MINUTES
University Faculty Council
University of Mary Washington

November 8, 2011

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

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

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

1. Call to Order. The meeting was called to order by the Chair at 4:05 p.m. in the Red Room of the Woodard Campus Center.

2. Reading and Approval of Minutes. Members had received the minutes of the previous meeting of October 11, 2011 (Attachment 1), so a formal reading of the minutes was dispensed with. There were no corrections or additions. Leigh Frackelton moved that the minutes be approved, Suzanne Sumner seconded, and the motion was approved unanimously by voice vote.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

In discussion it was stated that the Office of Institutional Analysis and Effectiveness is conducting a pilot study on the effectiveness of the online course evaluation process, and that this study should address the issues in the proposed charge. It was also pointed out that the pilot study focuses on the online process and does not address the evaluation questionnaire itself. Teresa Kennedy explained that the faculty are not only interested in the validity of the process used to disseminate the questionnaire (whether online or in person), but also the validity of the instrument itself, since it is the just about the only documentation, other than self-reported accomplishments, that is used for faculty evaluation. There was general consensus that evaluation needs to be multi-sourced and that the UFAC should investigate other sources for documentation in the faculty evaluation process. Stephen Davies pointed out that there is research showing that online and paper-based data cannot be compared and suggested that the committee examine how the process of data collection affects the usability of the data. Dean Finkelstein pointed out that departments and individual faculty members vary widely in their attitude toward online versus paper-based evaluations and that there are many factors that contribute to these variations. Teresa Kennedy proposed that the charge to the committee be revised to include investigating the use of multiple sources in the evaluation process, and Andrew Dolby suggested that it also include making recommendations about the criteria included on the student course evaluations. He agreed to work with Suzanne Sumner to reword the charge to the committee and to circulate it to the UFC for an electronic vote before sending it to the UFAC (Attachment 17).

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

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

Respectfully submitted,

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

October 11, 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, Honors Program Director Kelli Slunt, Student Government Association Academic Affairs Chair Meagan Holbrook, College of Education Faculty President Norah Hooper, Chair of University Academic Affairs Committee Nicole Crowder, Representative from the University Faculty Organization Committee David Rettinger, Chair of the Quality Enhancement Plan Committee Alan Griffith

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 September 13, 2011 (Attachment 1), so a formal reading of the minutes was dispensed with. There were no corrections or additions. Teresa Kennedy moved that the minutes be approved, Leigh Frackelton seconded, and the motion was approved unanimously by voice vote.

3. President’s Report. President Hurley announced that he will begin a fundraising tour soon and that he has been meeting recently with various state officials in discussions about the Governor’s Top Jobs (TJ21) initiatives. He noted that while these initiatives favor large research institutions, the state’s liberal arts and sciences universities are beginning to be heard. He thanked the faculty for their participation in making the previous week’s Inaugural activities so successful.

   In response to questions about the outcome of the Compensation Study, President Hurley explained that the recommendations from the Deans are on his desk and that he hopes to make the final announcement within a week or so. The Provost added that a summary has been shared with the Chair of the University Faculty Affairs Committee. He noted that the primary issue was compression, but that there were different issues addressed in each college.

   Questions were also asked about faculty input in the budget process. President Hurley explained that there are two budget documents which are handled differently. The 6-year plan (see Attachment 3) is the document that addresses the Governor’s TJ21 initiatives. The President explained that we had a short timeframe in which to prepare this document, so the process was through the Deans. We will have a longer timeframe for next year’s version of the 6-year plan. The other budget document is the internal operations budget, which goes through the colleges and the administrative division vice presidents. Both documents were reviewed by the Budget.
Advisory Committee. The President pointed out that he rarely prioritizes an item on the budget that the BAC hasn’t also identified as a priority.

A question was raised about the intensive summer program that is listed on the 6-year plan. John Morello explained that it is a proposal in response to the requirements in the TJ21 legislation for universities to increase year-round use of facilities and to shorten the time it takes for students to graduate. A related question was asked about the emphasis in the legislation on funding of STEM programs. In discussion it was explained that resources will not be taken from humanities to fund STEM initiatives. The President explained that this has been a concern of all the liberal arts universities in the state, and that the message is being heard in Richmond.

A final question was asked about whether any revisions will be made to the university’s policy on student protests. President Hurley said that the policy has not been revised. Jo Tyler suggested that if any changes are recommended in the future, they be submitted to the University Student Affairs and Campus Life Committee.

4. Provost’s Report. The provost said that he would not give a report at this time.

5. College of Business Dean’s Report. Dean Richardson said that the college is beginning to address the requirements for AACSB accreditation. She has been talking to faculty about academic research and developing a research culture in the college. She has also been meeting with local business leaders and will be traveling to meet with alumni for fundraising. The COB faculty have formed two task forces, one on assessment and one on the future of the MBA program. They are also looking at the BPS program and transitioning it to a BS on the Stafford Campus.

6. College of Education Dean’s Report. Dean Gendernalik-Cooper did not have a formal report, but made a clarification about an article in the Bullet, which reported that new programs have been added in the COE. She stated that no new programs have been developed; rather new pathways have been added to enable students to complete current programs in different ways.

