

# Faculty Handbook Working Group Report, October 2024

Nicole Crowder, Co-Chair

Bridgette Dennett

Rachel Graefe-Anderson

Jonathan Levin

Melissa Wells, Co-Chair

## Summary of Charge

On April 19, 2024, the University Faculty Organization Committee issued a call to populate a Summer *Faculty Handbook* Working Group, charged with reviewing the *Faculty Handbook* in accordance with best practices and the new Academic Affairs organizational model. Its goal was to provide a series of recommendations and revisions for consideration by the University Faculty Council (and its committees) by the beginning of the Fall 2024 semester, including edits for errors, contradictions, and inaccuracies, as well as suggestions for improving governance, creating efficiencies in service, and streamlining the *Handbook*. The working group was not given the authority to make changes to the *Handbook* and instead only was charged with making recommendations for further consideration.

The *Faculty Handbook* Working Group met weekly via Zoom from May through August. Each section of the handbook was reviewed independently by each member of the committee and then discussed with the whole group. Individual committee members then took responsibility for revising each section. The proposed revisions are outlined below. Additionally, in June 2024, the working group sent out a survey to all instructional faculty to gather information about strengths and weaknesses of the current *Handbook* as well as preliminary insights into possible updates to University policies and procedures relating to promotion and tenure, curriculum approval, University committee structures, and University faculty governance structures (i.e., UFC). Twenty-seven responses to the survey were received and analyzed.

The working group recommends that revisions be made in two phases. The drafts produced by the committee in August 2024 will compose Round 1 of the process. In this round of revisions, general clean-up and streamlining occurred. Round 2 will be forthcoming pending the recommendations made later in this report and will reflect more substantive changes to align

the *Faculty Handbook* with the proposed Academic Affairs organizational model once it is finalized and approved by SCHEV.

## General Revisions

In general, the proposed revisions include the following types of changes:

- Correcting errors and inaccuracies
- Deleting redundant sentences and information
- Updating information that was out-of-date and inaccurate
- Reordering sections to be more logically organized and streamlined
- Aligning the *Handbook* with the revised *Faculty Handbook Style Guide* (Appendix E)

## Section Revisions

This section lists significant adjustments to specific sections of the *Faculty Handbook* beyond the general revisions listed above.

Note: References to other sections within the *Handbook* and the Table of Contents will need to be updated as a final step once the “clean” version is approved. In some cases, the referenced section numbers correspond to numbering in the current 2024-25 Handbook; in others, the referenced sections have been updated to the revised version. In particular, references in other sections to Section 4 will need to be updated to reflect the proposed reorganization of this section.

### Section 1

For §1.1, the new UMW mission statement was approved by the BOV this July. Once this is approved by SCHEV, the Handbook will need to be updated.

§1.2 was updated to remove outdated information and any information that may become easily outdated, such as information on student population and the dates of our accreditation cycle. The current accreditation information was added. The paragraph under this section dealing with the University's organizational structure must be updated once the Academic Affairs reorganization is finalized.

In §1.6, the Code of Virginia reference was updated to the correct section.

In §1.7.2, the full list of direct reports to the Provost was updated.

In §1.9, references to pertinent University policies (*Department Chair Responsibilities* and *Department Chair Compensation*) were included.

In §1.9.1, the statement from the University *Department Chair Responsibilities* policy regarding the external hire of chairs was inserted. A suggested sentence from the Dean of CAS regarding compensation for work conducted by department chairs over the summer was added.

In §1.9.2, the section number regarding annual evaluations was corrected to §6. Sentences from this section regarding department committee structure and responsibilities were moved to the section on department committees, §1.10.2.

In §1.9.4, the former §§1.9.4.1 and 1.9.4.2 were combined and simplified to cover the scenarios for planned leaves taken by department chairs. The new §1.9.4.2 covers the scenarios for unplanned leaves taken by department chairs. Provisions were added to §§1.9.4.3 and 1.9.4.4 for the replacement of a chair that resigns or is terminated from the chair appointment.

Sentences regarding departmental committees were moved to §1.10.2 from §1.9.2.

In §1.11, the correct handbook title for A/P faculty was referenced.

§§1.11.1 and 1.11.2 were combined to convey current practice with an electronic version of the *Faculty Handbook*.

## Section 2

In §2.1 (“The General Faculty”), a section on provisions for general faculty meetings was added to address the Committee of the Whole and quorum expectations earlier in the section. Additionally, the original §2.1.2 about special general faculty meetings was divided into two sections: one on special general faculty meetings (§2.1.6) and one on emergency general faculty meetings (§2.1.7).

