

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

**September 13, 2011**

**Members Present:** Andrew Dolby (Chairperson), Stephen Davies, Leigh Frackelton, Dan Hubbard, Jennifer Jakubecy, Teresa Kennedy, Mary Beth Mathews, Debra Schleef, Suzanne Sumner, Jo Tyler (Secretary); President Richard Hurley, 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:** none

**Guests:** Associate Provost John Morello, Associate Provost Fred Pierce, Honors Program Director Kelli Slunt, 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 April 12, 2011 (attachment 1) and the organizational meeting of May 5, 2011 (attachment 2), so a formal reading of the minutes was dispensed with. There were no corrections or additions. Leigh Frackelton moved that the minutes of April 12 be approved, Suzanne Sumner seconded, and the motion was approved unanimously by voice vote. The minutes of May 5 were approved in the same manner.

3. President's Report. President Hurley began his report with an update on faculty salary increases based on the compensation study conducted by Stan McKnight and Associates in the spring. He explained that the University had allocated \$100,000 for this year's budget as a first step in reducing inequities and has asked the Deans and the Office of Human Resources for recommendations. He added that he will share the rationale for his decision with the appropriate faculty group before it becomes final. Andrew Dolby suggested that it be communicated to the University Faculty Affairs Committee. Jay Harper noted that the recommendation would be available in about two weeks.

President Hurley provided an update on the University's plan for addressing the mandates of the TJ 21 legislation (Top Jobs of the 21st Century: Virginia Higher Education Opportunity Act of 2011). The plan has been discussed by the University Budget Advisory Committee and will be reviewed by the Deans and Provost before being sent to Richmond on September 19. It will prioritize 23 initiatives that address the Governor's TJ 21 agenda to be funded by a combination of general funds and tuition increase. The President explained that because this is a new process, he could not predict the outcome once it reaches Richmond.

The third topic in the President's report was the Quality Enhancement Plan that is part of our SACS review. The title of the QEP is *Understanding and Improving the First-Year*

*Experience.* The President said that this topic has “game-changing potential for UMW” and he will be keeping the QEP at the top of his agenda.

In response to questions following his report, President Hurley stated that the workload study needs to be done and that faculty will not be receiving bonuses this year.

4. Provost’s Report. Provost Harper reported that he had just returned from China where he had been invited to participate in an economic summit with global corporate, government and academic leaders that focused on investment in China. We have a partnership and exchange program with Lingnan University in Hong Kong. The Provost also reported that ELS, a company that specializes in college-level English language instruction is opening a program in Eagle Village. He noted that the on-site Director of the program is a graduate of UMW. Fred Pierce is responsible for relations between UMW and the ELS program.

5. College of Arts and Sciences Dean’s Report. Dean Finkelstein explained his theme as one of stability, both in quality and funding, for CAS. Central to this theme is planning for the future, and he has a number of task forces developing plans in areas such as arts and culture, undergraduate research, and grants development. Some new programs on the horizon include African American Studies and Civil Rights and Social Justice. The Dean also reported that the Dahlgren Campus is slated to open in 2012 which will afford new opportunities for CAS in areas like foreign languages and the sciences. Regarding the compensation study mentioned in the President’s report, the Dean reported that in CAS the biggest issue is salary compression over the last 12 years, so most CAS recommendations will be for that group.

6. College of Education Dean’s Report. Dean Gendernalik-Cooper announced that a major undertaking this year is in collaboration with CAS on development of an undergraduate interdisciplinary major in STEM for students planning to enter the M.S. program in elementary education. The COE will be undergoing a program review by the Virginia Department of Education in the fall of 2012, and preliminary reporting is now underway. This program review is coordinated with the SACS review. Other developments include proposals for new pathways in the areas of special education and other PreK-12 and secondary teaching areas. The Dean also announced that the COE is coordinating with school divisions in the region to provide contracted professional development courses. One of these courses is already under contract and two are in the pipeline.

7. College of Business Dean’s Report. Dean Lynne Richardson explained that she is studying the ideas that have been generated in the college and will have a report at the next UFC meeting.