7. College of Arts and Sciences Dean’s Report. Dean Finkelstein extended thanks to the Faculty Senate especially and to the faculty for the progress being made in development of new programs that might be funded through the TJ21 legislation. He noted that TJ21 should not have a negative impact on CAS goals and emphasized that what we already do in CAS fits well with the TJ21 priorities. On the topic of the Compensation Study, he noted that the big issue in CAS is compression, and he recommended raises for those faculty most affected.

8. UFC Chairperson’s Report. Andrew Dolby reported that he has been fielding many inquiries about the timing of committee meetings and reporting procedures. In response, he issued a memo detailing the timeline for curriculum changes.

9. Committee Reports. Andrew Dolby suggested that we accept all of the committee reports, except the Faculty Organization Committee, in one motion. Two of the committees had proposed motions which were taken up separately under New Business. The discussion of the committee reports is summarized as follows:

Standing Committees:
a. Academic Affairs Committee (Attachment 2): no questions or comments; a motion to reword the policy about incompletes to be discussed under New Business
   b. Budget Advisory Committee (Attachments 3 and 4): no questions or comments
   c. Curriculum Committee (Attachments 5 and 6): Mary Beth Mathews pointed out that the committee established certain types of minor curriculum changes that do not have to be approved by the University Curriculum Committee.
   d. Faculty Affairs Committee (Attachment 7): no questions or comments
   e. Faculty Appeals and Grievances Committee: no report
   f. General Education Committee (Attachment 8): no questions or comments; a motion to modify the Human Experience and Society requirement to be discussed under New Business
   g. Sabbaticals, Fellowships and Faculty Awards Committee (Attachment 9): no questions or comments
   h. Student Affairs and Campus Life Committee (Attachment 10): no questions or comments

Other Advisory and Special Interest Committees:
   a. Academic Resources Advisory Committee: no report
   b. Distance and Blended Learning Committee: no report
   c. First Year Seminar Committee (Attachments 11 and 12): A question was raised about whether the UFC has a role in approving the learning outcomes. Jo Tyler pointed out that according to the Handbook, one of the duties of the committee is to “review and approve or reject” proposals for courses. In discussion the consensus was that the role of the University-level committees is to determine if proposals from a college would cause any conflicts with the curriculums in other colleges. The UFC’s role is to accept the reports of the committees or to ask for revision or clarification when needed.
   d. James Farmer Multicultural Center Advisory Committee (Attachment 13): no questions or comments
   e. Speaking Intensive Committee (Attachment 14): no questions or comments
   f. Teaching Center Advisory Committee: no report
   g. Writing Intensive Committee (Attachments 15 and 16): no questions or comments

Teresa Kennedy made a motion to accept all of the committee reports except the University Faculty Organization Committee’s report. The motion was seconded by Suzanne Sumner and approved unanimously by a voice vote.

10. Report of the University Faculty Organization Committee. The committee had submitted a report (Attachment 17) explaining a procedure for preferential voting to improve the efficiency of committee elections. David Rettinger explained that the current run-off method is unwieldy, so the UFOC has studied an alternative in which voters rank their preferences for more than one candidate. The election results of this type of balloting are calculated by software. Questions focused on how the method arrives at the best candidate. David Rettinger explained that there has been a lot of research about this and other methods, and this one makes it possible to arrive at the best candidate for a majority of voters, especially when it is a multiple-seat election. Andrew Dolby suggested that the idea should be discussed in the colleges and then the UFOC should draw up a formal proposal for the Faculty Handbook to be considered by the UFC.
Teresa Kennedy made a motion to accept the report of the UFOC; the motion was seconded by Suzanne Sumner and approved unanimously by a voice vote.

11. Motion from Academic Affairs Committee. The proposed motion to revise the wording about incompletes in the Undergraduate Academic Catalog and the Dictionary of Academic Regulations was contained in the committee’s report (Attachment 2). Mary Beth Mathews brought the motion to the floor and it was seconded by Leigh Frackelton. There was no discussion. It was approved unanimously by a voice vote.

12. Honors Program Learning Outcomes (Attachment 18). This discussion was deferred from the previous meeting of the UFC. Stephen Davies noted that the discussion in CAS involved outcome A, and Kelli Slunt explained that the intention was to make the wording of the outcomes broad enough to allow a variety of courses and not attempt to detail a number of specifics. Andrew Dolby asked whether non-honors program students who take an honors course would have the honors designation appear on their transcript. Kelli Slunt explained that the honors designation for individual courses will be like the across-the-curriculum designations and will not appear on transcripts, but for students who are in the Honors Program, that information will appear on their transcripts.

Teresa Kennedy made a motion that the proposed Honors Program Learning Outcomes be approved; the motion was seconded by Mary Beth Mathews and approved by a unanimous voice vote. Andrew Dolby asked that the University Faculty Organization Committee develop a proposal to revise the Faculty Handbook to include the Honors Program Committee.

13. Motion from the General Education Committee. The proposed motion to modify the wording of the Human Experience and Society requirement was contained in the committee’s report (Attachment 8). The change involves listing academic disciplines in which this requirement could be met in order to comply more explicitly with a SACS requirement. Jo Tyler brought the motion to the floor and it was seconded by Teresa Kennedy. Mary Beth Mathews pointed out that none of the humanities disciplines are listed, but there was no further discussion. The motion was approved unanimously by a voice vote.