In §2.3 (“The University Faculty Council”), proposed revisions focused on clarifications of existing content. In §2.3.2.6, clarifications were made to state that University standing committees are created and eliminated based on majority votes of the faculties in each college, and faculty advisory committees can be created or eliminated based on a majority vote of UFC. A new §2.3.2.8 references the Faculty Senate of Virginia (which was previously an erroneous sub-section of “UFC Officers” in §2.3.5.5.8). Eligibility to serve on UFC (§2.3.4.1) was changed to “a minimum of three years at the commencement of service” instead of the time of election to align with time-based service requirements of other faculty committees. For elections of at-large members (§2.3.4.3), the requirement for a written statement was deleted; this change had been requested from UFOC previously. Additional details about the process for electing UFC Officers (§2.3.5) were added, noting that a quorum of the newly-constituted committee should vote and that officers officially commence their roles on August 16. In the individual UFC Officer position descriptions, redundancies were deleted (i.e., requiring that the UFC Past Chair be tenured was unnecessary as it was already a requirement to become UFC Chair), and minor

clarifications were added (such as charging the Parliamentarian with enforcement of both *Robert's Rules of Order* and the UFC meeting rules established in Appendix L). Note that this section will need additional changes once the academic organization plans are finalized, and some ideas for university faculty governance structures are outlined in Appendix A.

In §2.4 (“University Faculty Committees”), proposed revisions re-align the *Handbook* with current practice. For example, a clarification that new committee officers officially commence their duties on August 16 (§2.4.1); committee meeting schedules should be announced by the end of the first week of class each semester instead of the entire year’s schedule being announced by August 30 (challenging, if not impossible, to do without knowing one’s spring teaching schedule; deleting the requirement for meeting changes to be communicated to the UFC Chair and presiding officers of the college governing bodies and instead requiring that the committee webpage be updated with pertinent information (§2.4.3.1); and that secretaries do not need to upload their minutes to University Archives by June 30, as University Archives have been automatically archiving these materials since 2014 (§2.4.3.4). Additionally, councils were renamed to presidential councils (§2.4.6) to more accurately reflect their function. While the working group considered if an additional section on other committees (such as working groups or task forces) was needed, we decided instead that these are encompassed within the existing category of administrative advisory committees (§2.4.5) and should be named accordingly in the future.

§2.5 was reorganized to encapsulate the “Organization of University Standing and Faculty Advisory Committees.” Originally, the organization of faculty advisory committees was discussed separately in §2.7; however, there were significant overlaps between these two sections, so combining them was logical. A clarification that full-time instructional faculty are eligible to vote in committee elections was added (§2.5.2.2).

In both §§2.6 and 2.7, updates were made to clean up current committee structures (i.e., replacing ex officio positions that no longer exist with ones that do). Some charges were updated. The University Faculty Affairs Committee was missing in its charge its responsibility to conduct formal investigations outlined in §4. The University Faculty Organization Committee was charged to review faculty governance, but the original §2.9.2 and §2.3.2.5 delegated this to UFC, so this was deleted. Additionally, UFOC’s charge to keep digital archives of committee reports was also deleted, as this is automatically archived from the committee webpages. The University General Education Committee had a charge added to reflect the work it already does to determine if transfer courses carry general education designation credit at UMW. Several faculty advisory committees that review proposals (i.e., SI, WI, DI, FSEM, DBL) mistakenly had in their charges to report to the University General Education Committee, and these were clarified. Kelli Slunt, Director of the Honors Program, requested that her position be converted

to an ex officio position, and other ex officio members be added: the Associate Directors of the Honors Program and the Honors Program Coordinator. Future changes to committees will be necessary to streamline service; recommendations are made in Appendix B.

Due to the combination of the previous §§2.5 and 2.7, the former §2.9 (“College Governance”) will become §2.8. Future changes to this section will be necessary to align with the proposed academic organization.

## Section 3

§3.1 and 3.1.1 were changed to reflect the fact that after the initial appointment letter, faculty appointment letters are now only sent in cases where the rank or salary has changed.

In §3.1.1, it was clarified that continued employment is assured except in cases of financial exigency or discontinuance of a program, with reference to appropriate sections (former §§4.1-4.2).

In §3.1.2, redundancies were removed, and all referenced section numbers were corrected. Clarification was provided on who is making the decisions and recommendations in each stage of the reappointment process and at what point the decision regarding reappointment is final.

In §3.1.3, redundancies were removed. The sentence on faculty not being appointed to an RTA position if they have a terminal degree was removed, as this is not current practice at UMW. The stipulations about the number of faculty that can be at an RTA rank in a given department, college, or university overall were removed, as this is not current practice at UMW.

In §3.1.4, corrected the statement that limited term appointments were non-renewable, as adjunct appointments are renewable indefinitely.

In §3.1.4.1, the appropriate reference to the section on visiting ranks was included (§3.4).

In §3.1.4.1, the appropriate reference to the section on full teaching load was included (§5.4.2).

§3.1.4.3 was reorganized to clarify that summer teaching is not guaranteed unless criteria are met and that faculty cannot be required to teach summer school. References to the appropriate policy on summer compensation were included, and the order of sentences was reorganized to show what policies apply to certain classes of faculty. Clarification was provided on who is paid using the current adjunct salary matrix.

In §3.1.4.4, the appropriate references to the section on full teaching load and the University policy on overload teaching were included (§5.4.2).

In §3.3, the phrase “to carry out full-time instructional (or coaching), professions, and service responsibilities” was removed throughout this section, as this is implicit in a faculty appointment.

In §3.3.3.1, the referenced section numbers were corrected throughout to the appropriate Handbook sections.

In §3.6.1, the referenced section number was corrected to the section on Promotion and Tenure (§7).

In §3.6.2, “teaching faculty” was corrected to the defined term of “instructional faculty.”