8. UFC Chairperson’s Report. Andrew Dolby’s report to the Board of Visitors had been circulated in writing (attachment 3). There were no questions or comments. He thanked everyone for the success of the organizational meeting of the standing committees on August 23. All of the committees now have officers and are in the process of filling *ex officio* positions. He noted that the organization is complex and may need revision to improve efficiency.

9. Reports from the Committees. Written reports from the August 23 meetings of the University Curriculum Committee (attachment 4) and the University Faculty Affairs Committee (attachment 5) were included in the UFC agenda for this month. Stephen Davies moved that the reports be

accepted, Leigh Frackelton seconded the motion, and the motion was approved by a unanimous voice vote. Andrew Dolby announced that the September meetings of the University-level committees were scheduled for September 9, 12 and 14, and that those reports would be included in the UFC agenda for next month. He urged that the reports be submitted in writing to be posted on the UFC website when received. Suzanne Sumner asked for a procedure to be established for the committee reports to be distributed to the colleges' governing bodies. A suggestion that received general consensus was that when the committees send their reports to the UFC, they copy the presidents of each college governing body. Jay Harper noted that the Distance and Blended Learning Committee and the Academic Resources Committee did not meet. Andrew Dolby suggested that if there are overlapping responsibilities or other issues, these should be on the next UFC agenda.

10. Honors Program Report. Kelli Slunt, Honors Program Director, introduced the proposal for the Honors Program, which had been circulated in writing (attachment 6), plus an addendum of proposed program outcomes (attachment 7). Teresa Kennedy moved that the proposal be considered without the addendum, because the outcomes had only been drafted within the past couple days and may need further refinement. Dan Hubbard seconded the motion. In discussion, Jay Harper explained the importance of having outcomes up front in order to effectively evaluate the contributions that the Honors Program makes to the University. Teresa Kennedy and Kelli Slunt also pointed out that some issues remain before the outcomes can be finalized, but that the proposal itself needs to be approved immediately in order for publicity and admissions to proceed. Dean Finkelstein pointed out that the proposal has been thoroughly vetted by many committees as well as by the governing bodies of each college. Brief discussion followed about the timeline; the Admissions office is already publicizing the program and taking applicants in the early admissions process, but the actual catalog copy deadline is February 7, 2012. Suzanne Sumner moved to call the question on the motion, and Dan Hubbard seconded. The motion to consider the proposal without the addendum was approved unanimously by a voice vote.

Teresa Kennedy made a motion to amend the proposal by deleting the writing intensive/speaking intensive requirement from the honors freshman seminar, and Stephen Davies seconded the motion. In discussion it was pointed out that combining both WI and SI into a freshman seminar has no precedent, it could be a daunting first experience with UMW, the General Education Committee is reluctant to have courses with this combination, and there seems to be little support for it generally. The procedure for designating courses as Honors courses was also discussed. Kelli Slunt explained that proposals to change the designation of a current course to an Honors course would be approved through the Honors Program Committee, and new courses would follow the current procedure through the colleges and appropriate committees. Stephen Davies moved to call the question and the motion was seconded by Suzanne Sumner. The motion to amend the proposal by deleting the WI/SI requirement from the honors freshman seminar was approved unanimously by a voice vote.

Dan Hubbard made a motion to approve the Honors Program proposal as amended, Stephen Davies seconded. In discussion a question was raised about why there is a cap on the number of honors courses that can be taken by a student who is not in the Honors Program, and how that cap would be enforced. Kelli Slunt explained that if there were no cap, it would make admission to the Honors Program no different from admission generally, yet there are important benefits for having non-honors students in the honors-designated courses. John Morello explained that the cap could be handled the way the current cap on the number of physical

education courses is enforced—students cannot count courses over the cap as credits toward graduation. Other questions in discussion covered details in the proposal: the deadline for a student to apply (within the first year or first 30 credits); the gpa floor (3.2); the topics for honors freshman seminars (can be as broad or focused as any freshman seminars); timing of service learning and research requirements (sophomore and later years, respectively); support for faculty who supervise service learning and research projects (from the Honors Program Director and as determined in each department); and withdrawal and reenrollment in the program (allowed). Leigh Frackelton moved to call the question and Dan Hubbard seconded. The motion to approve the Honors Program Proposal as amended was approved unanimously by a voice vote. Andrew Dolby thanked Kelli Slunt and the committee for developing such a comprehensive and promising proposal for the Honors Program.

