UFC Meeting Minutes

September 16, 2013

Lee 414

3:30-5:30

Present: Debra Schleef, Courtney Clayton, Debra Steckler, Angela Pitts, Gail Brooks, Jodie Hayob, Marcel Rotter, Smita Jain Oxford, Steve Greenlaw, Tamie Pratt-Fartro

Ex Officio Present: Dean Finkelstein, Dean Richards, Dean Gendernalik-Cooper, John Morello, and Provost Levin, Lavar Edmunds

Absent: President Hurley

Visitors: Keith Mellinger, Doug Searcy, Megan Higginbotham and Les Johnson

I. Call to Order

II. Doug Searcy, Meg Higginbotham, Keith Mellinger – discussion of summer orientation

* asked to speak with us about orientation this summer, what happened and what will continue next time and get feedback
	+ first time for summer orientation; revisiting preview model to ensure students connect with university early-on; primarily academic registration
	+ had over 1,000 students come through this summer; 200 that did not come through summer
	+ primary goal of connection was achieved
	+ summer session impacted what we did in August, i.e. welcome session was Friday afternoon traditionally attended by students and families, but this time on the Friday, no parents were there so they will look at this for next year
	+ goal is to solidify feedback; set a platform for communication to move forward, and a schedule in place by mid-October that has been vetted by the UFC
	+ Summer Orientation: Day 1, split parents and students. Students had general testing and overview of resources and then lunch. Concurrent sessions in afternoon with financial planning, athletics, etc. Later in evening there was a residence life session, then dinner, then social and then sent parents home. Day 2: general programs in the a.m. followed by orientation and registration, went as long as 3:00pm for students.
	+ Who did the testing? All students took a math test and were offered a language test. Chemistry exam, which was limited to students who were interested in taking Chemistry and Latin exam. Marcel asked if the language test was required or if it was optional. Dean Finkelstein answered the question. He has asked Rita about mandatory testing, but it was difficult to require all students to take test.
	+ Keith Mellinger said he wasn’t sure if all students took language placement test, which he thought was the case. Suggested that department perhaps makes it binding.
	+ Provost suggested maybe said that if students place in 102, then if they take 101, they won’t get credit, but he is interested to see what other schools do.
	+ Question was asked about what kind of guidance students got in orientation sessions about academics. Keith explained how this went. Hour presentation by faculty, had ppt talking about academic policies, suspension, pass/fail, repeating a class, credits, etc. Then got into general education curriculum a little bit. At the end, there was a planning document that they passed out about crafting first year, introduced resources, binders with info about general education courses. About 25 students per group, and then each faculty member met with students individually, then went to computer space to learn how to register in Banner, etc. Most students out in an hour and a half or two hours at the most.
	+ Some students who couldn’t get courses they wanted, most students got a reasonable subset of what they wanted when came in June.
	+ Transfer students had two days, and Keith and Doug have had a lengthy conversation about how this should change since summer didn’t seem to work well. Classes they wanted were not available. Request was made to have transfer sessions done later, in late July or early August. Said would be helpful to have Chairs here on those days so that they can sign documents for transfer students to get into courses.
	+ Seats were still released piecemeal, not all released at the time freshmen were here. Some departments didn’t have seats saved if chairs didn’t request it.
	+ Question was asked if there were a systematic process for Chairs to be reminded to hold seats. One chair on the UFC said she got numerous reminders about holding open seats, but normally, registrar reaches out about holding seats in courses.
	+ Meg Higginbotham: did survey with students, and overall was very positive, both June and August experiences. Ability to know who students are early in courses was good; biggest complaint was registration process and interacting with academic services. One big change is next summer, will do 7 sessions and capping students so that groups are down to 10 to 12 students. Looking at possibilities of doing testing at home rather than on campus. Want to have academics first from 1-3 pm on Friday, then Friday evening going on to honor convocation. Would be 6:00 or 7:00 in the evening.
	+ Marcel said the testing at home won’t work in terms of participation in the test.
	+ Debra suggested having testing as part of registration process.
	+ Dean Finkelstein said that Chemistry department upset that a full third of students they needed to divide, didn’t take the exam. Wondered how the issue might be worked into the schedule. Keith suggested that it might not have been addressed enough during first opening session – academic orientation.
	+ Provost wondered what happens to student who needs to take multiple tests. Meg said that testing was back to back, but that the Chemistry exam was after lunch, and there may have been students who were lost in the process.
	+ Day 2 will now be nothing but academic registration. There will be more time and smaller faculty/student ratio.
	+ Suggestion made that an email go out with more information about what faculty would do, and that the email could ask for volunteers to advise students who are interested in specific areas.
	+ Provost suggested with a notebook with majors, and suggests courses to take. Keith and Provost will check on that. Suggested creating a pdf on registrar’s site with all of the materials.
	+ UFC member mentioned that faculty were paid a small stipend in the past and worked the entire day to assist students to register all day.
* Doug asked how we would like to advance these questions/discussions with academics. How to get them in policy?
	+ UFC member suggested a planning session with Chairs and Orientation Committee. Suggestion was made to put more faculty on the Orientation Committee. The student affairs office will then write the schedule, and then under that, basic assumptions about academic processes and the Deans, and then send to all faculty for feedback.
* Meg will also take any feedback at any point via email mhiggin3@umw.edu
* Student representative, Lavar Edmunds spoke: STP and those students, it was required for them, and it didn’t work out so well. It conflicted with their course schedules, issue of redundancy for them. For STP students, would there by another policy for these students?
	+ Meg said they wanted all students to experience everything. They would now like to have STP students do orientation with everyone, and then rolling into their courses.
	+ Issue of practicality was raised by him, so they would have something like a Th/F/Sat STP