In §3.6.4, a defunct position was removed. It was clarified that professional development adjuncts are not instructional faculty, as defined.

In §3.7.1, redundancies were removed, and it was corrected that the list of graduate faculty is now published in the Graduate Academic Catalog.

In §3.7.2, the term “special assignment” was removed, as this has a specific connotation that does not apply in this section. In addition, the role of UMW program director was introduced in this section; this has not been defined elsewhere, which should be considered in the revisions to Section 1 following the reorganization.

In §3.8.3, it was specified that the reduction in teaching load for a special assignment is considered a full teaching load for sabbaticals, fellowships, and awards, as well as the categories already included.

§3.9 was expanded to include information about searches for adjunct and visiting faculty.

§3.10 was reorganized for clarity, redundant sentences were removed, and referenced section numbers were corrected to the appropriate sections. It was updated to include information about accessing the Faculty Handbook, as appointment letters no longer include the actual handbook.

The former §3.10.2 was combined with §3.13.1.

In the new §3.10.2 (former §3.10.3), it was clarified that faculty in the same unit or department should ordinarily have equal starting salaries, not that all faculty starting in a given year will have the same starting salary.

In §3.12.1, the list of issues that family members cannot have judgement on was expanded to include scholarships, fellowships, and awards.

The former §3.10.2 was combined with §3.13.1, and both were updated to reflect current HR practice. The name of the system used for job applications was removed so that this does not have to be continually updated. Referenced section numbers were updated to be consistent with edits.

Former §§3.13.3 and 3.13.4 were made subsections of §3.13.2, as that section introduces these two types of personnel files. The term "special duties" was changed to "special assignments" to be consistent with definitions.

In the new §3.13.2.2 (former §3.13.4), the listed of included documentation was updated, and special assignment appointments were added to the list of correspondence that would be included.

The new §3.13.4 (former §3.13.6) was updated to reflect current procedures for grievance files.

The new §3.13.5 (former §3.13.7) will need to be updated to reflect current P&T practice.

§3.14 was updated to make clear that the policies presented in the Faculty Handbook in this section apply to faculty who are not covered under VSDP. VSDP is one of the options that faculty select upon initial employment at UMW. Most faculty are not in the VSDP system.

Medical procedures were added to the list of what would qualify for sick leave in §§3.14.1 and 3.14.1.1. Clarification was provided on who is eligible for the University's disability leave policy. The length of time was changed from 10 class days to 10 business days, for equity issues.

It was clarified that there are 3 forms of parental leave in §3.14.3.

It was clarified that the provisions in §3.14.3.1 apply to parental leave in the title to the section and throughout the section.

Language was edited for consistency between §§3.14.3.2 and 3.14.3.3 as to who is eligible for these leaves. The question as to timeline for initial and extended parental leaves when an eligible event occurs between semesters needs to be answered.

In §3.14.3.4, the appropriate reference to the section on full teaching load was included (§5.4.2).

In §3.14.5, the appropriate reference to the section on full teaching load was included (§5.4.2). The last sentence from §3.14.5.2 was moved to this section, as this is where sabbatical leave is introduced.

In §3.14.5.1, the appropriate reference to the section the referenced committee was included (§2.6.7).

In §3.14.5.3, the timeline for final sabbatical report submission was clarified.

In §3.14.6, provisions were included for class coverage in the case of extended civil leave.

In §3.14.8, sentence order was reorganized for clarity.

In §3.15, the timeline for this process was clarified. The mention of merit pay was removed. A reference to the section on criteria for tenure and promotion was included (§7).

§§6.7 and 6.8 were combined and moved from Section 6 (on annual evaluation) to Section 3 (on faculty benefits), to reflect a better fit for subject material. This is a new §3.16.

In §3.16.3, the stipulation to leave a forwarding address upon separation from the university was removed, as all checks are direct deposited.

The new §3.17 (former §3.16) was updated to reflect current HR practices for full- and part-time faculty.

The former §§3.17.1, 3.17.1.1., 3.17.1.2, 3.17.1.3 (new §3.18.1) were combined to remove redundancies and cover all types of faculty separation from the university. The conditional release of the last paycheck was removed, as this is illegal.

Information on the required break in service time period was included in the new §3.18.3.2 (former §3.17.3.2). This also applies to any full-time faculty member that leaves the university, so should be incorporated elsewhere, if appropriate.

The new §3.19 (former §3.18) was updated to be inclusive of both tenure-track and RTA faculty. Guidelines from AAUP that were inconsistent with practice at UMW were removed. In addition, §3.19.1 was edited to mirror language from §3.19.2 regarding dismissal for cause and deadline for notice of nonreappointment, without changing substance of the contained information.

The final two sentences in §3.19.1 (former §3.18.1) were moved to the new §3.19.3 (former §3.18.3), which is the section on limited term faculty.

In §3.19.2 (former §3.18.2), the appropriate sections on dismissal for cause were corrected (former §§4.3-4.4).