Teresa Kennedy made a motion that we table discussion of the addendum to the proposal covering the program outcomes until the committee can bring a final set of program outcomes to the next UFC meeting. Dan Hubbard seconded this motion and it was approved unanimously.

11. Student representation on the UFC. Andrew Dolby recognized Meagan Holbrook from the Student Government Association. Meagan is the Academic Affairs Chair of the SGA, and she is an *ex officio* member of the CAS Faculty Senate. She suggested that she should be an *ex officio* member of the UFC. In discussion, questions were raised about how a student representative on the UFC would be selected to represent students on all campuses and from all colleges. Teresa Kennedy made the following motion, seconded by Mary Beth Mathews, and approved by a unanimous voice vote: That the Student Affairs and Campus Life Advisory Committee, in consultation with student government associations, examine the question of having student representation on the UFC and report its findings at the December 6, 2011, UFC meeting.

There being no further business, the meeting adjourned at 5:55 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Jo Tyler, Secretary

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

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

Absent: Jo Tyler (secretary)

Guests: Tim O'Donnell, Associate Provost John Morello

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

6. College of Business Dean's Report.

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

7. College of Education Dean's Report.

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

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

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

10. UFC and University Committees Report.

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

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

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

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

#### 11. University Faculty Handbook Report.

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

### **Old Business**

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

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

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

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

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

### **New Business**

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

15. Curriculum report from Leigh Frackelton.

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

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

Respectfully submitted,

Marie E. McAllister, Acting Secretary

Chairperson's Report  
University Faculty Council  
April 12, 2011

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

**University of Mary Washington**

**Budget Advisory Committee 2010-11**

**February 25, 2011**

**George Washington Hall – Room 106**

**8:00 to 9:00 a.m.**

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

Minutes from 2/11/2011 passed unanimous.

**New business:**

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

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

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

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

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

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

Question & Answer:

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

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

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

**Future Meetings:**

March 11<sup>th</sup>, 2011, GW Hall, Rm 106 8:00am

- a. Torree Meringolo – Presenting

March 18<sup>th</sup>, 2011 GW Hall, Rm 106 7:30am

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

Meeting adjourned – 9:05am

Minutes respectfully submitted by Dana Hall

**University of Mary Washington**

**Budget Advisory Committee 2010-11**

**March 11, 2011**

**George Washington Hall – Room 106**

**8:00 to 9:00 a.m.**

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

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

**NEW BUSINESS:**

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

Highlights from this report include:

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

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

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

**Q & A**

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

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

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

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

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

Meeting adjourned at 9:05am

Respectfully submitted: Dana S. Hall

## **Budget Advisory Committee 2010-11**

**March 18, 2011**

**George Washington Hall – Room 106**

**7:30 to 9:00 a.m.**

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

### III. Faculty position priorities – Dr. Harper

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

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

### V. Next Meeting

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

b. Continue Request Prioritization

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

**University Committees Election Results**

**Faculty Affairs (3 positions).**

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

**Faculty Appeals and Grievance (2 positions).**

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

**Faculty Organization (2 positions).**

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

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

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

**University Faculty Council (2 positions).**

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

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

---

## 1. Status of the online *Faculty Handbook*

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

[http://www.umw.edu/provost/faculty\\_handbook/univfachbkaug2011/default.php](http://www.umw.edu/provost/faculty_handbook/univfachbkaug2011/default.php)

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

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

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

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

## 2. College Abbreviation Conventions

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Author: Mary Beth Mathews, CPR

### **Proposal:**

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

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

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

### **Behavioral/Social Sciences**

#### **Humanities**

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

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

### **Rationale:**

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

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

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

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

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

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

Changes to language passed by CAS Senate:

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

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

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

### **Campaign for the Future of Higher Education**

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

**1. The curriculum for a quality 21<sup>st</sup> Century higher education must be broad and diverse.**

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

**Conclusion:** Change in American higher education in the 21<sup>st</sup> Century is both inevitable and desirable.

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

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

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

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

3/21/2011

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

**Organizational Meeting**  
**May 5, 2011**

1. Call to Order. The meeting was called to order at 9:00 a.m. by outgoing Chairperson, Ernest Ackermann, with all voting members of the 2011-2012 UFC present as follows:

