Chair Schleef called the meeting to order at 16h33.

1. Following significant amendment, the minutes of the October meeting were unanimously approved.

2. President Hurley:
   a. Stated that during his travels, joint alumni and prospective student meetings were highly successful. Where numbers warranted, such as in Boston and Roanoke, Admissions representatives were accompanying him. He also highlighted the extensive role of Athletic Department coaches in successfully recruiting out-of-state students.
   b. Noted that the proposed renovations to Woodard and Mercer were now at the stage where the Department of General Services was involved. An architectural meeting is to be the next step, after which official authorization to proceed will be sought.
   c. Stated that the Executive Committee of the BOV was focusing a great deal of attention on admissions. Dean Gendernalik-Cooper interjected that there was a need for “building a college-going culture,” and that this was something the COE could do.

3. Interim Provost Newbould:
   a. Is working with Fred Pierce on the “First Year Experience” and highlighted the need for a broad committee to deal with the challenges of both social and academic transitions. In referring to the recent flurry of e-mails concerning faculty perceptions of changes in the nature of incoming students, he stated “working with students is always a challenge.” He further noted that a study of the FSEM structure is needed. “There seems to be something missing” and “Where are the disconnects here?” were two of his salient comments.
   b. Spoke of the need for changes in “resource allocation.” He discussed the possible use of a “consulting source” to aid us in determining “what should we be supporting?” He noted that we do some things “well” and others “not-so-well” and that there was an increasing need to be more “efficient.” As we try to generate new programs, we must continually ask “where will the resources come from?”
   c. Discussed the “space development of Woodard” and the possibility of “centralized space allocation” throughout the Fredericksburg campus.

Angela Pitts asked “what data” were to be used in determining resource allocation decisions. The response was that it was not entirely certain, but that the process had been
taken up at a number of universities. A system of evaluating the “importance to the institution” needed to be developed and the “efficiency of employees” (particularly in the non-academic units) needed to be examined. Interim Provost Newbould emphasized that there was a need to look at the entire range of institutional activities, and that he expected the process to be in place prior to 1 July 2013. He cited the example of the University of Hartford and that across the board cuts were not effective. Larry Penwell spoke of the need to create a culture prepared to have key resource discussions, and that the UFC would play a “key role” in this creation.

4. Dean Finkelstein:
   a. Noted that there were some good ideas for new programs, particularly with Master’s offerings. He said that the Geospatial Analysis program was awaiting SCHEV approval, and that he and Associate Provost Morello would be receiving training from SCHEV concerning new program submissions.
   b. Stated that the consultant for the proposed B.S. in Nursing program had been identified and had submitted a proposal. He felt that Fall 2014 would be a possible start date.
   c. Highlighted that the Data Science minor (formerly Data Analytics) and other new programs were “flowing forward.”

5. Associate Provost Morello:
   a. Stated that SCHEV approval was required prior to any name changes for departments, and that the proposed shift from “Modern Foreign Languages” to “Modern Languages and Literatures” had been referred to them for action.
   b. Noted that the UCC report needed to come before the UFC in order to expedite curricular change process for the proposed Geospatial Analysis program. The UCC report was then read aloud by Stephen Davies, and the report was approved (although technically incomplete), creating a new MSGA prefix. One question which arose was whether the UCC, whose primary focus is academics, should deal with resource issues.

6. The UFAC Report on Evaluation noted that there was concern that there was an overreliance on student evaluations, and that there needed to be a review of evaluation criteria. The hope was expressed that the Teaching Center would change the culture of evaluation.

7. Keith Mellinger asked whether consideration should be given to creating a standard core.

8. Dan Hubbard asked that the BOV be invited to dine with the faculty during their campus visits, and also consider visiting classes.

The meeting was adjourned at 18h13, with the next session scheduled for 4 December 2012 at a site to be determined.

Respectfully submitted,
Dan Hubbard, Secretary