14. Information Technology Advisory Committee Strategic Plan Proposal. The committee had previously posted its proposal for the 2011-2013 IT Strategic Plan at http://itplan.umwblogs.org/the-plan/ and asked for feedback from the faculty. Suzanne Sumner mentioned that in the Mathematics Department there is concern about the move away from computer labs because some of the software is licensed only for certain computers. Jay Harper suggested that this concern can be addressed through future licensing agreements. Jo Tyler mentioned that on the Stafford Campus there is concern about the support for distance and blended learning. John Morello explained that the duties of the former Director of Distance and Blended Learning have been reassigned and spread across several individuals in DTLT, and he offered to have a list of support contacts prepared.

15. Quality Enhancement Plan. Alan Griffith gave an update on the QEP, which is titled “Understanding and Improving the First-Year Experience.” This project is part of the SACS reaffirmation. The scope of the project is incoming freshmen, so it does not include transfer students or graduate students in their first year. The committee has been studying a large body of
existing data in order to determine specific needs of the target group of students. The needs will lead to development of improved learning outcomes and improved program assessment. In response to questions, Alan Griffith explained that a new website for the QEP will be created soon because communication is a large part of the project and more involvement of faculty will be needed. Rick Hurley explained that the budget for the QEP that is in the 6-year plan is just an estimate and the eventual budget will depend on what the committee proposes, but it is not expected to be a large amount. Alan Griffith added that during the SACS review they will be looking to see if we are devoting sufficient resources.

16. Governance. Andrew Dolby handed out a memo outlining his views about reforming University faculty governance.

The meeting was adjourned at 5:50 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Jo Tyler, UFC Secretary
To: The University of Mary Washington Board of Visitors’ Academic Affairs Committee

From: Andrew Dolby, University Faculty Council Chair

Date: November 2, 2011

RE: University Faculty Council Chair’s report

Since the September 16 meeting of the Board of Visitors, the University Faculty Council has approved implementation of the university’s new Honors program, effective fall 2012. The Honors Program committee is now receiving honors course proposals. Our next task is to establish the Honors Program Advisory Committee as a permanent university committee to ensure the ongoing expansion and maintenance of the program.

We have also begun to process routine university business such as approving curriculum revisions and adjustments to academic policy and referring emerging governance issues to appropriate university committees. As we fulfill our charge, we are carefully evaluating how our newly created governance structure might be improved for next year. We are documenting strengths and weaknesses of our current roster of university committees and overall approval procedures for various business items. Additionally, over the coming weeks, we will be reconsidering the UFC’s agenda and systematically reassessing which issues should lie under its purview versus under the jurisdiction of individual colleges. I have focused much of my personal attention on ideas to reform faculty governance so that it is as efficient, responsive, and transparent as possible. The UFC is planning further discussion on this subject over the coming weeks.

Jo Tyler, Leigh Frackelton, and I attended two President’s Leadership Council meetings and the October Board of Visitors’ Academic Affairs Committee meeting. During these meetings, we provided governance updates and conveyed faculty concerns regarding institutional support for delivery of the university’s existing academic programs and the faculty’s increasing administrative workload. Additionally, Jo Tyler has taken the lead in maintaining the UFC’s web site and integrating it with the new university web site. She has created an efficient system for posting UFC and university committee documents and has added to her secretarial duties continuous updating of these documents.

Please contact me if you have any questions or concerns regarding this report.

Phone: 540-654-1420
Email: adolby@umw.edu
University Academic Affairs Committee Report to University Faculty Council (October 2011)

The University Academic Affairs Committee met on Friday, September 26th, 2011.

The committee continued our discussion on clarifying our policy for transfer credit for Cambridge A-level Examinations. As a result of our discussion, information will be solicited from the appropriate departments regarding the credit they would award for Cambridge A-level exams. The committee will consider our policy for exams in subjects that we do not offer at UMW (such as certain foreign languages) once this preliminary data is received.

The committee also examined our policy on undergraduate course credit for graduate level courses. The consensus of the committee was that the current policies do account for any scenario that may arise in currently-offered programs.

Respectfully submitted,

Nicole Crowder, Chair of the University Academic Affairs Committee
Budget Advisory Committee Meeting Minutes  
September 26, 2011

In Attendance: Joe Romero, Paul Messplay, Nabil Al-Tikriti, Tim O’Donnell, Dana Hall, Danny Tweedy and Tamie Pratt-Fartro

1) Meeting called to order at 7:30 by Joe Romero

2) Approval of the minutes from 9/19/11 postponed until everyone has a chance to read more fully; will circulate online and approve at next week’s meeting

3) Reminder about BAC report due to UFC by November 8th which will include reporting out on President Hurley’s budget items for 2011 put forth from 2010 recommendations from BAC

4) Paul’s Report to the Committee (working from Table B Summary previously distributed):
   