Stephen Davies, Computer Science (at-large)

Andrew Dolby, Biology (at-large, returning)

Leigh Frackelton, Accounting and Management Information Systems (COB, returning)

Dan Hubbard, Accounting and Management Information Systems (COB)

Jennifer Jakubecy, Foundation, Leadership, and Special Populations (COE)

Teresa Kennedy, English, Linguistics, and Communication (CAS)

Mary Beth Mathews, Classics, Philosophy and Religion (at-large, returning)

Debra Schleeef, Sociology and Anthropology (at-large)

Suzanne Sumner, Mathematics (CAS, returning)

Jo Tyler, Foundations, Leadership and Special Populations (COE, returning)

2. Order of Business. The purpose of the meeting was to elect UFC officers for the 2011-2012 academic year. Ernest Ackermann explained the duties of the three officers: Chairperson, Secretary, and a third representative. There was some discussion about giving the third representative a title, and Ernest Ackermann pointed out that the incoming UFC can address the issue as a change to the Faculty Handbook.

3. Election of Officers. Ernest Ackermann asked for nominations for officers. Mary Beth Mathews nominated Andrew Dolby as Chairperson. The nomination was seconded by Jo Tyler. Leigh Frackelton moved that the nominations be closed, and Andrew Dolby was elected Chairperson by acclamation. Teresa Kennedy nominated Jo Tyler as Secretary, and Dan Hubbard seconded the nomination. Mary Beth Mathews moved that the nominations be closed, and Jo Tyler was elected Secretary by acclamation. Teresa Kennedy nominated Leigh Frackelton to serve as the third UFC representative, and Jo Tyler seconded the nomination. Andrew Dolby moved that the nominations be closed, and Leigh Frackelton was elected as the third representative by acclamation.

4. Organizational Process. Andrew Dolby said that he plans to meet with John Morello to schedule a meeting of all UFC committees during the orientation week in August and to organize the schedule for meetings. The goal will be for the University-level committees to meet before the College governing bodies and for the College governing bodies to meet before the UFC. Mary Beth Mathews suggested that the UFC continue meeting on Tuesday at 4:00 p.m. once a month for its regularly scheduled meeting, and this proposal received general consensus.

5. Action Items. Ernest Ackermann pointed out that due to the SACS review beginning next year, John Morello has requested that all University curriculum decisions and Catalog revisions

be approved in the Colleges by December 2011 and be submitted to the UFC by February 2012. Andrew Dolby recommended that another goal he has for the UFC is to improve the presence of faculty governance on the UMW website. Stephen Davies agreed to assist in this effort, and Jo Tyler agreed to work on organizing the UFC blog. These efforts will be coordinated with the University Faculty Organization Committee, which is charged with monitoring a digital archive of all University committee reports (Faculty Handbook §2.6.6.7). Andrew Dolby also mentioned that during the coming year the UFC should plan to work actively with the committees and offices dealing with the QEP and the Honors Program.

6. Duties of UFC Members. Andrew Dolby mentioned that the UFC members, especially the representatives elected from each college, should bring feedback to UFC meetings. Jo Tyler also noted that members have a dual role of not only bringing issues from the faculty to the attention of the UFC, but also reporting back to the faculty and explaining University-wide decisions of the UFC. Ernest Ackermann mentioned that as UFC Chairperson he tried to attend each meeting of the college governing bodies, although this is not a required duty of the chairperson.

7. Budget. Suzanne Sumner raised the idea of the UFC having a budget funded by the Provost's office. She pointed out that currently the Provost provides reimbursement for UFC members who attend meetings of the Faculty Senate of Virginia. Teresa Kennedy mentioned that the course release for the UFC Chairperson should not come out of the "adjunct" budget for that person's college or department, so a formal policy about this is needed.

