

**UFC Minutes**  
September 18, 2024

Members in Attendance: Davis Oldham (Chair), Alex Dunn, Kim Kinsley, Sayan Sarkar, Christy Irish, Jennifer Walker, Janine Davis, Davis Oldham, April Wynn (Parliamentarian), Mindy Erchull, Melina Patterson (Vice Chair), Caitie Finlayson, Mara Scanlon, Michael Benson, Elizabeth Johnson-Young, Patricia Orozco, Karen Anewalt (Secretary)

Guests: Troy Paino (University President), Tim O'Donnell (Provost), Keith Mellinger (Dean CAS), Filiz Tabak (Dean COB), Pete Kelly (Dean COE), Kevin Caffrey (Senior Associate Registrar), Wes Hillyard (Dean for Academic Success and Integrity), Nicole Crowder (Handbook Working Group), Melissa Wells (Handbook Working Group), Bridgett Dennett (Handbook Working Group & FSEM Chair), Will Thompson (SGA President), Shanita Mitchell (Staff Council President)

- I. Call to Order
- II. Meeting Minutes
  - a. Minutes from April 17, 2024 - Motion to approve
  - b. Minutes were approved (unanimous)
- III. Reports
  - a. President Update/Comments
    1. President Paino provided a summary of recent events at the state-level. In the last legislative session, the General Assembly asked the Joint Legislative Audit and Review Commission (JLARC), a non-partisan group, to do two studies on higher education out of legislative concerns. One is a study on institutional viability and the second a cost study. This is motivated by the divergent enrollment experiences of small and large public institutions in Virginia during and post-pandemic. In the institutional viability report, we were evaluated as one of the institutions at “elevated risk” (not high risk) along with 6 other institutions (of the 15 public institutions). This study is a retrospective snapshot based on 2-year old data. This was not a good time for us as we were coming out of the pandemic and the institution had other financial issues at play. The elevated risk was attributed to three sub-issues. The first is our pricing power (in JLARC’s opinion, we are discounting tuition too much). The second risk is the state of our facilities (in their analysis, we had the 2nd oldest facilities and a lot of deferred maintenance). However, the study didn’t take into consideration that we have about 200 million dollars of capital improvement in the queue right now and we have also invested about 10 million of our own money in maintenance over the last few years. The third risk is concerns about our level of liquidity. A challenge for us is they used the UMW Foundation in the metric, which helped the metric for most schools but that hurt our metric. And the metric did not take into consideration that we've now purchased or sold all the commercial real estate across Route 1 and the UMW Foundation is now out of debt, so using the current state

of things, today we look much better. The UMW administration has been spending a lot of time managing this institutional viability report so that media doesn't make a statement based on the old data. In the second report, the cost study, we looked pretty good. However, President Paino warns that one of the recommendations across most institutions is to pursue reductions of work force. The state government is applying increased scrutiny on overhead and labor costs, so we are likely to continue to hear about this issue. In positive news, we were called out as having done some positive things to contain costs post-pandemic.

2. The Board of Visitors is meeting this week. President Paino will be sharing how our enrollment looks this year related to our budget. We have stabilized enrollment over the last few years. The FAFSA had a small negative impact this year (probably lost 40-50 students in the first year class). But we also saw a significant increase in transfer enrollment (up over 80 students). So our overall enrollment/overall residency for the year has exceeded our goals and as a result, we're doing well financially. Certainly we have some challenges, especially related to facilities, but we have about 200 million in queue for capital projects and we've had record fundraising last few years. The endowment is finally getting to a point where we can use it to invest in student experience and academic programs. We are now in the quiet phase of a new capital campaign expected to raise 150-200 million over the next 5-6 years.
  3. President Paino has been out on the road meeting w/alumni. Recently he visited California hearing alumni stories and it's gratifying to hear their stories and the impact that UMW made on their lives.
  4. No questions.
- b. Provost Update/Comments
1. Davis Oldham shared that when the UFC Executive Committee met with Provost O'Donnell a few weeks ago, the idea of written reports was discussed and Provost O'Donnell pointed out that if he were to submit a written report in advance of the UFC meeting, it would be outdated at the time of the meeting.
  2. Provost O'Donnell shared that the [Academic Affairs Report to the BOV](#) highlights all the incredible work being across campus. He encourages everyone to read that report.
  3. Provost O'Donnell shared a status update on the reorganization process with SCHEV. The provost thanked Kevin Caffrey and Debra Schlee for their work on phase 1, which is to move departments into colleges. SCHEV has informed Tim that his signature isn't legible. He has since re-signed the paperwork and that was re-submitted on Thursday. They are expecting feedback within two weeks. He expects to communicate an update after that feedback is received, in advance of next UFC meeting.
  4. Questions