## Section 4

Generally, Section 4 has been restructured to reflect a general order that proceeds from definitions to general procedures to more specific situations. Appeals information has been largely consolidated into one section. A section on allegations of bias has been added. Throughout the section, minor revisions have been made to clarify language without changing substance. Throughout the restructure of the section, redundant language has been removed when possible. A set of abbreviated parallel tables of contents (TOC) are provided below. A more complete parallel set of TOC for the two versions of the section can also be provided upon request (in the interest of space, it is not included here).

OLD Table of Contents	NEW Table of Contents
4.1 Termination of an appointment before the end of the term specified in the faculty member’s appointment letter (contract)	4.1 Definitions and general procedures
4.2 Appeal procedures in cases involving termination or reassignment of faculty appointments prior to the end of the specified appointment (contract) term	4.2 General procedures for addressing allegations
4.3 Imposing sanctions for allegations of violations of policy, and discharge for cause	4.3 Procedures for formal investigation of university policy
4.4 Procedures for formal investigation of violations of university policy	4.4 Termination of an appointment before the end of the term specified in the faculty member’s appointment letter (contract)
4.5 Appeal of major sanctions	4.5 Appeal procedures
4.6 Allegations of incompetence, neglect of duty, or misconduct	4.6 Termination of an appointment for medical reasons
4.7 Allegations of discrimination or harassment	
4.8 Allegations of academic misconduct in scholarly activity or research	
4.9 Termination of an appointment for medical reasons	

Most of §4.1 was moved to be the new section §4.4. The definition of financial exigency (old §4.1.1) is now §4.1.2.

Section §4.2 was moved to be the new section §4.5.1 under the new §4.5 that covers appeals.

Sections §4.3.1 and §4.3.2 were moved to be the new section §4.1.

Of note here, the new section §4.1.4 now contains the definitions for types of allegations in one place.

Section §4.3.3 was moved to be the new section §4.2. Section §4.3.3.6 was removed and is now covered in the new section §4.5 on appeals

Section §4.4 was moved to be the new section §4.3. The following sentence was added for clarification to the section on Challenges to Committee Membership (UFAC): [“Replacements will serve for the duration of the investigation and will not perform the other duties of the UFAC.”](#)

Section §4.5 has been changed to cover appeals more generally and now includes most appeal processes

Sections §4.6.1- §4.6.2 have been moved to the new section §4.2 covering general procedures.

Sections §4.6.3- §4.6.4 have been moved to the new section §4.3 covering formal investigation procedures.

Section §4.6.5 is now under the new §4.5 covering appeals.

Sections §4.7-4.8.2 have been moved to the new section §4.1 covering definitions.

Sections §4.8.3-4.8.5 have been moved or integrated into the new section §4.2.1 covering inquiries and general procedures.

Section §4.8.6 has been integrated into the new section §4.2.2 on informal investigations.

Sections §4.8.7-4.8.8 are now section §4.3.9 covering specifics associated with allegations of academic misconduct.

As the University no longer has a separate policy for allegations of bias, this section was removed in Sections 4 and 5.

## Section 5

Added links to the Catalog or to University policies where appropriate to make it easier to find additional information that is referenced in the handbook.

§5.2 THE HONOR CODE – Edits were made to align our language in the Handbook with current practices. Added guidance from Wes Hillyard re: university expectations around Artificial Intelligence. Additional language was added to §5.2.4 to further expand on the Honor Council process.

§5.3 EQUAL OPPORTUNITY AND RESPECTFUL WORKPLACE POLICIES – Amended discrimination list to match newer sections that had updated qualifiers.

§5.4 ACADEMIC POLICIES AND REGULATIONS – §5.4.5 Amended language to directly align with the policy on student absences that is published in the Catalog. Old language didn't match either the catalog or current practices. §5.4.6 Added language including a course AI policy to the list of information required in the course syllabus. §5.4.7 Removed the wording that stated office hours must be posted on the faculty member's office door – amended to say that it must be posted and maintained. §5.4.10 Copied language from the Registrar's site specifying that it is the student's responsibility to see that all degree requirements have been met. Added senior degree progress checks to the list of advising duties. Added language saying that advisors must keep accessible records, complete paperwork in a timely manner, and lift holds. §5.4.14 Added Honor Convocation to the list.

§5.5 FACULTY DEVELOPMENT – Added a section on the Waple Fellowship. Added a section on Anderson Distinguished Professorships. §5.5.6 Updated the title of the Center for Teaching. Changed “scholarly inquiry” to the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning to match language elsewhere in the Handbook. §5.5.7 Updated language describing Digital Learning Support to reflect current practices.

§5.6 PROFESSIONAL ISSUES - §5.6.4 Added decisions on student employment, scholarships, fellowships to the list.

§5.8 FACULTY GRIEVANCE - §5.8.3 Adjusted the list to reflect Handbook order. Confirmed and updated referenced sections. §5.8.11.3 There was confusion amongst the working group about how faculty can challenge the membership of the UFAGC that will hear their grievance. The policy remains unclear and needs to be confirmed by the faculty.