III. Approval of Minutes from April 9 and August 21, 2013

* + April 9th minutes were approved
	+ August 21st A minutes were approved (general meeting)
	+ August 21st B minutes were approved (UFC meeting)

IV. Reports

 A. President’s Report (President Hurley unable to attend)

 - he reported to UFC Chair that he has been on the road fundraising and it has been going well

 B. Provost’s Report

* has been meeting with departments and units in academic affairs; meetings have been going well; has asked about challenges and opportunities; about general education curriculum, are students prepared; broader issues on faculty life, student life, he is trying to learn.
* On SACS report, had 3 recommendations about things we needed to address. Those are due October 15th. Has brought focus group together who worked on QEP.
	+ One is about structural organization of QEP committee
	+ second was about assessment – laying out timeline.
		- Morello said it was about ready to share with the people – would like independent readers who haven’t had anything to do with creation of response to be sure it’s coherent.
	+ Third item was about research. Research is articulated in our mission statement, faculty and undergraduate student research, and they raised concern that we weren’t doing much to measure institutional effectiveness to which we are achieving goals of research.
		- Brought together Chairs of P&T committees and agreed that this is distinct from how single individual is doing from how institution is doing as a whole.
		- He is charging the Deans to write a research standard at the College level
		- COB has articulated a standard that others may want to articulate.
		- He wants a meaningful standard that can be measured and reported upon, this amount of research is being done, and this is how we are measuring the standard. Will be developing procedures to track this.
		- May want to look at undergraduate standards of 30% and what about graduate students in terms of research. He will share charge he has given with SACS. Need this by March.
* Angela suggested that Provost Levin keep in mind the relationship between student and faculty research in terms of how to measure that. CAS Senate is having that conversation
* Summer Teaching: a number of groups including UFAC has brought issue of concerns about substance of changes in summer compensation and process by which changes were made.
	+ He is going to work out a model and will write to faculty to invite observations and comments about this issue. Will be available for comments; and he will consider reasonable modifications to program in place. One thing he doesn’t want to do is just go back to where we were, but he is open to modifications
	+ Said faculty had strong concerns about timing by which contracts might change, etc.
* With UFAC, faculty governance issues; communication with BOV; strategic resource allocation process and how to get better data on outcomes. Group that is revisiting the alumni survey.
* CAS P&T committee brought online course evaluations to his attention.
	+ Have dipped down to about 38% response rate. Talked about how to communicate better with students. His position is he thinks online is how people are moving, but we do have to figure out how we get better return rates; and, if we can’t, may need to go back to another way
	+ UFC Chair suggested going to students by way of Lavar Edmunds, for example, to see what they think
	+ Provost suggested maybe all grades will be released January 2, but once you do evaluation, you have immediate access of grades. He says look at instrument and maybe make a better instrument.
	+ Provost sat on P&T committee at Drew as Dean; this was an instrument that they had developed, and it was good. They knew what limitations were, and they used it in pre-tenure reviews when trying to articulate for candidates what issues needed to be addressed.
	+ Provost suggested giving faculty charge of creating another form/instrument
	+ UFC Chair suggested working with Taiwo on ideas he has about response rate; Provost said Taiwo can create template and then maybe have Chairs post it for comment, or something like that
	+ Decided that UFAC should be in charge of looking at instrument
* Staffing:
	+ Director of Academic and Career Services, there is a consensus candidate from everyone, so just finishing references and getting paperwork in place. Hopefully extending offer within next couple of days.
	+ QEP director: apps due today
	+ Search Committee for Carol Desak’s position: individual will be in charge of enrollment management; working with search firm, very important appointment, and we have to get this right. So looking forward to getting it launched in next few weeks. Recruitment this semester and looking for January for actual search. July 1st is target; if found someone early, would do that.

 C. Deans’ Reports

 D. UFC Chair’s Report

- talking with Debbie Zies of UFOC, concerned that lots of people don’t seem to want to serve on committees, and we understand why that is. But, would like us to think about ways to get faculty to serve on committees.

- Streamlining faculty governance might be useful

E. Student Representative: Lavar Edmunds

- Academic affairs council chairperson. His mission is to reach out to department chairs to get a group of students from each department. He will contact the departments to find out how to elect or appoint student representatives.

V. Old Business

a. Strategic Resource Allocation – language in 4.1.2 is appended.