   a. Reviewed the circulated PowerPoint presentation given to new board members
   b. Six-year plan impacting budget process; all items put forth in budget to state had to also be included in the six-year plan
   c. President requested everything in six-year plan
   d. 56% general funds and 44% tuition and fees will cover items that the state says can be funded
   e. State does not provide any state funds for out of state students; model is 67% from the state for in-state students
   f. Governor will release budget to General Assembly in mid-December 2011, so we’ll know more regarding funding priorities / available funds
   g. Governor interested in incentive-based initiatives rather than giving institutions a lump sum of money to do with as they see fit
   h. Table B: Sources and Uses Summary; Paul explained each category:
      a. Ed and General Programs: to balance budget, 2.5 million set aside due to state budget cuts and loss of stimulus funds on a one-time basis only
      b. Auxiliary Enterprises: no state support so have to generate own funds or get from student fees; this includes bookstore, dining, housing, athletics, debt services; 4.3 million taken each year from this category to support E&G as mandated by the state
      c. We discussed university contracts (such as dining/catering) and explored the possibly of requesting faculty, staff and student input when those are ready to be renewed
      d. Student Financial Assistance: money from state for in-state need- based students; out-of-state students have to cover 100% of their costs; $8800 in state; $20534 out-of-state tuition and fees (not housing and board)
      e. Discussion of different tuition models for out-of-state students and how student athletes might be affected
      f. Museums and Cultural Services
         i. Belmont and James Monroe 2/3 state support and rest themselves
      g. Higher Education Centers:
         i. Dahlgren kept separate so that we don’t mix funds from E&G
ii. Status of Dahlgren: some contracts negotiated and leasing building now
h. General Fund Support slide (bar graph on PowerPoint): state has steadily been withdrawing their funds so we have to back-fill from tuition and fees
i. Tuition and Fees slide compared to other institutions in VA
   i. In-state commuter students; we had the highest tuition and fees increase in the state last year and we stayed at the same ranking
j. Anderson and Monroe and Convergence Center paid for by state funds
k. Dining Hall and dorms funded by student fees

5) Questions:
   a. Tim asked Paul to discuss the increases and decreases in percentages that are most significant; we discussed Student Services which includes increased in areas such as Leadership, Freshman Orientation and Admissions

6) Next Meeting on October 3, 2011 at 7:30 in Trinkle 243
   a. Review Recommendations funded last year and six-year plan; homework for members: look at president’s decisions and the alignment with our recommendations along with six-year plan

7) Looking Ahead:
   a. October 28th is goal for getting report finished for UFC which is due three days prior to the meeting on November 8th
   b. Future Directions: budget requests must reflect institutional effectiveness process; Paul will share instructions given to VPs, Deans, etc. with Tim so that perhaps we can revise to reflect more useful recommendations
   c. Two weeks: Review draft of instructions that will go to VPs, Deans; if members have ideas that need to be included in those instructions, circulate via email and if time, we will discuss within the next two meetings
   d. Nabil brought up faculty input in the process; perhaps we could put on a future agenda

8) Meeting adjourned at 9am
UMW Budget Advisory Committee Meeting Minutes
October 3, 2011

In Attendance: Joe Romero, Jay Harper, Dana Hall, Tim O’Donnell, Rick Pearce, Paul Messplay, Nabil Al-Tikriti, Danny Tweedy, and Tamie Pratt-Fartro

1. Meeting called to order at 7:35am
2. Motion made by Tim to approve Minutes from 9-19-11; motion seconded by Nabil and approved unanimously
3. Rick briefly discussed refinancing Eagle Landing:
   a. Currently an agreement with UMW Foundation to operate EL as a support agreement; no lease; Foundation owns the asset (EL)
4. President Hurley’s Actions on 2011-2012 Budget:
   a. CAS, COE and COB replacement positions to be hired in 2012-2013; not part of $500,000 expenditure
   b. Discussed need for additional information about how $500,000 related to faculty was spent in 2011-2012
   c. $100,000 to address faculty positions identified in Compensation Study; the Compensation Study addressed teaching faculty and administrative faculty separately; Provost Harper makes recommendations to President Hurley on the allocation of the $100,000 for teaching faculty once the funds are released
   d. Summer School: no excess revenue generated, so no revenue-sharing from Summer 2011
   e. Anderson Center: $500,000 increase in budget last year and that amount will continue into future budgets
   f. Fitness Center: $50,000 increase was to lease new cardio equipment
5. Will need to revisit the 2011-2012 Consolidated Request Summary next week
7. Motion to Adjourn made by Tim and seconded by Dana; meeting adjourned at 9am
Minutes of the University Curriculum Committee
University of Mary Washington
26 September 2011

Present: Voting members:
- Gail Brooks (Accounting and Management Information Systems) – College of Business
- Beverly Epps (Foundation, Leadership, and Special Populations) – College of Education
- Gary Richards (English, Linguistics, and Communication), secretary – College of Arts and Sciences

Non-voting members:
- Rita Dunston – Registrar
- John Morello – Associate Provost

Acting chair Gary Richards called the meeting to order at 3:04 p.m. in Trinkle B6.

Minutes of the 9 September meeting had been circulated and approved electronically, and secretary Gary Richards had filed them with UFC. They are posted at http://ufc.umw.edu/committees/university-curriculum-committee/.

