time for other SCHEV program actions is shorter. New certificates need only be reported. Program mergers, title changes, and deletions usually take three to six months to become officially approved by SCHEV.**

In every case, the proposer fills out the UMW cover sheet titled “New_Program_Proposal_State_Action_Required.” In addition to the specified attachments required by UMW (as stated on this cover sheet), the proposer completes the required SCHEV cover sheet and documentation. The SCHEV requirements are:

- **For new degree or certificate programs**, complete and attach SCHEV’s “Program Proposal Cover Sheet” and all narratives and documents as required by SCHEV’s instructions.
- **For program title changes**, complete and attach SCHEV’s “Format for Revising Academic Programs Cover Sheet” and all narratives and documents as required by SCHEV’s instructions.
- **For program mergers**, complete and attach SCHEV’s “Format for Merging Academic Programs Cover Sheet” and all narratives and documents as required by SCHEV’s instructions.
- **For major and/or certificate deletions**, also complete and attach the SCHEV “Intent to Discontinue Academic Program” form (form is available at the University Curriculum Committee web site) and provide any additional attachments are required by SCHEV’s instructions.

The following steps are required to receive UMW approval in cases of program actions also requiring state approval:

A. The proposer downloads the “New_Program_Proposal_State_Action_Required” cover sheet from the UCC website. The form is filled out completely, and any attachments as required are added. Also, the required SCHEV cover sheets and attachments are also completed and provided as a part of the proposal packet. Requirements from SCHEV vary according to the action being requested; see the above list of SCHEV cover sheets and documentation for details.

B. The proposal moves through whatever procedures are standard for curricular actions within the department. When department approval is secured, the proposal moves to the College Curriculum Committee (CCC). (If the college permits proposals to go directly to the CCC, the departmental review step may be ignored.) The department chair’s name on the UMW proposal cover sheet indicates either department approval of the submission or acknowledgement of the submission in cases where a College allows faculty to submit proposals directly to its CCC.

C. **Prior to submitting the proposal to the CCC**, the proposer/department must meet with the College Dean for an initial consultation about the proposed new program. This initial consultation step will help to identify and potential problems and will help promote a smooth proposal review process.

D. Following CCC approval, the CCC chair sends the electronic copy of the course proposal with all attachments to the Dean. **At the same time**, the CCC Chair reports
the curriculum actions approved to the College Faculty Body. The Dean has five (5) class days to approve or reject the curriculum proposal. If the Dean approves, the proposal is returned to the CCC Chair. Once the College faculty Body has accepted the proposal, the CCC Chair sends the proposal to the UCC. If the Dean rejects the proposal, it is returned to the CCC Chair with a written explanation of the reasons why the proposal was not accepted.

E. If the UCC discovers problems with any program proposal approved by a college, it will identify the problem, return the proposal to the CCC, and request that the problem be addressed before the proposal is reviewed by the UCC. Once the CCC has addressed the issue raised by the UCC, and with the approval of the College Dean, the proposal is returned to the UCC for action.

H. Once new programs and program changes requiring state action are approved by the UCC, they are reported to the UFC as part of the UCC’s regular report to that group. Simultaneously, the UCC chair sends the proposal document with all attachments to the Provost. The Provost has five (5) class days to approve or reject the proposal. If the Provost approves, the proposal is returned to the UCC Chair. If the Provost rejects the proposal, it is returned to the UCC Chair with a written explanation of the reasons why the proposal was not accepted.

F. If approved by the Provost and accepted by the UFC, the proposal cover sheet is updated, and the proposal status at the UCC website is noted as “Approved, Pending Board of Visitors’ Review.” The Provost, he/she will place the new program proposal on the Board of Visitors’ agenda for one of their regularly scheduled meetings occurring during the academic year.

G. If the Board approves the proposal, the UCC website will be updated to state “Approved by Board of Visitors, Awaiting Final Action by SCHEV.” The Provost will submit the program proposal to SCHEV in accordance with their procedures. Once approved by SCHEV, the UCC website will be updated to state “Final Approval from SCHEV Received on [date],” and the proposal is filed in the electronic archive maintained at the UCC website.

H. Should SCHEV not approve a program proposal that has been approved at all UMW levels, the Provost will convene a meeting with the program proposer, the department chair, the relevant College Dean, the relevant CCC chair, and the UCC chair in order to discuss how to proceed.