1. Melina Patterson, question to Provost O'Donnell, "Do you have a sense of when you will be able to move on to phase 2?" Provost O'Donnell: Stage 2 will begin when SCHEV turns over the templates for stage 2 to Debra and Kevin. SCHEV discourages us from doing work in advance because we need to study the template and exemplars for each phase, which we don't have access to until they are provided by SCHEV.
- c. Deans' Reports
    1. All 3 deans provided written reports. None of the Deans provided additional comments or updates.
    2. Davis Oldham thanked the Deans for submitting written reports and invited members of UFC to provide feedback on the format in the future if improvements can be made.
    3. No questions.
  - d. President of the SGA Report
    1. Will Thompson introduced himself as the SGA President. He reports that students are busy and feeling optimistic. SGA is experiencing the highest participation rate in several years. Students have responded positively to the opening of the new coffee shop. Club Carnival was a success with over 1100 students attending and more activity has been experienced in the CRUC. SGA has set 3 standards that it has highlighted for the year: excellence, high character and respect, and promoting positive messages of unity and possibility.
    2. No questions
  - e. University Staff Council President, Shanita Mitchell, was not able to attend this part of the meeting but did make an announcement later.
  - f. UFC President Report
    1. Davis Oldham shared that not much has happened since Rachel's report in April.
    2. No questions.
  - g. UFC Vice Chair Report
    1. Melina Patterson had no report. There was a brief discussion of what a Vice Chair might report on. One example is if the Vice Chair were leading a special sub-committee on a particular topic.
  - h. Faculty Senate of Virginia Report
    1. Patricia Orozco shared that they have not announced a meeting schedule for the year yet. They have announced an advocacy event for January 2025 and she'll update us as more details emerge.
- IV. University Committee Reports
- a. The floor was open for discussion and questions about any committee report.
    1. Davis Oldham noted that UFC will need to track some committee discussion related to their individual charges. Some committees read the recommendations as an all-encompassing set of options, rather than some suggested starting points for discussion. The Digital Intensive Committee said that it prefers to keep their committee as-is in terms of

size and charge. Davis believes that we will have more updates from committees on this point in the next group of minutes.

2. Janine Davis to FSEM Committee/Tim: The FSEM committee minutes mention the Provost foreseeing changes in the FSEM program. Could Tim/April speak to that a little bit? Tim says: Our FSEM program is more than a decade old. Over the past few years, some faculty have raised concerns about the way the course has grown and some feel that it's become so burdensome to the point where it's no longer desirable to teach. We also know that our students have changed in this decade and faculty/department capacity to support the course has changed. Last spring, Tim asked April and the FSEM committee to talk through the evolution and different approaches moving forward. April has done a lot of incredible research about what is being done at various institutions. Tim is reviewing that report now. The FSEM Committee has already made some positive changes, for example the requirement to complete all of the modules has been dropped. Tim says we're in very early stages of thinking about how the FSEM program should evolve over the next 5-ish years.

b. Motion to approve the committee minutes.

c. Unanimously approved.