8. Adjournment. The meeting adjourned at 9:45 a.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Jo Tyler, Secretary

To: The University of Mary Washington Board of Visitors' Academic Affairs Committee

From: Andrew Dolby, University Faculty Council Chair

Date: August 30, 2011

RE: University Faculty Council Chair's report

The University Faculty Council's primary activity since May 15, 2011 has been to prepare our new university governance system for its upcoming year. I organized and hosted an orientation meeting on August 23 for all standing university committee members. In attendance were members of the following University Committees: Academic Affairs; Curriculum; Faculty Affairs; General Education; Budget Advisory; Sabbaticals, Fellowships, and Faculty Awards; Appeals and Grievances; Faculty Organization; and Student Affairs and Campus Life Advisory. We met as a group to review the overall governance structure, the approval process for committee business, information flow, and university meeting calendar. Following this session, individual committees met to elect officers, settle their calendars, and develop agendas for their fall meetings. Other participants in this orientation meeting were John Morello, who explained the timeline for approval of curriculum changes for the upcoming year, and Tim O'Donnell, who spoke briefly about SACS reaccreditation. In addition, Jo Tyler, UFC Secretary, has been working on restructuring and adding informative content to the UFC's web site: <http://ufc.umw.edu>. She presented the web site and its features to the meeting's attendees.

Several tasks will occupy the attention of the University Faculty Council this fall. First, we will receive and discuss the most recently revised Honors Program proposal during our September 13 meeting. We are committed to approving an Honors Program in time for full participation by the August 2012 matriculating class. Second, we will be paying careful attention to our institution's progress toward reaffirmation of SACS accreditation, and since the Quality Enhancement Plan is an integral component of that process, we will also closely monitor its development over the coming months. Finally, 2011-12 will be an important test year for our new committee structure, and thus, one of our top priorities will be to ensure that it operates efficiently and according to the University Faculty Handbook.

Minutes of the University Curriculum Committee  
University of Mary Washington  
23 August 2011

Present: Voting members:

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

Non-voting members:

- John Morello – Associate Provost

The meeting came to order at 10 a.m. in Jepson 219 immediately following the general University committee organizational meeting.

Mary Beth Mathews was elected chair of the committee, and Gary Richards was elected secretary. A designated representative from the Registrar's office will complete the six-member committee.\*

The committee began preliminary discussion of providing “clear direction for the college-level curriculum committees as to which curricular actions require University-level oversight and which do not, so as to prevent course and/or program duplication.”

John Morello invited the committee to consider a review of courses that have not been recently offered.

The committee will next meet Friday, 9 September 2011, at 3 p.m. in Trinkle Hall in a room to be secured and announced to the committee by Mary Beth Mathews.

The meeting adjourned at approximately 11 a.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Gary Richards

\* Per a 30 August email from Rita Dunston, the representative from the Registrar will be Kevin Caffrey, Senior Associate Registrar.

Minutes of the University Faculty Affairs Committee  
University of Mary Washington  
August 23, 2011

Present:

Wei Chen (Management and Marketing) – College of Business  
Alan Griffith (Biology) – College of Arts and Sciences  
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

The meeting came to order at 10:00am, immediately following the general University committee organization meeting.

Keith Mellinger was elected chair of the committee, and Leslie Martin was elected secretary.

The committee discussed its charge, considering issues of faculty welfare, compensation and evaluation.

The committee will meet next on September 9<sup>th</sup>, 2011 at 4pm in Trinkle 119.

The meeting adjourned at approximately 11:00am.

Respectfully submitted,

Leslie Martin

**To:** All Teaching Faculty

**From:** Honors Program Committee

Kelli Slunt, Director, CAS, Chemistry

Laurie Abeel, COE, Foundation, Leadership, and Special Populations

Porter Blakemore, CAS, History and American Studies

Gail Brooks, COB, Accounting and Management Information Systems

Teresa Kennedy, CAS, English, Linguistics, and Communication

Suzanne Sumner, CAS, Mathematics

**CC:** Richard Finkelstein

Jay Harper

Mary Gendernalik-Cooper

Lynne Richardson

John Morello

**RE:** Changes to the Honors Program Proposal based on feedback received

The Honors Program committee has continued to work to modify the proposal for the program based on comments and feedback provided at faculty senate meetings and email correspondences.