ELECTRONIC SUBMISSION OF CURRICULUM PROPOSALS

The entire curriculum review and approval process is managed through the University Curriculum Committee’s website, to located at a space on the UMW web site (currently under development). All required cover sheets and instructions for submitting a particular curriculum will be available at that location along with complete instructions for posting documents to the UCC web site after they have been approved at the college level. All required cover sheets will be available as word documents and fillable PDF forms. All attachments will need to be in PDF format, and all pages required for a given proposal will need to be in one PDF document (with the required cover sheet as the first page). A convention for naming proposal files will also be provided at the web site. This web site will be ready to go just as soon as the curriculum approval process document is approved.
UNIVERSITY OF MARY WASHINGTON -- COURSE CHANGE PROPOSAL
Submit this form electronically, beginning with the first required level of review (department or college level). Each level of review passes the form and any attachments to the next level when the action is approved.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Submitted by:</th>
<th>Date Prepared:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Department/Discipline and Course Number:</td>
<td>UCC Tracking Number:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Course Title:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Type of change (check all applicable):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course Number*</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Credits</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Prerequisites</th>
<th>Deletion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

*This course number must be approved by the Office of the Registrar before the proposal is submitted.

Effective Date: FALL Semester, Year ____________________________

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Current Catalog Entry</th>
<th>Proposed Catalog Entry</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

JUSTIFICATION (including impact on majors, minors, concentrations, and general education courses within the University curriculum; attach additional pages if required)

TRANSITION PLAN (describe how will students who are in Catalogs where the course is required for a major be accommodated; attach additional pages if required)

Approvals

Department Chair ____________________________ Date: ____________________________

College Curriculum Chair ____________________________ Date: ____________________________

Action Posted on (date) ____________________________ Comment Period Ended: ____________________________

If comments require UCC to act on this proposal, date of UCC approval: ____________________________
**UNIVERSITY OF MARY WASHINGTON -- NEW COURSE PROPOSAL**
Electronically submit this completed form with PDF attachments to the Chair of the College Curriculum Committee.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COLLEGE (check one):</th>
<th>Arts and Sciences</th>
<th>Business</th>
<th>Education</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Proposal Submitted By:</td>
<td>Date Prepared:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Course Title:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department/discipline and course number*:</td>
<td>UCC Tracking Number:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*This course number must be approved by the Office of the Registrar before the proposal is submitted.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of credits proposed:</th>
<th>Prerequisites:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Will this be a <strong>new</strong>, <em>repeatable</em> “special topics” course? (Do you want students to be able to take this new course more than once if the topic changes?)</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Date of first offering of this **new** course: FALL SEMESTER, year |
| Proposed frequency of offering of the course: |
| List the faculty who will likely teach the course: |
| Are ANY new resources required? | NO | YES | Document in attached impact statement |

This new course will be (check all that apply):

- Required in the major
- General Elective
- Elective in the major
- General Education**

**AFTER the new course is approved, a separate proposal must be sent to the General Education Committee.

**Catalog Description:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COURSE HISTORY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Was this course taught previously as a topics or experimental course?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Course Number and Title of Previous Course</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

CHECK HERE if the proposed course is to be *equated* with the earlier topics or experimental offerings. This means that students who took the earlier “topics” course will only be able to take the new course if they made a C- grade or lower in the earlier course.

**NOTE:** If the proposed course has not been previously offered as a topics or experimental course, *explain in the attached rationale statement* why the course should be adopted even though it has not been tried out.

**REQUIRED ATTACHMENTS:**
1. **Rationale Statement** (Why is this course needed? What purposes will it serve?)
2. **Impact Statement** (Provide details about the Library, space, budget, and technology impacts created by adding this new course. Include supporting statements from the Library, IT Department, etc. as needed.)
3. **Sample Syllabus**

Department Chair Approval: ___________________________ Date: _____________

CCC Chair Approval: ___________________________ Date: _____________

UCC Chair Approval: ___________________________ Date: _____________
**UNIVERSITY OF MARY WASHINGTON – PROGRAM CHANGE PROPOSAL**

Electronically submit this completed form with attachments to the Chair of the College Curriculum Committee.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COLLEGE (check one):</th>
<th>Arts and Sciences</th>
<th>Business</th>
<th>Education</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Proposal Submitted By:  
Date Prepared:  
Department /Program:  
UCC Tracking Number:  

Note: for any program change entailing the addition any new courses, or revisions to existing courses, separate proposal for those course actions must also be submitted.