V. Unfinished Business – none

VI. New Business

- a. Action item – Request from FSEM advisory committee to eliminate UFC from approval process
  1. Bridget Dennett, FSEM Chair, stated that the committee does not want to circumvent the UFC process or remove accountability, instead, they want to streamline the approval process to better communicate with prospective students and the faculty/departments offering the courses.
  2. Mara Scanlon: Part of the justification of the request is that other advisory committees don't have UFC oversight, but actually all of the advisory committees (SI, WI, DI, HN) do send action items of designation approvals to UFC. So this seems like a bigger issue for UFC or someone to think through as we consider this request.
  3. Melina Patterson: Would this change make FSEM the only new courses that don't go through UFC?
  4. Bridgett Dennett: But the action items from FSEM aren't new courses because they're all FSEM 100. The action items are approving different sections of the same course.
  5. April Wynn: The other designations have the option for a chair to request approval for all department faculty. But the FSEM proposals are all linked to a specific instructor and the instructor is being approved to teach a particular section of the FSEM, so the granularity is a little different.
  6. Mara Scanlon: The language that the FSEM committee approves instructors rather than courses was surprising. If it's the instructors being approved, why are faculty having their proposed FSEM courses sent

back for revision? If we trust our colleagues and believe that they're a "good enough" teacher, why have the revision process? It's a little confusing. Perhaps the issue is really with how the committee is defined in terms of its charge. I don't have anything against this request. I do think there are a lot of bigger issues around this request, that are potentially worrisome.

7. Davis Oldham: What is the timeline issue? All the other curriculum deadlines have something that drives the deadline. With a new course, it's getting it into the catalog or with adding a new designation, it's getting it approved ahead of the upcoming semester schedule. What's the last date that an FSEM could be approved for an upcoming fall? And who needs the approval information other than the department chair that is creating the course schedule?
8. Bridget Dennett: Usually at the end of the fall semester, we have everything approved for the following fall.
9. April Wynn: The timeline for FSEMs is very different from other approval processes. FSEM courses are handled as an add a designation proposal in CIM. All approvals have to be done before goes on FSEM website, which is used by prospective students. February 10-12th is when students can start depositing and filling out the first year questionnaire. That questionnaire lists all of the FSEMs for that fall and points to the FSEM website. We have to know what those are in January. And by Feb 1, we need to have the course descriptions, etc. on the FSEM website. Another difference is that the FSEM staffing plan is built a year out. Departments are discussing participation now for fall next year. As a chair, it can be confusing and stressful to be planning for an FSEM not knowing if it will be approved yet. The decision process has to be a year in advance of the course offering.
10. Mara Scanlon: But why wouldn't an FSEM be approved unless the committee were doubting the instructor? Does the committee reject a lot of proposals? Or once someone has submitted a proposal is it generally just a matter of working through revisions?
11. Bridget Dennett: In my experience, it is a matter of working with them through revisions. Most revisions are fairly minor. Sometimes there is a lot of communication between the committee and a faculty member if the faculty member doesn't understand the FSEM course goals. It seems like chair could approve and people go to a workshop if they needed to understand the course better.
12. Christy Irish: This is very similar to conversations we've had on Distance and Blended Learning Committee. It seems like if the issue is instructor preparation and understanding the course goals, the department chair or Dean could approve. And if the syllabus needs work, the potential instructor could go to a workshop on the first year experience goals/objectives and specifics of the FSEM course.
13. Caitie Finlayson: There seems to be two issues. First, what is the approval process? It seems like it should be like approving a course as

WI/SI and unclear how this situation is different. The second issue is individual instructors and maybe also wanting to align with WI/SI on this point, where a course can be approved for any instructor. Is that right?