The committee approved the following curricular actions send forward by the CAS Curriculum Committee and detailed in their minutes:

- Request to Revise Catalog Description of MUPR 208: Class Piano IV
- Proposal to Revise the Psychology Major
  - Request to Change Credits, Prerequisites, and Catalog Description of PSYC 372: Sensation and Perception
  - Request to Change Credits, Prerequisites, and Catalog Description of PSYC 373: Cognitive Psychology
  - Request to Change Credits, Prerequisites, and Catalog Description of PSYC 374: Physiological Psychology
  - Request to Change Title of PSYC 305: Biocognition to Cognitive Neuroscience
  - Request to Change Title of PSYC 374: Physiological Psychology to Biological Psychology
  - Proposal for a New Course PSYC 411: Research Seminar in Abnormal, Personality, or Social Psychology
  - Proposal for a New Course PSYC 412: Research Seminar in Biological Psychology
  - Proposal for a New Course PSYC 413: Research Seminar in Cognition or Learning
  - Proposal for a New Course PSYC 414: Research Seminar in Developmental Psychology
  - Proposal for a New Course PSYC 492: Individual Research
  - Request to Delete PSYC 306: Biocognition Laboratory
  - Request to Delete PSYC 375: Experimental Social Psychology
  - Request to Delete PSYC 381: Applied Behavioral Analysis
  - Request to Change Catalog Description of PSYC 490: Guided Readings in Psychology
  - Request to Change Catalog Description of PSYC 491: Individual Research
  - Request to Change Catalog Description for Requirements in the Psychology Major
- Proposal for a New Concentration (Geospatial Information Systems Concentration) in the
Computer Science Major

• Proposal for a New Course HISP 323: Heritage Tourism


• Request to Revise Catalog Description of CPSC 105: Problem-Solving with Databases

The committee did not act upon the proposal for a new course IDIS 350M: The Holocaust and Its Representations in Germany since this was determined not to be a new course but rather an iteration within a variable topics course.

The committee approved the following curricular actions send forward by the COE Curriculum Committee and detailed in their minutes:

• Request to Change the Co-requisites and Revise Catalog Descriptions of EDSE 519: General and Special Education Goals and Practices: Elementary and EDSE 521: Language and Literacy for Special Populations (FLSP)


• Request to Revise Catalog Description of EDSE 541: Goals and Practices for Students Accessing an Adapted Curriculum (FLSP)

• Request to Revise Catalog Description of TESL 512: Second Language Acquisition (FLSP)

Mary Beth Mathews updated the committee via email about the ongoing assessment of unoffered courses.

The committee continued its discussion to determine expedited curricular actions and voted that changes to and deletions of existing courses in isolation that affect other majors and/or programs may not be expedited.

The committee also discussed standardizing curricular forms and procedures to be used by all three colleges.
The committee will next meet Friday, 21 October 2011. Three p.m. was the agreed upon time of that meeting.

The meeting adjourned at 3:55 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Gary Richards
Minutes of the University Curriculum Committee
University of Mary Washington
21 October 2011

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

Non-voting members:
- Rita Dunston – Registrar
- John Morello – Associate Provost

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

Minutes of the 26 September meeting had been circulated and approved electronically, and secretary Gary Richards had filed them with UFC. They are posted at http://ufc.umw.edu/committees/university-curriculum-committee/.

The committee continued its discussion of standardizing curricular forms and procedures to be used by all three colleges. Further input from staff of the Registrar’s Office will be solicited for the potentially concluding discussion at the 16 November meeting.

The committee continued its discussion of the ongoing assessment of unoffered courses. Mary Beth Mathews will solicit department chairs to assist in this process. It was determined that any changes from this assessment will not affect the 2012-2013 catalog.

The committee approved the new course HONR 100: Honors First-Year Seminar. Contingent final approval, the course will be effective Fall 2012.

Contingent upon minor changes and corrections, the committee approved the following curricular actions send forward by the COB Curriculum Committee and detailed in their minutes:

- Request to Revise the Prerequisites and Catalog Descriptions of:
  
  BUAD 310: Principles of Marketing  
  BUAD 312: Retailing: Online, Offline  
  BUAD 331: Intermediate Accounting I  
  BUAD 332: Intermediate Accounting II  
  BUAD 333: Cost/Managerial Accounting  
  BUAD 334: Federal Taxation of Individuals  
  BUAD 335: Federal Taxation of Business  
  BUAD 346: Human Resource Management
BUAD 347: Organizational Development and Change
BUAD 350: Business Communication
BUAD 354: Database Management Systems
BUAD 356: Principles of Knowledge Management Systems
BUAD 363: Operations Management
BUAD 381: Principles of Finance
BUAD 384: Commercial Law
BUAD 410: International Marketing
BUAD 413: Marketing Research
BUAD 414: Marketing Strategy
BUAD 420: Negotiation
BUAD 426: Communication and Technology
BUAD 431: Governmental and Not-for-Profit Accounting
BUAD 432: Advanced Accounting Problems
BUAD 435: Auditing
BUAD 437: Accounting Information Systems
BUAD 441: Information Security
BUAD 446: Systems Analysis and Design
BUAD 448: Project Management for IT
BUAD 460: Management Creativity
BUAD 464: Business Ethics
BUAD 471: Business Administration Seminars
BUAD 473: Environment of International Business Seminar
BUAD 490A: Strategic Management
BUAD 491: Individual Study in Business Administration
BUAD 499: Internship

Contingent final approval, these revisions are set to be effective Fall 2012.

The committee approved the following curricular actions send forward by the COE Curriculum Committee and detailed in their minutes:

- Request to Change the Credits of EDUC 385: Managing the Secondary Classroom from two to three credits. Contingent final approval, these revisions are set to be effective Fall 2012.

However, per a 28 October 2011 email from Beverly Epps, the Department of Curriculum and Instruction withdrew this proposal.

Two requests were returned to the COE Curriculum Committee for revision.

The committee will next meet Wednesday, 16 November 2011.

The meeting adjourned at 3:55 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,
Gary Richards
Report of the University Faculty Affairs Committee Meeting  
University of Mary Washington  
September 26, 2011

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

Absent:  
  Venitta McCall (Foundation, Leadership and Special Populations) – College of Education

The meeting came to order at 4:00pm.