**PROPOSAL TO CHANGE EXISTING PROGRAM** (check one of the following)

| Revise requirements for existing major  
Revise requirements for a concentration within an existing major  
Revise requirements for an existing degree program  
Revise requirements for existing certificate program  
Revise requirements for existing minor  
Implementation Date: FALL semester, year: |

**REQUIRED ATTACHMENTS FOR CHANGES TO EXISTING PROGRAMS:**

1. **Rationale statement** (Why is this program change needed? What purposes will it serve?)
2. **Impact Statement** (Provide details about the Library, space, budget, technology, and impacts created by this program change. Supporting statements from the Library, IT Department, etc. evaluating the resource impact and feasibility of the program change are required.)
3. **Catalog Copy** (Provide the existing Catalog Description and the complete statement of the proposed new Catalog description that reflects the program changes)

**PROPOSAL TO CREATE PROGRAM NOT REQUIRING STATE ACTION** (check one of the following)

| New concentration within existing major | Name:  
New minor | Name:  
New Major but NOT a new degree* | Name:  |

*Use ONLY for interdisciplinary majors that will be grouped as part of the "Special Majors/General Liberal Arts and Sciences" degree (CIP Code 24.0101) or reported as a BLS degree (CIP Code 24.0199)

Implementation Date (semester and year):  

**REQUIRED ATTACHMENTS FOR NEW PROGRAMS NOT REQUIRING STATE APPROVAL:**

1. **Rationale statement** (Why is this additional program needed? What purposes will it serve?)
2. **Impact Statement** (Provide details about the Library, space, budget, technology, and impacts created by this program change. Supporting statements from the Library, IT Department, etc. evaluating the resource impact and feasibility of adding the new program are required.)
3. **Catalog Copy** (Provide the complete Catalog Description for the proposed new program)

Department Chair Approval: ___________________________  
Date: ____________

CCC Chair Approval: ___________________________  
Date: ____________

Dean Approval: ___________________________  
Date: ____________

UCC Chair Approval: ___________________________  
Date: ____________

*Provost Approval: ___________________________  
Date: ____________

*Required only in cases of proposals for new concentrations, new minors, or new majors that do not involve a new degree
UNIVERSITY OF MARY WASHINGTON – NEW PROGRAM REQUIRING STATE APPROVAL

Electronically submit this completed form with attachments to the Chair of the College Curriculum Committee.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COLLEGE (check one):</th>
<th>Arts and Sciences</th>
<th>Business</th>
<th>Education</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Proposal Submitted By:</td>
<td>Date Prepared:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department /Program:</td>
<td></td>
<td>UCC Tracking Number:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: for program changes entailing the addition new courses, or revisions to existing courses, submit separate proposals for those course actions.

PROPOSAL TO CREATE PROGRAM REQUIRING STATE ACTION (check one of the following)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>New Degree Program*</th>
<th>Name:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>* Use this in cases where the proposal would either: (1) seek to award an undergraduate degree in a major not currently offered, such as a new B.S. degree in Biochemistry; or (2) create a new Master’s program.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>New Certificate Program</th>
<th>Name:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Program Title Change</td>
<td>Current Name:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>New Name:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program merger</th>
<th>Programs to be merged:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>New Name for Merged Program:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Delete existing major, certificate, concentration, or degree program

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Implementation Date – FALL semester, year:

Note: After proposal for a new degree is approved by the UMW Provost, allow at least nine months from that date for the required SCHEV review. Keep this factor in mind when stating the desired implementation date for starting a new degree program. Other program actions reported to SCHEV also require time for review but will not take as long.

REQUIRED ATTACHMENTS FOR NEW PROGRAMS REQUIRING STATE APPROVAL:

1. Rationale statement (Why is this additional change needed? What purposes will it serve?)
2. Impact Statement (Provide details about the Library, space, budget, and technology impacts created by this program change. Supporting statements from the Library, IT Department, etc. evaluating the resource impact and feasibility of adding the new program are required.)
3. Catalog Copy (Provide the complete Catalog Description for the proposed new program)
4. For new degree or certificate programs, complete and attach SCHEV’s “Program Proposal Cover Sheet” and all narratives and documents as required by SCHEV’s instructions.
5. For program title changes, complete and attach SCHEV’s “Format for Revising Academic Programs Cover Sheet” and all narratives and documents as required by SCHEV’s instructions.
6. For program mergers, complete and attach SCHEV’s “Format for Merging Academic Programs Cover Sheet” and all narratives and documents as required by SCHEV’s instructions.
7. For major, minor, and/or certificate deletions, also complete and attach the SCHEV “Intent to Discontinue Academic Program” form (form is available at the University Curriculum Committee web site) and provide any additional attachments are required by SCHEV’s instructions.

All of the forms required by SCHEV, and instructions for completing them, are available at the University Curriculum Committee website.

Department Chair Approval: __________________________ Date: ________________

CCC Chair Approval: __________________________ Date: ________________

Dean Approval: __________________________ Date: ________________

UCC Chair Approval: __________________________ Date: ________________

Provost Approval: __________________________ Date: ________________

Cover Sheet for New Program, State Approval Required (revised March 2012)