14. April Wynn: The key difference is that the other designations don't go down to the same level of approving the instructor. For other designations, the department chair can apply have an all-instructors designation for their department. But FSEM can be taught by people outside the dept. FSEM committee in a way acts in the way that the department chair does for other designations, acting to ensure the instructor understands and will meet FSEM goals so that they serve students well. And while the FSEM Committee may want to follow the approval process timeline of the other designations, the calendar is just very different for the FSEM courses.
15. Caitie Finlayson: What does the committee want the approval process to look like?
16. Bridget Dennett: The biggest faculty complaint (beyond that there is too much content in the FSEM) is that the approval process is cumbersome. The FSEM Committee has been trying to make improvements, for example, we've been sending out a checklist of steps for proposals. There are 4 responses from the committee: approved as-is, minor revisions which don't require resubmitting, major revisions, and reject. In practice, the committee does not reject proposals and instead works with faculty through revision process. Most proposals are approved or approved with minor revisions. While very few proposals require major revisions, the ones that do take time to work through. And that's where the calendar challenges come in. If the FSEM didn't accept late proposals and revisions last year, we could not have been able to staff the FSEMs this fall. So the committee is asking to not have to send the revisions back through UFC and to allow them the authority of accepting courses in December.
17. Jennifer Walker: I wonder if zooming out, if the upcoming conversations about where we are with FSEM in general will influence the timeline. We've recently seen some little shifts, which may introduce new targets for the first year experience. Is it reasonable to think the committee may look different? Or that the process may look different? Is this something that could be tabled until more conversations occur, which might make the FSEM Committee, timeline, or targets for the FSEM experience look different?
18. April Wynn: Absolutely. The FSEM committee is trying to meet needs of faculty and respond to feedback.
19. Jennifer Walker: We may end up with a different place if changes occur.
20. Melina: I can see different circumstances when there is need for quick decision making/approval. For example if the person planned to teach a course needs to be replaced by an adjunct at the last minute. Do we need to make a policy that the UFC Executive Committee can approve

emergency late changes? There are lots of ways where the academic calendar doesn't match with the governance meeting calendar. Rather than making FSEM a special case, does it make more sense to create a standard emergency approval process?

21. Bridget Dennett: I like that suggestion. This would address a lot of issues with the FSEM approval timeline.
22. Melina Patterson: I have no idea how the UFC would feel about allowing a smaller group of the UFC to make decisions via email about action items that are about getting emergency courses onto the schedule.
23. Janine Davis: One equivalent case that we have already is Special Topics courses. For these, the chair reviews and decides to put the course on the schedule. So allowing the FSEM request would be allowing the committee to in that same role for the FSEM courses. Also Distance & Blended Learning approves emergency designations without UFC approval. So the FSEM request is really just asking for the same thing.
24. Mindy Erchull: If we go that route, we need to define "emergency" because it doesn't mean that someone got their stuff in late. For the UFC body to concede control to a smaller group to make a decision, there needs to be a clear sense of what constitutes an emergency.
25. Tim O'Donnell: I agree with Mindy. I'm supportive of an efficient process. I would be reluctant to see university faculty governance step out any curricular decision process. I think that's important. We can certainly create processes where emergency one-time approval is possible for staffing purposes. Kevin, are there other expedited options with CIM that we might leverage to instill trust in the committee to make decisions while still providing some opportunities for review?
26. Kevin Caffrey: We can look at CIM and see what's possible that might be helpful for expedited proposals.
27. Nicole Crowder: I think that it makes sense for the Executive Committee of UFC to have some authority. There is Handbook precedence for various Executive Committees having some type of decision making power. Also, the Executive Committee often meets in December and might meet over the summer, so that would help to provide oversight during times that most faculty aren't under contract.
28. Davis Oldham to Parliamentarian April Wynn: What are the options for moving forward.
29. April Wynn: The options are: that we call the question and we can vote on the current motion. Or we can request to table it. Or we can make a substitute motion.
30. Mindy Erchull: I think there's two overlapping issues and I'm not sure they need to be addressed in the same way. The first issue is that the timing may not be unique to the FSEM issue and we may want input from parallel committees before acting. The second issue is the emergency approval piece.

31. Michael Benson: Given the various issues that have arisen in the discussion, I move that we table this item until additional conversations have occurred.