The committee discussed evaluation issues currently before the CAS Faculty Senate pertaining to online evaluations, and changes to current evaluation questions.

The committee also discussed the issue of evaluating all courses, both pre- and post-tenure, an issue brought to the committee by Assistant Provost Taiwo Ande. Discussion centered on the purpose of the student course evaluations, and how that should inform action on this issue. Keith Mellinger will invite Taiwo to the next UFAC meeting to address questions raised by committee members. Keith will also be contacting college leadership about this issue.

The committee will meet next on Oct 21, 2011 at 4pm in Trinkle 119.

The meeting adjourned at approximately 5:10pm.

Respectfully submitted,

Leslie Martin
UFOC meeting  
Trinkle Education Suite  
September 26, 2011  
Meeting Minutes

1. The UFOC committee members agreed that our business this cycle was minimal and we would be able to conduct business online. All members participated in discussion and voting.

2. The draft of the September 16th meeting minutes was edited and then accepted. The minutes were sent to the university governing bodies.

3. Debbie will give a report on progress on the university committee membership database at our next meeting.

4. David presented a report for the UFC regarding preferential voting. The report was approved by the committee. The report was sent to the university governing bodies for consideration. David will attend the UFC meeting on October 11th to elaborate and/or answer questions regarding the voting system.

5. Next meeting will be Friday October 21, 2011 at 4pm, Trinkle Education Suite 2nd floor.
Meeting was called to order at 5 PM in 313 Jepson.

Present: D Baker, chair; J. Gaines, sec.; N. Kim; C. Creque; T. Ande, ex officio; R. Dunston, ex officio; J.-A. Sainz

Approval of Minutes: for the 9/14 meeting with no additional changes.

Old business:

1) T. Ande updated the committee on the progress of the various Gen Ed Assessment groups: Nat Sci (a meeting was held, another planned for 11/14 to approve a final plan, with Fall ’11 and Spring ’12 implementation by different depts.), WI (work has been coordinated with Writing Center and Prof. Salter of Poli Sci will attend next Gen Ed meeting for an update), SI (working to determine coordination with Fsem), Fsem (progress has been made), QR (email from T. Ande’s office has opened communication with dept. heads, responses to be checked in 2 weeks). Discussion was held on the modalities to be used for Spring ’12 reporting process, with a view to succinctness.

2) J.-A. Sainz discussed further streamlining and enhancement of the process for pre-approving Experiential Learning and global Inquiry credit. Handouts were distributed of the EL/GI contract and the SAGE report of current participation. It was noted that EL was by far the most popular of the two options. Students have continued to wish to change existing contracts, though faculty supervisors were not always in the loop of this process. There is considerable uncertainty over the definition of the “reflective component” in these 0-credit options. Discussion was held about whether or not the provost could appoint an individual to handle all or some of the approval process for EL/GI. It was moved by Gaines and seconded by Creque that Sainz be encouraged to set up a committee of four or more instructors experienced with study abroad to better define the “reflective component” and that this committee report back to Gen Ed at its Jan. ’12 meeting. Motion passed.

New Business:

1) L. Pinkerton’s petition for retroactive change of SAGE 000 to SAGE 001 was discussed and approved, with the provision that J.-A. Sainz must first complete all relevant steps for approval of credit through International Studies.

2) C. Brau’s request for re-evaluation of transfer credit in ALPP was discussed and approved.

3) D. Purpura’s request for re-evaluation of transfer credit in ALPP was discussed and set aside, as it appears that adequate ALPP credit was already awarded for another summer course.
4) E. Kissell’s request for re-evaluation of transfer credit in HES was discussed and tabled pending reception of further information.
5) M. Meola’s request for re-evaluation of transfer credit in FSEM was discussed and tabled pending reception of further information from her advisor, D. Hubbard.
6) Shannon Farrar’s request for re-evaluation of transfer credit in ALPP was discussed and denied.
7) Tara Banks’s request for transfer credit in ALPP was discussed and approved.

Meeting was adjourned at 5:25 PM
Sabbaticals, Fellowships, and Faculty Awards Committee
Meeting of 12 October, 2011
Chair: Chris Foss
Secretary: JeanAnn Dabb
Members present: Dawn Bowen, Teresa Coffman, JeanAnn Dabb, Chris Foss, Bob Greene, John Morello (ex-officio)

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

John Morello reported on decisions by college deans regarding sabbatical applications. The eight proposals submitted by CAS faculty were approved by the Dean. No applications were received by the COE and the one proposal from a member of the COB was not recommended for advancement in the process by the Dean of the COB. Bob Greene moved that the Committee approve the eight CAS proposals as funding is available to support that number. Chris Foss seconded the motion and the Committee vote was unanimous in the affirmative.

The Committee next considered the Jepson Fellowship applications. Chris raised questions regarding Jepson Fellowship criteria relative to some of the documents submitted as part of the applications and the Committee reviewed award criteria. The twelve proposals, having been distributed at the last meeting for all Committee members to review, were considered one by one in alphabetical order. The Committee members discussed the strengths and weaknesses of the proposals and shared opinions about their reactions to each, particularly in light of the stated criteria for the awards. When discussion concluded, John reminded Committee members of the process for voting that was to be completed by 5:00 p.m. on 19 October. Each Committee member was to submit a score for each proposal that ordered the applications from 1 to 12 (1 as top and no ties to be submitted.) For each proposal, Committee members would also rate the proposal from 5 to 1 (5 as highest rating.) With these two scores tabulated for the group John would then distributed the results by email and the Committee could meet if further discussion was considered necessary.