## Section 6

**§6.1 ANNUAL EVALUATION PRINCIPLES FOR FULL-TIME INSTRUCTIONAL FACULTY** Revisions and reorganization of material in this section aims to clarify the distinction between the three rating categories used to rate performance in the areas of teaching, scholarly, creative, and professional activity, and service (meets, exceeds, and does not meet expectations) and the overall rating for the year, Satisfactory or Unsatisfactory. The criteria for determination of an overall “unsatisfactory” rating are from the present §6.9 (and §6.3.2). Revisions here and

elsewhere in §6 also introduce new formatting (bullet points for “meets,” “exceeds,” and “does not meet expectations” in the areas of teaching, scholarly, creative, and professional activity, and service). Note too that throughout §6 (and throughout the Handbook), different versions of “scholarly and professional activity” are regularized as “scholarly, creative, and professional activity,” in keeping with revisions introduced (alas, not consistently) several years back. Finally, there is reference in this section to department “peer review,” which is optional and only practiced in some departments. **The committee asks if peer review shouldn’t either be adopted across the board or eliminated altogether, to regularize how annual review is done in departments. Any change here to the practice of peer review would require analogous changes throughout §6.**

**§6.2. ANNUAL EVALUATION POLICY AND PROCEDURES** A cross reference is added near the start of this section to the calendar that appears later in §6.6.1 in the newly revised Handbook (formerly §6.6.2.1). Most importantly, this section adds a sentence indicating that department “evaluation plans” should be “accessible to the department” and “reviewed regularly,” as it is not clear that these plans are documented as they should be (they rather seem to be a matter of oral history). **This may well require some departments to commit their orally transmitted plans to paper (and to the Dean for formal recognition or approval).** Language about different disciplines’ definitions of “scholarly, creative, and professional activity” moved from §6.2.1.6 in the 2024-25 Handbook to the opening of §6.3.3 in the newly revised Handbook, where it fits in better (and becomes more prominent). Language moved in 6.2.2.2 to add clarity about the role of the Dean in changing performance ratings. Language added in 6.2.2.4 to clarify the maintenance of documentation in the personnel file. Clarification that the Provost’s authority is final is added in §6.2.3.2. §6.2.3.3 removed because substance of this section is already covered by §6.2.3.1. §6.2.3.5 is added to clarify maintenance of documentation in the personnel file in the Provost’s office.

**§6.3 MINIMAL PERFORMANCE CRITERIA AND ANNUAL EVALUATIONS** Some unnecessary language removed at the outset to reduce clutter. Keeping instruction “current and vibrant” changed to “current and engaging.” Some wordsmithing here for clarity as well, and some additional information on minimal service criteria to bring a modicum of clarity to an often murky issue. In newly revised §6.3.2, important language on the “preeminence” of teaching is brought nearer the top, to make it more prominent. In §6.3.2, under “meets expectations,” the distinction is drawn between student research presentations that count as teaching (campus based) vs. those that count as research (presented at external venues, like regional or national conferences). This distinction is common in the sciences, though it may be less so in other fields. This is meant to help resolve the ambiguity regarding how to “count” mentored/guided

research by students. Slight change in phrasing in §6.3.2, under “does not meet expectations,” to conform with other instances in the Handbook. Language added at outset of §6.6.3 taken from §6.2.1.6. In §6.3.3, under “meets expectations,” adopted the phrase “scholarship of teaching” to reference pedagogy-based research and writing. Redundant language about grants and funding removed from §6.3.3. In §6.3.3, under “does not meet expectations, removed examples that some found confusing. In §6.3.4, removed reference to service on a department committee, in order to clarify the importance of serving on at least one college or University committee; service to the department is also addressed at length further into the paragraph.

**§6.4 ANNUAL EVALUATION DOCUMENTS** §6.4.4 restructured, but with minimal change to substance of paragraph. §6.4.5 addresses Special Assignment Performance Reviews (the SAPRs). There is a general sense that this is **an area in need of improved processes and procedures**. There was some consensus that these procedures are not always followed to the letter (with examples offered by members of the Handbook group). Also, the form in the appendix is dated (it refers to weighting scores, for example) and lacks the reference to the opportunity to file a letter of exception that appears on the APR. There is nothing wrong with the stipulated policy. It simply needs to be followed, with a clearer sense of who is filing the SAPR (the supervisor), and to whom (the department chair).

**§6.5 GUIDELINES FOR COMPLETING THE FAAR** Information in §6.5.1.1 moved to the current position from §6.6.1.2 for clarity. The phrase “current and engaging” adopted here again, in place of “current and vigorous.” §6.5.1.4 added to conform with other sections. §6.5.1.5 reorganized for clarity, with minimal changes. Changes in §6.5.3.1 are meant to allow other forms of college or university service to be recognized (such as “working groups” and “task forces”). §6.5.3.5 added to conform with other sections.

**§6.6 THE SCHEDULE FOR ANNUAL EVALUATION** Minor revisions to §6.6.2 allow us to regard the calendar for annual evaluation to be set as described, with allowance for changing dates to ensure that deadlines fall on business days. In the schedule at §6.6.2.1, in the second box of the first column, it is noted that the schedule for completion of peer review (in departments that practice peer review) must be adjusted for anyone undergoing a promotion and/or tenure review, as August 31 is simply too late to provide the peer review, based on the calendar for P & T in §7. Language in chart is altered to reflect changes in how reviews are conducted. In §6.6.3, adopted the more commonly used phrase “business days.”