32. Unanimously approved

- b. Discussion of university-level faculty governance structure options proposed by handbook advisory group. Details are in Appendix A of the draft handbook advisory group report.
1. Davis reminded everyone that we will be having a discussion. However, any changes that we would want to make to UFC has to be approved by the governing bodies of each of the three colleges. So we might all agree to something today but we can't vote on anything today.
  2. Mindy Erchull: What constitutes the governing bodies of the colleges? For CAS, is it CAS-FC or faculty as a whole?
  3. Melissa Wells: Changes to the structure must be approved by the majority votes of the governing bodies of each college through procedures to be determined in each college.
  4. Mindy Erchull: So it sounds like it's CAS-FC for CAS.
  5. Nicole Crowder: But CAS-FC could decide to do a full CAS faculty vote to determine the CAS vote.
  6. Davis Oldham: Side note, we haven't elected a chair of CAS-FC.
  7. Kim Kinsley: Do you have any updates to the attorney general on the Handbook revisions?
  8. Nicole Crowder: I communicated with the attorney yesterday and she had just got out of the hospital. We are hoping to get feedback to the working group by early next week. But the governance piece is somewhat separate from the Handbook revisions.
  9. Kim Kinsley: Something gives me pause is that COB has looked at the models but they have not integrated any discussion with Math, Computer Science or Economics for input. It would be premature to vote without bringing them into the conversation.
  10. Christy Irish: Right now, I believe the majority of COE likes Option 1 (modified UFC). Our biggest concern is that we don't want CAS to believe that option 2 (faculty senate) is going to solve communication issues. If there was a senate, the senate charge shouldn't include taking over responsibilities that should be done by CAS. (Similar to how UFOC works now where it runs CAS elections in addition to university elections).
  11. Alex Dunn: I'll add that part of the discussion in COB was a lack of support for option 3 (full faculty meeting). We have a hard enough time making decisions in UFC, having more people involved won't allow us to be more efficient.
  12. Many added that COE and CAS also don't like option 3 (full faculty meeting). Davis and the Handbook Working Group said option 3 was included for completeness and to represent the main options used at other institutions.



13. Christy Irish: COE also questions the need for at-large positions. So if anyone has reasons why those would be important, please add to the discussion.
14. Davis Oldham: That came up in discussion in my own department as well.
15. Nicole Crowder: The Handbook group included the at-large options because they exist now. Remember these are just starting points for discussion and you don't have to pick any of these models.
16. Mara: One thing that came up in our discussion is that none of us could see how the proposed models address issues of overburdening of certain groups and on the other hand, in some cases a representative is assigned to represent a large groups of faculty. For example COE & Health College has 3 members from 3 departments but Nursing only has 3 people in it. Is it going to be a burden to those 3 faculty members because that school doesn't have the flexibility of other options? The UFC was set up as it is because COE and COB were concerned about being squeezed out of decisions but over time have also come to recognize the burden of service. The other thing that came up was a feeling that nothing we do will work because faculty don't really have a voice anyway, which is a pretty disheartening viewpoint.
17. Alex Dunn: COB also discussed proportions. COB is going to have more faculty after the reorganization and believe that the COB representation should be equal to CAS. Some of these models are still heavy on CAS representation.
18. Janine Davis: One positive aspect of UFC is that it's been accessible service, particularly when we were fully online in COVID. When the meetings are online, UFC is more open to faculty and even students. It would help if we went to a more flexible modality and people can feel more included. Another comment related to option 1 (modified UFC), is that COE has always managed to staff our positions even if it feels like a lot. Perhaps having some proportional representation (House of Representatives style) make sense where larger groups have more representation.
19. Davis Oldham: Do you see that representative structure as something that could be built in both option 1 (modified UFC) and option 2 (faculty senate)? Would you suggest modifying numbers in option 1 and potentially merging departments together in option 2?
20. Janine Davis: I think it makes sense for fewer people to do the work on faculty governance. It's hard to find time for the current group to meet and that will be more complicated if the group is larger.
21. Davis Oldham: My department suggested that particularly with option 2 (faculty senate) it would be important to set term limits and specifically state whether representatives could serve in the governance body and also on a committee. There is value in rotating on and off of faculty governance and also in serving on committees.