The meeting concluded at 5:35 p.m.

*Subsequent to the votes of each Committee member being received and tabulated, (with exception of John Morello who, as ex-officio member, does not vote) John shared the rankings and ratings summary via email. Committee members unanimously agreed with the summary rankings and the six top applications will go forward to the Provost with the Committee’s support. The Provost will reply to all applicants and the BOV will approve awards of Jepson Fellowships at their November meeting.

Minutes submitted by JeanAnn Dabb
University Student Affairs and Campus Life Committee

Meeting Minutes

19 October 2011

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

The meeting was called to order at 12h in the foyer of the Anderson Center as a joint luncheon discussion with Vice President for Student Affairs Doug Searcy and many members of his staff. Following introductions and brief discussions of each of the various staff functions, Mr. McCarthy emphasized that this committee serves in an advisory capacity and asked those present “What should we focus on?” A lively discussion ensued, from which some of the following highlights are excerpted:

1. Chris Porter, Director of Residence Life, felt that it was vital for us to collaborate with Student Affairs staff. She stated “we are educators in a different area” and pleaded that we should not “let it end at the classroom door.” In her opinion, we needed to not only extend the excitement about learning into the residence halls, but also to make a better effort to actively engage the commuter students.

2. Larissa Ruuskanen, Staff Psychologist with CAPS (Counseling and Psychological Services), felt that professors could provide a better “referral avenue” and do more to identify those in trouble. She thought that the faculty network could provide support for “students of concern,” particularly if faculty were better informed on how to refer students to CAPS. She suggested the possibility of either a FAQ sheet or pamphlet on identifying and dealing with both disruptive students and those showing signs of serious psychological distress. Ms. Reynolds suggested the possibility of seminars on Alcohol misuse, disruptive behaviors, addiction issues and the like.

3. Ray Tuttle, Director of Judicial Affairs and Community Responsibility, noted that TIP Seminars were once used to address student issues, and suggested that a similar vehicle might be developed. He urged faculty to be curious and ask students about their lives. One question he urged faculty to ponder is “What are students doing these days?” Earlier intervention, particularly by observing behavioral changes in the classroom, could be particularly helpful. Interfacing with Residence Life through the use of UMW Cares would allow staff to “go to where they live.” The Behavioral Intervention Teams, under the direction of Dean of Student Life Cedric Rucker, can be useful in “pattern assessment” and information diffusion to the faculty on behavioral trends among students.

4. Mr. McCarthy noted that the discussion should not just focus on negative issues. He highlighted the important role of “sports education” in the lives of many students, and emphasized that coaches are also educators.

5. Heidi Simpson, Associate Director of the Student Health Center, discussed the struggle with the concept of “wellness” among students and asked “How should students receive this?” She indicated that the current methods have the aura of a “toxic approach.”
6. Courtney Chapman, newly-minted Director of the Leadership Coordination Strategic Initiative, pointed out the need for proactive programming linked to classroom content. She cited the ability of faculty to reinforce practical applications through “direct syllabus interaction.” She also recommended more experiential applications and enhancements of “what happens in the classroom.”

7. Christina Eggenberger, Associate Director of Student Activities and Community Service, said that her office was both eager and willing to be a “service matchmaker” for faculty interested in adding service components to their courses.

8. Bob Liebau, Associate Director of Campus Recreation and the Fitness Center, as well as coordinator of the UMW Wellness Team (which also includes Dr. Riley, Dr. Tuttle and the CAPS Director) reiterated that “we are all educators” and commented on the possible cataloguing, for educational purposes, of the weekly radio program devoted to wellness issues.

9. Priscilla Sullivan, National Testing Coordinator, pressed for increasing the interactions between students based on the Stafford campus and those in Fredericksburg.

10. Vice President Searcy described the importance of both faculty and staff serving as continual advocates, not just of learning, but also of the basics of safety and security. He also talked about the possibility of developing “living and learning” centers in the renovated Randolph and Mason dormitories.

As the group discussion drew to a close, Mr. McCarthy noted that “this is just the opening of the dialogue.”

Following the luncheon discussion (and many thanks to Student Affairs for feeding the committee!!), a brief session was held to select possible student members for inclusion on the committee. Discussion as to whether this committee would recommend that students have voting rights on the UFC was deferred to a later date.

The meeting was adjourned at 13h49, with our next meeting scheduled for Friday, 28 October 2011 at 13h in the Wellness Room of the Fitness Center.

Respectfully submitted,

Dan Hubbard
University of Mary Washington
Teaching Center Advisory Committee
Minutes of September 15, 2011 Meeting

Call to order: 12:30 p.m.

Present: Laurie Abeel, Martha Burtis, Steve Greenlaw, Alan Griffith, Cheryl Hawkinson Melkun, Krystyn Moon, and Anand Rao from the Committee. Jim Groom, Tim Owens, and Andy Rush were visitors.