### **Revised Program Highlights**

The following is a list of the major changes to the proposal:

- Reduced the number of credit hours required for each year from 9 credits to 6 credits
- Removed the requirement of a second honors first-year seminar
- Added the requirements of WI and SI to the honors first-year seminar – this would make the seminar more distinctive from the non-honors FSEMs and provide those students with the ability to fulfill some general education requirements in the program.
- Honors designated coursework remains an integral part of the program. We would like to encourage the faculty to consider creating honors sections of existing courses. Keep in mind when revising courses to not add additional assignments but rather change the approach or types of assignments utilized in the courses. For example, natural science faculty could consider altering the laboratory component of their courses to include more research-like experiments, greater exposure to the primary literature, or increased hands-on use of instrumentation. These courses will not be restricted to honors students. In addition, students who are not formally admitted to the honors program may not complete more than four honors courses during their tenure at UMW.

- Removal of the tutorials from the program, based on concerns about staffing the tutorials and avoiding over-burdening of the faculty.
- Altered the required service project and the leadership from course requirements to program requirements. For service project, students must complete a pre-approved project but it does not have to be associated with a specific course. This experience could involve work with a community based club, completion of “community service option” offered in some departments. For the leadership component, students will participate in admission related events and mentoring of other honors students.

## University of Mary Washington Honors Program Proposal

### **Mission:**

As appropriate to a small liberal arts university with strong traditions of individualized attention, honor, and strong community connections, the Honors Program at the University of Mary Washington will enhance students' intellectual growth by engaging them in rigorous honors designated coursework, interdisciplinary seminars, strong internship experiences, extended research and creative projects, and community service that develops a community of learners. The program will seek students whose performance and intellectual abilities demonstrate that they have the range of talents and skills to thrive in diverse communities. Ongoing assessment will insure that the program is continually updated to meet the needs of our students and the institution.

### **Honors Program Curriculum:**

In keeping with the mission outlined above, this curriculum provides students with an intellectually rigorous program that challenges them to apply academic excellence in the broader community. It is a combination of fixed and elective requirements that offer students a great deal of flexibility. To this end, the program is "porous," meaning that there are multiple points of entry and many opportunities for non-Honors students to benefit from Honors offerings. Honors designated courses will not be restricted to honors students. In addition, students who are not formally admitted to the honors program may not complete more than four honors courses during their tenure at UMW.

The first two years of the program will emphasize breadth of study in the liberal arts, interdisciplinary thinking, and community engagement. The second two years of the program will emphasize advanced work on a disciplinary or interdisciplinary project.

In particular, the curricular goals of the program are:

1. To develop intellectual skills such as:
  1. Critical thinking
  2. Communication (oral and written)
  3. Creativity
  4. Independence
2. To integrate academic work with engagement in the broader community through activities such as:
  1. Learning through service on campus and beyond
  2. Participating in internships
3. To provide

1. enhanced opportunities for long-term student research and performance projects
2. increased opportunities for interdisciplinary experiences in areas where appropriate

## **Requirements**

All Honors students must complete a minimum of **6** credits of Honors work each year and maintain a GPA of 3.2 in all of their coursework. “Honors work” is a broad category that encompasses many learning contexts and pedagogical methods. Students will be able to craft an individualized curriculum that suits and challenges them. Academic departments will also have flexibility to offer those Honors experiences best suited to their curricular and logistical needs. Some Honors courses will have across-the-curriculum and general education designations once approved by the appropriate committees. Students who want to accelerate their experience at UMW can fulfill these course requirements in less than four years.

### **Yearly Requirements**

- Maintain a 3.2 GPA overall – a student who does not maintain a 3.2 overall GPA will not be allowed to continue in the program
- Successfully complete a minimum of 6 Honors credits per year
- Participate in a minimum of one Honors co-curricular event per semester (a minimum of 8 events prior to graduation)

### **First Year Requirements**

- Honors First Year Seminar (3 credits)
- Honors designated coursework and/or Honors contract based coursework\*\* (3 credits)

### **Second Year Requirements**

- Sponsored/mentored Service Project\*\*
- Honors designated coursework and/or contract based coursework\*\* (6 credits)