**§§6.7 and 6.8 FACULTY SALARIES and ANNUAL SALARY ADJUSTMENTS** §§6.7 and 6.8 have been moved to §3, as they have no apparent bearing on annual evaluation. However, §6.8.2 does have a bearing on performance evaluation, so we might include, as a new §6.7, a section titled "Merit Pay Adjustment Process," that reads as follows: "Should funds become available to award merit increases to faculty, the Provost will work with the University Faculty Council to develop a process for making these awards, a process consistent with and based on the annual review process. Merit pay will not be awarded to any faculty member with an overall rating of "unsatisfactory" for the previous evaluation period." This language recognizes that there is presently no merit pay system, but it acts as a placeholder, should merit pay become viable (or should it be mandated by Richmond) in the future.

**§6.8 [new numbering, b/c of deleted section above] ADDRESSING UNSATISFACTORY PERFORMANCE** Revisions to §§6.8.1 and 6.8.2 are meant to clarify the triggers and processes related to unsatisfactory performance review. Also, distinct sections for untenured and tenured faculty are eliminated in favor of simply noting the differences for untenured faculty, as in the last sentence of §6.8.2. Changes in §6.8.3 are also intended to clarify the processes described, simplifying the way in which the "two out of three years" rule is described. In §6.8.3, removed unnecessary examples under "removal for cause." In §6.8.4, reference to minor sanctions added, because this would seem to have to be the case. In §6.8.5, "discharge" changed to "dismissal," in keeping with phrasing elsewhere.

## Section 7

**§7 Promotion and Tenure Procedures** Much of this section assumes (and refers to) the separate P & T processes in the colleges and the appendices that flesh them out. If that system changes, these references will need to be eliminated or reframed.

**§7.1 PROMOTION POLICY** Some minor changes in phrasing in this section to clarify, streamline, and bring into conformity with phrasing elsewhere in the Handbook. Regarding the reference to the "needs of the University" at the end of this section, nothing has been changed here, but there was some interest in better understanding what this means and how it factors into the decision-making process. Perhaps §7.6.2 is the relevant section to reference here?

**§7.2 GENERAL MINIMUM PROMOTION REQUIREMENTS** The phrase "teaching effectiveness" changed here to "teaching" to conform with most other instances in the Handbook of the phrase teaching, scholarly, creative, and professional activity, and service" (the phrase

“teaching effectiveness is of course also used elsewhere, but not in this particular, and frequent, combination). Change made in §7.2.1.2 and in §§7.2.2.3, 7.2.3.3, and 7.2.4.3 from the vague "professional responsibilities" to "contractual responsibilities," with added cross-reference to §§5.4.1-5.4.10. Slight change in phrasing so that 7.2.2.2 conforms with 7.2.3.2 and 7.2.4.2. Changed "exceptional" to "unusual" in §7.2.4.3 to conform with 7.2.2.2 and 7.2.3.2 (it's possible this different phrasing was meant to indicate something, but it's exceedingly hard to tell what that difference might be).

**§7.3 INDIVIDUAL CRITERIA FOR PROMOTION** Slight modifications to phrasing in §7.3 to conform with language used elsewhere in the Handbook.

**§7.4 INSTITUTIONAL RANK STRUCTURE POLICY** Does the 70% policy need to be revisited in an environment where the number of new appointments has been (and may continue to be) very limited?

**§7.6 TENURE POLICY** Eliminated some unnecessary language in order more clearly highlight the relevant sections providing procedural protections. Some changes in §7.6.2 to enhance clarity. The concluding sentence in §7.6.2 was added for clarity.

**§7.7 TENURE REQUIREMENTS** Consultation with the faculty member and Chair when shortening the probationary period added in §7.7.3, as this seems only sensible.

**§7.8 GENERAL PROMOTION AND TENURE CALENDAR** As with the calendar in §6 (on annual evaluation), the language here seeks to clarify that the "sample" calendar is the calendar, though it must be adjusted annually in order to ensure that all deadlines fall on working days. Earlier deadline for candidates undergoing peer review (in departments that have a peer-review system) indicated as August 15. Minor changes throughout the calendar to reflect the fact that at least in some colleges, materials are now submitted via Canvas (not dropped off at the Dean's office).

**§7.12 PROMOTION AND TENURE APPEALS** In §7.12.1, changed "one working week" to "seven days" to conform with language of subsequent sections. Perhaps, though, this should be "five working days," in keeping with the phrasing for other similar timelines in the Handbook. Also, some language has been added here for clarity. It was noted in our discussion that at present, COB appears to have no appeals process outlined in Appendix J for P & T decisions.

## Section 8

Throughout, links were updated.

In §8.4, the appropriate reference to the section the referenced committee was included (§2.6.7).

In §8.5.1.1, it was clarified that the University is officially closed during these time periods.

§8.5.1.2 was updated to reflect current practices, using language from our website regarding inclement weather closings.

Key card access was included in §8.5.2 to reflect current practice.

The former §8.5.5 about faculty telephone services was removed to reflect current practices with zoom phones.

§8.5.6 was updated to reflect current practices and use of Chrome River for travel approvals.

In §8.7.1, references to the Fredericksburg and Stafford campuses were removed.

Former §§8.7.4 and 8.7.5 were combined, as it now the Speaking and Writing Center.