Also SCHEV language on eliminating programs

<http://www.schev.edu/adminfaculty/ReviewPublicAcademicProg.pdf>

* talked at last meeting about this language and what our role might be. Morello said that SCHEV is looking at teach-out process and that universities need to prove that program advised to be discontinued is not a critical shortage area as identified by VA. SCHEV staff has to approve it, and then they report it to the council.
* need to address what kind of information UFC needs to review. Would we need to see deliberations from task force? We won’t have context for conversation so template may not be helpful.
* Question was asked about what data we would use?
* Maybe we would need to ask task force to present information as to why program is being considered for discontinuance.
* Provost said it is his expectation is that there will be a thorough process for task forces to explain their recommendations and for programs to respond. Once task force makes recommendations, it goes to Provost.
* UFC Chair emphasized that there need to be faculty forums to discuss recommendations.
* suggested that UFC makes recommendations about how task force should report out
* UFC needs to meet with task forces to talk about timelines. Decided we would encourage an early April deadline.
* Provost said that decisions won’t be made over summer without input from faculty
* Suggestion made and agreed upon that current UFC stay in place through the summer

b. faculty governance / Lollar survey – forum Oct. 11

* from 3-5pm on Friday the 11th, it’s Lee Hall 411, he will give presentation from 3-5 and open forum to talk about results of survey
* Schleef or Greenlaw will meet him to show the room
* Pitts will talk with him about getting report
* How to try and get people there? UFOC maybe can get involved to get campaign started

VI. New Business

 A. Need to establish a QEP advisory committee (and procedure) – Provost Levin

* when FSEM and UFC approved QEP, there was a description that defined QEP advisory committee. Details were not there about duties, but recommendation two said that we needed to have more specificity about QEP advisory board to better differentiate roles and purposes of pieces of committee. Advisory board’s role is to work with QEP director and give feedback about plans for faculty development workshops, etc., how to put out RFP to get appropriate developers, etc.
* QEP advisory board is about programmatic assessment, not student learning
* Will specify 11 people who will be on the board, and made in consultation with UFOC. People are likely to be the WI chair, FSEM chair, SI Chair, etc.
* Morello said that language about the advisory board does not need to be drafted. Original plan that UFC approved was that there would be advisory committee, now called board, and now tapping membership. The Provost will invite those individuals to serve. Replaces the focus group, in effect. According to the document, people will be notified about selection to the board as soon as QEP Director is named.

 B. Speaking Intensive Committee Report - action items: passed

<http://ufc.umw.edu/wp-content/blogs.dir/3211/files/2011/10/SI-committee-Sept-10-2013-action-items.pdf>

 C. UCC (minutes attached to email)

* first issue is how to deal with proposals for new programs that include new courses from other colleges. CAS CC finds it difficult to approve programs that involve new courses from other colleges that haven’t been approved yet. Move to ask UCC to investigate this and if necessary to create a University-level policy to create such proposals.
* minutes of UCC of April 18th, 2013 stated that committee discussed and approved new proposals. UCC needs to communicate back to college-level committees.
* Morello said at same meeting, UCC voted to expand impact statement to include department chair and dean about how proposal will impact other departments, etc. Morello said language is probably too vague about what needs to be in impact proposal. Everyone disagrees about how much detail is required at level of curriculum committee. Impact largely occurs when a new major or minor or degree program is where big expenses come into play, such as staffing, operating expenses, equipment, etc.

D. Minutes only (UFC website):

 FSEM

 Honors program

 Writing Intensive

 Faculty Affairs

* there weren’t any questions about minutes. Pitts moved them to be approved, and all approved.

VII. Announcements

Any items for BOV meeting?

* Pitts has brief announcement that she has been working with student affairs and wellness teams, about to launch at UMW mindfulness week.

VIII. Adjournment

Respectfully Submitted,

Courtney Clayton

UFC Secretary**4.1.2 Discontinuance of a Program or Department of Instruction**

A decision to terminate

academic appointments resulting from the discontinuance of a program or department of

instruction *not compelled by financial exigency* (as defined in 4.1.1 above) must reflect long-range institutional judgments that the educational mission of the University as a whole will be

enhanced by the discontinuance.

**4.1.2.1** The determination that it is in the best interest of the University’s educational mission to

discontinue the program or department, and the identification of the criteria for selecting the

appointment(s) to be terminated or reassigned, shall be made by the Provost in consultation with

UFC (or a committee of their choosing). However, ultimate authority over these decisions rests

with the President and the Board of Visitors. Once the President and the UFC have determined

that the substantive standards for discontinuance of a program have been met (as defined above),

but before any faculty appointment is terminated, the Provost will request that the UFC affirm

that the discontinuance of a program or department of instruction reflects long-range institutional

judgments that the educational mission of the University as a whole will be enhanced.

**4.1.2.2** Although the UFC’s response is not binding on the President, should the UFC determine

that the substantive standards have not been met, that opinion will be entered into the record and

forwarded to the University Faculty Affairs Committee and, if necessary, to the Board of Visitors

should the faculty member(s) whose positions have been reassigned or terminated appeal the

decision (see §4.5.3).