22. Multiple people from COE/COB: That current policy only applies to CAS and is not in the COE/COB.
23. Handbook group representatives: The Handbook already states that you can't serve again for 2 years from your term.
24. Mindy Erchull: In the previous Faculty Senate model, there were people who were the constant senate representative for their department.
25. April Wynn: My department was excited about option 2 (faculty senate). We feel it invites more communication & opportunities to hear alternate viewpoints. We didn't discuss online vs in-person but for me personally, I think they both have value. The representation question is where we struggled – we need to ensure that large departments aren't under-represented and that small departments aren't over-burdened.
26. Melissa Wells: Other institutions dealt with concerns of over-burdening small departments by allowing proxy voting. If a department has fewer than say 5 people, they can delegate their vote. There are ways around the issue of small departments, so we shouldn't disqualify any model just based on that issue.
27. Jennifer Walker: So that would be like a permanent proxy?
28. Melissa Wells: Yes.
29. Christy Irish: I'm concerned that we're still having trouble filling positions. It seems odd to make more positions.
30. Caitie Finlayson: My department overwhelmingly supported option 2 (faculty senate). We appreciate that a senate allows all departments to have a seat at the table. In my experience, there's value in coming together and hearing what other departments think about issues. I think the proxy is good idea for small departments. We also think that a senate model is the most flexible since it is department focused. If departments merged or new department were formed, that could be handled naturally where it might cause problems in a model more like option 1 (modified UFC model).
31. Christy Irish: We also have concerns about representation on faculty committees. We think option 1(modified senate) addresses these concerns more.
32. Melina Patterson: UFC doesn't serve CAS faculty well. We aren't organized in a way that UFC acts like we're organized. We never meet as groups and aren't organized in the same building. We don't communicate as much outside departments. It doesn't reflect our interests or values. The COB & COE are going to change so they won't be as unified. And then they'll have the experience where their new makeup isn't going to be as unified in values and concerns as they are now.
33. Melissa Wells: You're saying UFC doesn't meet CAS's needs. Does CAS-FC meet CAS's needs?
34. Melina Patterson: I have no idea what CAS-FC would do to meet my needs. I can't have a conversation with all the social scientists about what our thoughts are. We have different spaces, resources, sizes, and

personalities. It's hard to say I represent the social sciences. I can count the number of times had communication from a UFC representative inviting feedback on an issue. And there's no email to create communication. We're not that connected to the people that we are supposed to represent.

35. Mara Scanlon: Even after the reorganization, there will still be large differences in size. COB is growing a lot but that college will still be smaller than the School of Social Science. And after the reorganization, CAS will still be 50% of the faculty.
36. Karen Anewalt: Of the people that I talked to, a lot of them remember the previous faculty senate model and felt it provided better communication channels and they were more natural. When you had a monthly meeting that included your representative, it felt more empowering because you knew that that person would share your concerns and ask your questions at the senate discussions. There's no conduit for college that contain multiple departments and disciplines to have that same type of conversation.
37. Christy Irish: UFOC and UFC worked on the communication issue last year. In making those changes, we assumed that agendas and minutes were distributed through CAS-FC. Is it possible to fix CAS-FC to eliminate these concerns?
38. Melina Patterson: In CAS, the "College Meetings" are department chairs meetings with the Dean and not when the CAS-FC meets. I don't know if CAS-FC could replicate what the other colleges have. It's hard to have a conversation with 50+ people. As we were doing the reorganization, the idea of having merged departments came up and I wondered what we would even talk about merged with another department. And it took me a long time to realize that we used to have department meetings to talk about university business and we don't have that anymore. Now we only talk about department issues. There's no way to fix the calendar because we don't meet in a deliberative group outside our department.
39. Christy Irish: Could you change your calendar to meet as a deliberative group?
40. Multiple CAS faculty: What would that look like? Would that be 1 person from each department? CAS could make a senate just for CAS and then we could also have a UFC but that seems like it would create more staffing issues.
41. Jennifer Walker: In COE, we have leadership from the top that facilitates communication. The leaders push out the next piece of info. Is it possible to replicate that in CAS even though you aren't in the same physical space? Even when we include Athletics & Nursing, we're still going to use the same system and bring them on board.
42. Caitie Finlayson: I'm wondering what the biggest objections are to option 2 (faculty senate)? It sounds like COE and COB have concerns. What are they?
43. Christy Irish: It's the percentage of representation.