### **Third Year Requirements**

- Project/Research Design Seminar (1 course)
- Mentor First Year Honors students – attend/participate with the Honors First Year Seminar course or with first year advising
- Honors designated coursework and/or contract based coursework\*\* (3-6 credits)

### **Fourth Year Requirements**

- Capstone Honors Course OR Honors Project (Thesis or Performance) in a discipline OR Interdisciplinary Project\*\* (minimum 3 credits)
- Honors designated coursework and/or contract based coursework\*\* (3 credits)
- Honors Program leadership – help admissions recruit potential honors students through events such as participation in tours, Showcase, special events (2 events during the fourth year)

\*\* must be pre-approved by the Honors Director/Committee

(minimum of 24 credits total)

### **Overview**

All students in the program must complete a minimum of **6** credits per year of Honors work in order to remain in good standing. All students in the program must successfully complete 1-5 below as part of those credits. The program will have multiple points of entry which are described later.

The Honors Program is comprised of several experiences, including:

1. Honors First Year Seminar
2. Second Year Sponsored/mentored Service Project
3. Third Year Project/Research Design Seminar
4. Capstone Honors Course OR Honors Project
5. Honors Electives, including:
  - Independent Study or Internship
  - Honors sections of existing courses
  - Graduate courses cross-listed as honors undergraduate courses
  - Honors individual learning contracts in non-Honors courses
  - Stand alone Honors courses (also open to non-Honors students)

### **Program Components**

#### **Honors Co-curricular Events**

UMW sponsors various co-curricular events throughout the academic year (i.e. seminars from outside speakers, the Great Lives series, films). Honors students are encouraged to attend as many of these events as possible and are required to attend at least one per semester. A list of suggested/approved events will be provided to honors students regularly.

#### **Honors First Year Seminar**

The *Honors First Year seminar* will build upon the FSEM 100 course. Using a variety of sources, the seminars will emphasize concepts such as leadership and civic engagement to develop important intellectual processes, such as critical thinking, writing, and oral expression. The courses will be problem-focused within a broad general area, e.g. the natural sciences, humanities, social sciences, or arts. The Honors FSEM course would be designated as writing and speaking intensive. Students will study a problem from multiple perspectives, working as a group to understand its academic and practical aspects. For example, a chemist and a geographer might lead a seminar on “Water Quality.” This might appeal to potential science majors, geographers, or others. Coursework would include water chemistry, understanding the nature of pollution from a chemical and social perspective, and techniques for finding and/or creating clean water. Students in this seminar would be encouraged to work in their second year as a group or individually on service projects dedicated to improving water supplies in communities that need them. Seminars focusing on topics such as biologically caused damage to historic buildings, developing ethics in schools, or green technology would serve this purpose as well.

*(3 credits)*

*The seminar will be intended to meet the FSEM general education requirement.*

### **Sponsored Mentored Service Projects**

During the second year, all Honors students will complete a mentored service learning project. These can take many forms, including service internships, individual projects, team service projects, participation with club service learning projects, etc. In all cases, the goal will be to apply knowledge gained in coursework to problems in the community beyond UMW.

A distinctive option will be the Sophomore Honors Team Service Project. Students will be encouraged to create teams and engage in broad, multifaceted service projects that apply coursework from their First Year Seminars. In the “Water Quality” example, students from that seminar and interested others would work together on a year-long service project to, for example, bring clean water to a rural area in Appalachia (or Peru). All Honors Service Projects would be mentored by faculty members and Student Affairs staff and must be pre-approved by the Honors Director/Committee.

*These projects might meet the experiential learning general education requirement.*

### **Project/Research Methods Seminar**

The project methods seminar will introduce students to epistemological questions within and/or between disciplines. Faculty in appropriate disciplines will mentor students in the introductory phase of the capstone project (e.g. research methodologies appropriate to the discipline). This course will help them find a project advisor, define their learning objectives, explore methodology, consider the nature of disciplines and interdisciplinarity, and begin their

literature review. This course must be completed prior to the capstone honors project must be pre-approved by the Honors Director/Committee. Honors program committee envisions that division seminars (i.e. Natural Sciences, Social Sciences, etc.) will be offered with rotating faculty of record. Departments with existing research methodology courses could apply for honors designation to meet this requirement. *(1 course)*

### **Capstone Honors Course OR Honors Project**

There are several options for the capstone project. It is anticipated that the project will grow out of the Project Design Seminar.