In new §8.7.7 (former §8.7.8), all reference to the Office were changed to the Center.

## Appendices

In Appendix A, under the section on curriculum vitae, all references to the College were changed to University. The referenced section numbers were updated to the correct sections consistent with edits. The section on personal information on the CV was updated to reflect current practice.



## Next Steps by Section

This section offers recommendations for subsequent actions needed to finalize specific sections of the *Faculty Handbook*.

### General Next Steps

Recommended Actions	Recommended Responsible Party
Once SCHEV finalizes the academic organization plan, revisit references in the handbook to “department chairs” and ensure all appropriate supervisory roles are represented.	
Re-check all inter-section references to ensure updated/ accurate locations are referenced.	

### Section 1

Recommended Actions	Recommended Responsible Party
Update the UMW Mission Statement, once approved by SCHEV.	
Update the administrative structure outlined in this section consistent with the reorganization of Academic Affairs.	
Determine which of the appendices should remain in the Faculty Handbook and which can be included as links in Section 8.	
Determine an appropriate process for the amendment and approval of the various appendices.	UFC and individual college governing bodies

### Section 2

Recommended Actions	Recommended Responsible Party
Consider adjustments and/or modifications to UFC/Faculty Senate, with initial considerations and recommendations outlined in Appendix A.	UFC and individual college governing bodies
Work with committees to determine needs and make relevant changes to University committee structures, with initial considerations and recommendations outlined in Appendix B and C.	UFOC (in collaboration with pertinent committees)

Consider principles for college governance structures (old §2.9, revised §2.8) that reflect proposed academic organization changes.	College faculty, deans, and Provost
Determine if a policy needs to be added to the handbook for what to do in cases where a committee is unable to be populated with its required personnel (i.e., due to faculty service overloads).	UFOC

### Section 3

Recommended Actions	Recommended Responsible Party
§3.13.5 will need to be updated to be consistent with the new promotion and tenure file procedures.	
Clarify the timeline for initial and extended parental leave when qualifying events occur between semesters.	HR and attorney

### Section 4

Recommended Actions	Recommended Responsible Party
Review all timelines for investigations and appeals procedures for consistency and rationale. The section contains multiple specified timelines of varied lengths for unclear reasons.	UFC
Review UFAC Guidelines for formal investigation of violations of university policy and incorporate detail as suggested by the committee (see appendix E)	UFC
Determine whether a new appendix to the handbook outlining hearings procedures is appropriate (see appendix E)	UFC
Ensure all investigative and appeal procedures are robust and follow legal requirements.	Provost and Attorney

### Section 5

Recommended Actions	Recommended Responsible Party
Review the University of Chicago principles and see how they apply in 5.1	UFC
Are “responsible employees” required to report information learned outside of working hours?	Provost and Attorney
What exceptions are approved for Final Examinations? Is there a deadline for submitting this?	Dean
Need more detail about grants	Deans and Provost

Check into phrasing about “parallel agreements”	Attorney
Need clarity on the process for challenging the composition of UFAGC	UFC

### Section 6

Recommended Actions	Recommended Responsible Party
Should we regularize practice around peer review, or allow departments to opt in or out?	UFAC, University faculty, deans, Provost
Are department “evaluation plans,” as described in §6.2, in place?	Chairs, deans
Are supervisors completing Special Assignment Performance Reviews (SAPRs) and filing them with Chairs to feed into APRs?	Chairs, deans, special assignment supervisors
Is a more streamlined FAAR format advantageous? (Some survey responses requested this.)	UFAC

### Section 7

Recommended Actions	Recommended Responsible Party
We will need to make a decision about whether to move to a single P & T committee for all University faculty, or maintain three separate P & T committees, serving the newly configured “Schools.” Section will need to be overhauled (along with appendices), if the former; it will need to be modified (again, along with appendices) if the latter, to reflect new departments in the Schools. Appendix D offers some possible configurations.	UFAC for recommendation; then University faculty, college faculty (to address appendices), deans, Provost
Revisit the 70% rule in §7.4: Presently, based on the 2024-25 catalog listing, 74% of faculty are Associate and full Professors. Does the policy of not exceeding 70% of the faculty at these ranks need to be revisited in an environment where the number of new appointments has been (and may continue to be) very limited?	Faculty, deans, Provost

### Section 8

Recommended Actions	Recommended Responsible Party
Possibly move material from the appendices to Section 8, such as links to the Honor Constitution and the University’s policy on academic freedom.	

## Appendices

<b>Recommended Actions</b>	<b>Recommended Responsible Party</b>
Ensure that college-level appendices are updated to follow the revised style guide (Appendix E) and other changes approved in §1-7. This includes special attention to the promotion and tenure expectations outlined in §6-7. The University Faculty Affairs Committee is charged with ensuring college-level P&T structures align with University-level policy, and the Faculty Handbook Working Group can provide insights into discrepancies between current University and college-level policies.	Appropriate college-level body in consultation with the University Faculty Affairs Committee and the Faculty Handbook Working Group
Consider what materials actually need to be included as appendices in the Faculty Handbook and which can be referenced to external documents or websites.	