44. Kim Kinsley: We don't know in COB because we haven't come together as the new group yet. Karen, I think you're the only representative here from the departments that are coming together with COB. Where is computer science leaning?
45. Karen Anewalt: Earlier I was speaking as an at-large representative. Speaking for Computer Science, we're strongly in favor of option 2 (the senate model).
46. Kim Kinsley: I'm not sure the math lines up with the representation in option 2 (senate model). I think we should eliminate the at-large representatives from that model and apply some mathematics to make representation more representative.
47. Mara Scanlon: I think that part of the issue is that option 2 (faculty senate) looks college-based but it's actually organized completely around department. So the issue of CAS vs the other colleges shouldn't even be an issue in that model.
48. April Wynn: The structure in COE does sound like it works well. But even with an ideal calendar, there's not really any time or space for CAS to have that discussion in a meaningful way. Even if we all read agendas and minutes and communicated via email, my ability to represent those viewpoints is limited if we've only interacted via email.
49. Mindy Erchull: I could send an email to all the social science people. But they don't all know me. I spend my time in Mercer, which is all Psych (with a few Monroe visitors now). People might recognize my name but they aren't going to be as likely to seek me out and have a conversation because they don't know me. The social science group is just too big a group for someone to represent well.
50. Davis Oldham: This will likely vary from department to department, but my sense is that it would be easier to get someone to agree to be senator than be a UFC representative. In the UFC, people in CAS can hope that someone else from across campus raises their hand. In a department meeting, there's more direct pressure to volunteer. So having a senate model could eliminate some of the "I hope someone else will do it" mentality and increase engagement.
51. April Wynn: We could do option 2 (faculty senate) & ditch the at large positions. We're not limited to the 4 options. We could send out a 1.5 that is part-way between model 1 and model 2 and address some of the concerns that we've heard and invite feedback.
52. Davis Oldham: We are not limited to the 4 options. Perhaps the next step is to brainstorm some options for model 2 with some different representation numbers.
53. Melina Patterson: Can we look at how many people each person on senate would represent?
54. Janine Davis: Should we consider the role of the governance body. We should think about what we do now and whether we are we going to keep doing the same thing?

55. Melissa Wells: I want to go back to Mara's comment about "it's just broken and can't be fixed." Is there more to that and why we've lost so much hope in faculty governance?
56. Mara Scanlon: If pressed, they were mostly in favor of option 2 (senate model) because it gives more buy in. I don't think Mary Washington has ever had a healthy governance relationship with the administration. There is a view that we just respond to administrative directives and don't decide what we think is important to talk about. I think people feel that serving on UFC is just listening to administrative reports and reacting to directives and it feels like a waste of time. I feel like it's a perspective that is both disappointing and at the same time I get it. We don't set the direction. The Faculty Handbook is totally under prevue of UFC and we knew it was a mess but we didn't take action until Tim made us. We have a class schedule that makes it difficult to arrive on time when classes are on opposite sides of campus. We've never taken up the issue of our class schedule which makes it near impossible for students who are not able bodied to navigate. Those are things we could be doing and that's on us. So there's just a lot of cynicism.
57. Tim O'Donnell: The administration would love for faculty governance to have the kind of conversations that Mara is talking about and to be more nimble. If this process produces that, it would be great.
58. Melissa Wells: The Handbook Committee wants to remind everyone of the timeline. UFC needs to make a decision by November so that we can meet the implementation deadline of August 2025.
59. Davis Oldham: Is the Handbook Committee still meeting as a group?
60. Nicole: No. We are in a holding pattern now.
61. Davis Oldham: I'm thinking of the most efficient way to move forward based on the feedback that we've heard today. My impression is that there is more support for option 1 and option 2. I don't want to discount the concerns people have raised about option 2. Would the best group to take a shot at modifying the options be the UFC Executive Committee or the Handbook Group or some other group?
62. Handbook Committee: I'm hearing an idea for a 1.5 and concerns about communication and representation. What are we trying to balance exactly?
63. Caitie Finlayson: I think Melina had a good idea. Can we find out how many people each representative would be representing in option 2 (faculty senate)?
64. Melina Patterson: What's the smallest, what's the highest, and what's the average?
65. Melissa Wells: Highest is Business at 21, lowest is nursing with 3, average is 10.27.
66. Davis Oldham: If Business were to split into multiple departments, that would help with the representation.
67. Kim Kinsley: It's possible that Business may have multiple departments in the future. We haven't gotten that far in the implementation yet.