New Business:

- **E-portfolio Subcommittee update:** Krystyn Moon, stated that the committee has investigated several e-portfolio options and has narrowed the field to two: Wordpress and Mahara. The committee plans to offer a number of e-portfolio workshops for students and faculty participating in the e-portfolio pilot in spring 2012. Workshops will begin in October and will run throughout the academic year as needed.

- **Online course evaluations update:** The teaching and learning center is no longer charged with investigating online course evaluations. Cheryl Hawkinson Melkun who is on the current course evaluation committee stated that an RFP seeking bids for both online and paper course evaluations has been approved. She also stated that there are no plans to force faculty to use online evaluations: faculty members will be able to choose paper or online evaluations. Alan Griffith stated that there are several members of the CAS faculty who object to online course evaluations and feel that the statistical analysis in Taiwo Ande’s report regarding online course evaluations is flawed.

- **Understanding by Design:** Alan Griffith presented a proposal which would be funded by the Teaching Center and would “guide faculty to successfully redesign, apply, and maintain more student centered approaches in the classroom.” Specifically, faculty members would work in collaborative teams as they redesign one or more of their courses using a backward design approach, an approach first introduced by Wiggins and McTighe known as “Understanding by Design.” The committee agreed that this is a worthwhile project and will investigate ways of launching the project and engaging faculty.

- **Live Stream:** Jim Groom asked the Teaching Center to consider the purchase of equipment to broadcast live programs. The DTLT staff has previously borrowed this equipment and has found a multitude of uses including live broadcasts related to teaching, on site broadcasting, and distance learning. Jim and the DTLT staff will produce a formal proposal for funding. The committee felt that this equipment would be useful for faculty and staff.

Meeting Adjourned: 1:30 p.m.
Submitted by: Cheryl Hawkinson Melkun
The University Academic Resources Advisory Committee met on Tuesday, October 11, 2011 in the Library Classroom from 3:00 to 4:00

Minutes:

Members Present: David Hunt, Cheryl Hawkinson-Melkun, Denis Nissim-Sabat, Rosemary Arneson, Steve Greenlaw

Members Absent: Jess Rigelhaupt, Suzanne Houff, Martha Burtis

Discussion

1. The members discussed the message from the UFC and the CAS Faculty Senate President that outlined the possible reassignment of CARC duties and budget to the newly formed UARAC. The budget under the administration of CARC would not transfer during the 2011-2012 academic year. The members will gladly accept the charges when acted upon by the CAS Senate, the UFC, College of Business Senate, and the College of Education Faculty.

2. Rosemary and David will draft a recommendation to the agencies listed above to help us clarify our role in the faculty governance system.

3. Rosemary distributed information of the UMW Libraries vision statement, mission statement, and goals. The members were supportive of the statements and it was suggested that given the scope of the UMW Library that a future “Library Committee” might be in need.

4. David inquired as to the number of academic departments that took advantage of the e-mailed offer to have members of the library and/or DTLT meet with their faculty during scheduled department meetings. The response was one, involving the library. Another invitation will be issued for the spring semester.

The meeting was adjourned at 4:00
The faculty governance system adopted in 2011 created the University Academic Resources Advisory Committee, and part of this committee’s charge is to “draft and submit to the UFC for approval a list of the Committee’s future responsibilities and duties that pertain to campus life and student affairs, as well as a timetable for meetings and a mechanism for disseminating information on Committee decisions to the University community and large.”

As we began our work on this and the other parts of our charge, we became aware of a number of other committees that overlap with UARAC in membership, charge, or both. The ITAC, the Distance and Blended Learning Committee, and the Teaching Center Committee all intersect with UARAC to some extent. In addition, the College of Arts and Sciences has an Academic Resources Committee and the relationship between that committee and UARAC is unclear. We realize that a motion has been submitted to the CAS Faulty Senate that reflects changes to Appendix F.9.1 of the Faculty Handbook and that these changes will help define the future of UARAC.

At the same time, the University’s Strategic Plan calls for the creation of a permanent presidential advisory board on academic technologies, information resources and libraries, with the charge of achieving the following two goals:

- UMW’s libraries will become the University’s knowledge center – a physical and virtual manifestation of the institution’s missions of connected, integrated, and engaged teaching, learning, research and service to our communities. Specifically, the libraries will become: spaces where people collaborate, gather, and conduct research; showcases and catalysts of innovation; dynamic digital repositories of the University’s teaching, research, and creative activities; models of support and service responsive to the needs and status of diverse users and learners.

- The University of Mary Washington will be a leader in the fields of academic technology, library services, and information resources by identifying, developing, investing in, and sustaining those practices and resources like the on-going work of the Division of Teaching and Learning Technologies, UMWBlogs, distributed learning pedagogy and technologies, and other programs that produce the highest quality of service, technology and support, while promoting, celebrating, and preserving innovations in teaching, learning, and scholarship.

None of the before-named committees seems suitable by themselves to address these strategic initiatives. We do not feel that the creation of yet another committee to be the desirable outcome, especially since such a committee would involve many of the same people who serve on the current committees either as members or ex-officio.

We recommend that the University Faculty Council, in consultation with the Faculty Senates of the three colleges and the University Administration, clarify the charge of the UARAC as it relates to the above committees and to the Strategic Plan. It is also our opinion that UARAC could serve as the presidential advisory board as required in the University Strategic Plan.

Respectfully,

David Hunt – University Academic Resources Advisory Committee
Rosemary Arneson – ex-officio
Student Affairs and Campus Life Advisory Committee’s Duties

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

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