The first option is the completion of a departmental project that will bring University Honors. Departments will oversee these projects, perform evaluation, and provide project advising.

The second option is completion of an interdisciplinary project that will bring University Honors. These projects will be advised by appropriate faculty and must be pre-approved by the Honors Director/Committee. This option is intended for those students whose goals do not neatly fit the requirements of their major department(s), but who intend to complete a rigorous capstone research or performance experience.

*(minimum 3 credits)*

### **Honors individual learning contracts in non-Honors courses**

Honors students may enter into a learning contract with the faculty member instructing any course. The instructor will, in consultation with the student and the Honors program director, create a different (not just additional) program of learning. This might include primary source reading, modified exam questions, projects, etc. The goal of these contracts is to provide flexibility to both students and departments. Instructors may choose to or not to enter into a contract. These contracts must be pre-approved by the Honors Director/Committee.

*(credits as appropriate to discipline)*

### **Honors courses**

If enrollments permit, departments will be encouraged to offer courses specifically designed for Honors and other advanced students. These courses would be designated as Honors courses, but would be open to all. Rigor, innovative pedagogy and special topics would distinguish Honors courses from other advanced work. Interdisciplinary and team-taught courses will also be encouraged and departments that participate will be supported with hire-behinds by the Dean's Office.

*(credits as appropriate to discipline)*

### **Entry Points**

Most students entering the Honors program will do so upon admission to the university. However, others may apply for acceptance after matriculation, during their first year. Such students must have a 3.2 overall UMW GPA or higher and two letters of recommendation from UMW faculty. Students entering after matriculation will be required to successfully complete Honors First-year Seminar, the Project Design Seminar, the Capstone experience and the mentored service project, in order to be awarded University Honors. The 6 credit per year requirement and minimum of 8 co-curricular events before graduation will also apply to these students for those semesters in which they are part of the Honors program. Exceptions to these policies can be made by the Honors committee/director in extraordinary circumstances.

### **Transcript Designations**

A student completing all of these requirements would receive a designation on their transcript of "University Honors." A student who solely completes departmental honors will have "Departmental Honors in *Discipline*" noted on their transcripts.

Note that departmental Honors will continue to be distinct from the Honors program. Honors in each discipline will still be administered by academic departments based on requirements they determine.

### **Student Learning Outcomes for the Honors Program (draft)**

Upon the completion of the honors program at Mary Washington, in addition to earning the appropriate credits for their degrees, students should be able to:

- analyze their own and others' assumptions and carefully evaluate the relevance of historical, social, analytical, and ethical contexts when presenting a position using a methodology appropriate to their discipline.
- demonstrate a sophisticated appreciation of the value of interdisciplinary study
- interpret intercultural experience from multiple social, economic, and ethnic perspectives, beyond simple categories of race, class, and gender.
- investigate a research topic to gain substantial and additional knowledge as well as actively pursue independent educational experiences.
- demonstrate critical reading, writing, speaking, problem solving, and thinking skills that incorporate information literacy, an appreciation of audience, and the rigors of specific disciplines or interdisciplinarity as appropriate to their fields of study.
- demonstrate an appreciation of ethical behavior and the values of good citizenship and service

### **Student Learning Outcomes for the Honors First-Year Seminar Course (HFSEM)**

Upon completion of the HFSEM, students must demonstrate:

- literacy skills that include web-based and traditional forms of verbal and written discourse
- competence in formulating an academic argument with appropriate research documentation
- the ability to complete independent research
- an appreciation of the importance of intentional learning
- an understanding of the liberal arts as an encyclopedic, systematic approach to knowledge.
- an ability to apply specific academic problems to a broader, interdisciplinary field of study

### **Student Learning Outcomes for the Project/Research Methodology Seminar Course**

Upon completion of the Project/Research Methodology Seminar Course, students must demonstrate:

- an understanding of process of framing and conducting unique research using methodologies appropriate to a discipline
- an ability to identify and locate appropriate resources necessary to conduct research

- skills in critically reading the literature resources associated with a research project
- ability to articulate a plan for a research project