68. Nicole Crowder: If we create a faculty senate where each department has one representative, then it doesn't matter how many departments are in each college or school. So the senate model is more flexible than the modified UFC model.
69. Melissa Wells: It's also important to remember that the Handbook there is still delegation to the colleges. The faculty governance (regardless of model) will not be unchecked. There are still things that each college has a responsibility for making decisions on. And that's where we also see some representation. It's not just UFC making all the decisions.
70. April Wynn: I'm not a fan of the at-large members, but that is one way that you could give representation to larger departments. They could run for the at-large rep and also keep their department representative. There might be language to give the larger department first right of refusal for the at large positions. And then if it was refused, it could just either go away or somebody else can take it. At large positions could also allow more active departments that wanted to be invested in faculty governments to be able to pop in there. We may need some numbers. But that would be one reason I could see a point for an at large position.
71. Caitie Finlayson: I think that's a cool idea too, and it speaks to your average, right? So if the biggest department is 20, and the average is 10, then they get one of the at large positions and then it's more balanced. This seems easier to figure out than some more complicated recommendations about representation.
72. Nicole Crowder: I'm just going to say I don't think it's our (the Handbook Working Group's) job to decide this.
73. Davis Oldham: I don't think so either. So probably the either the UFC chair acting by himself or in consultation with the executive committee to create some revised options.
74. April Wynn: I think for our tight timeline, it is really hard to have a conversation when we don't have the full Handbook document. Do we have to wait for the legal review before it can go to anybody else? Can it go out? Can we start having those conversations?
75. Nicole Crowder: I mean, this governance issue is separate from the Handbook revision.
76. Davis: It is separate. But I think the concern is that we could approve something and create an issue or conflict.
77. Nicole Crowder: The hope is that we will have feedback very shortly which would allow for discussion at the next UFC meeting, posting and dissemination, and feedback.
78. Davis Oldham: So you're envisioning the 45 page summary?
79. Nicole Crowder: Yes, the 45 page one could easily go out once we have feedback from the lawyers, as long as nothing is illegal.
80. Davis Oldham: I mean could I do it before that and then let people know later if a revised version is required due to feedback from legal or would that be too risky?
81. Nicole Crowder: I don't know. She said she was close.

82. Tim O'Donnell: I would expect that you'll hear back very soon.

83. April Wynn: Maybe it can go out together with the revised 1.5 model.

84. Nicole Crowder: We want to be able to share the document so we'll get this to Davis as soon as we have the okay.

- c. Shanita Mitchell, President of the University Staff Council, introduced herself and apologized for not being available earlier in the meeting. USC is meeting tomorrow and she's happy to provide access to anyone who would like to attend.

VII. Announcements

- a. Davis: I wanted to mention an issue that has come up a couple of times: the encampment at the end of the last semester. When the UFC Executive Committee met, the group came up with the idea of referring that issue and looking at some of the policies and how they changed to the Student Life Advisory Group. And Melina and maybe some others will attend that. Then we'll use the report as a starting point for future discussion.

VIII. Adjournment – Meeting ended 5:22pm.

Minutes prepared by Karen Anewalt