# Timeline Considerations and Procedures for Changing the Faculty Handbook

As specified in §1.12, §§1-7 generally require recommendations from either the UFC (approved by a majority vote of UFC members), the President, or a vote of the general faculty (“if reconsidering an action on an amendment that was passed by the UFC and voted on but not approved by the faculties in the colleges as stipulated in §§2.3.2.4 [UFC] and 2.3.2.6 [University standing committees]”). Legal counsel will also review the proposed changes, and the BOV will vote to adopt proposed changes before they become final.

Changes to UFC and University standing committee structures follow a different procedure. According to §2.3.2.4, changes to §2.3.4 (UFC) must be approved by majority votes of the faculty governing bodies of each college through procedures to be determined in each college. According to §2.3.2.6 (university committees), proposals for new University-wide *standing* committees, or elimination of current *standing* committees, must be developed in consultation with each college’s governing bodies. Such proposals must be approved by majority votes of the faculties of each college, through procedures to be determined in each college, before being submitted for approval as revisions to the University Faculty Handbook. Therefore, both changes to UFC and University standing committees must be approved through votes of each college’s faculty. Without knowing the final academic organization that SCHEV approves, it is difficult to make final determinations about possible structures of UFC and some University standing committees that rely upon unit-specific representation.

Updates to the current promotion and tenure policies and procedures will need to coincide with adoption of a new academic organization structure. Additionally, candidates applying for promotion and/or tenure will need sufficient time to prepare their dossiers to meet these updated expectations and requirements.

Changes to college governance structures must be approved by the college faculty, college dean, and the Provost (original §2.9.1).

Given these constraints, we recommend the following possible timeline to advance both “Round 1” (“clean up” of existing handbook policies) and “Round 2” (more substantive policy and procedure updates to increase efficiency and reflect possible updated academic organization) with a target implementation date of August 2025.

Suggested Timeframe	“Round 1” (“Clean Up”) Tasks	“Round 2” (“Substantive Updates”) Tasks
August 2024	Discuss preliminary proposed revisions with UFC.	Share Faculty Handbook Working Group Report with UFC and general

Suggested Timeframe	“Round 1” (“Clean Up”) Tasks	“Round 2” (“Substantive Updates”) Tasks
		faculty, which includes suggestions for further action.
September 2024	Make proposed revisions available to the general faculty. Invite commentary and suggestions, including from legal counsel.	UFC charges appropriate groups to pursue recommended actions from Faculty Handbook Working Group Report.
October 2024	Revise proposed revisions and bring to UFC vote.	Appropriate groups continue to pursue recommended actions from Faculty Handbook Working Group Report.
November 2024	Bring to BOV vote.	Appropriate groups share findings of work on recommended actions from Faculty Handbook Working Group Report.
December 2024		Revise handbook language.
January 2025		<p>Make proposed revisions available to UFC and the general faculty. Invite commentary and suggestions, including from legal counsel. This could involve a general faculty meeting.</p> <p>Complete corresponding approval policies (i.e., UFC or college faculty vote).</p>
February 2025		<p>Bring to BOV vote.</p> <p>Colleges should begin revisiting college governance structures to align with new academic organization models.</p>
March 2025		<p>College faculty, college dean, and Provost approve of revised college governance structures.</p> <p>College-level appendices are revised.</p>
April 2025		UFOC runs appointment/election campaign for University-level committees based on newly-

Suggested Timeframe	“Round 1” (“Clean Up”) Tasks	“Round 2” (“Substantive Updates”) Tasks
		<p>approved handbook for implementation in August 2025.</p> <p>College-level appendices are approved for handbook implementation in August 2025.</p>
May 2025		Trainings and information sessions for revised promotion and tenure policies.
August 2025		Implement academic organization plan alongside updated policies and procedures.

# Appendix A: Possible Configurations of UFC/Faculty Senate

Based on the 2023 UFOC Reports as well as current plans for academic organization, the following models are recommendations to investigate for adaptation and/or implementation. According to §2.3.2.4, changes to §2.3.4 (UFC) must be approved by majority votes of the faculty governing bodies of each college through procedures to be determined in each college. The final proposed model should be determined no later than November 2024. It would need to be voted through all college governing bodies no later than January 2025.

<p><b><u>Current Model: UFC with 18 members</u></b></p> <p><b>9 CAS</b>          (3 Health/STEM: biology, chemistry/physics, computer science, Earth/environmental sciences, mathematics, or health/physical education/recreation)          (3 Social Sciences: economics, geography, history/American studies, historic preservation, political science/international affairs, psychology, or Sociology/anthropology)          (3 Arts/Humanities: art/art history, classics/philosophy/religion, communication/digital studies, English/linguistics, modern languages/literatures, music, or theater/dance)</p> <p><b>3 COE</b></p> <p><b>3 COB</b></p> <p><b>3 At-Large</b></p>	<p><b><u>Option 1: Modified UFC with 14-15 members</u></b></p> <p><b>8 CAS</b>          2 School of Life &amp; Physical Sciences          2 School of the Arts          2 School of the Humanities          2 School of the Social Sciences</p> <p><b>2 COE&amp;H</b>          1 Education          1 Nursing/AHPE</p> <p><b>2 COB&amp;CS</b>          1 Business          1 ECON/MATH/CPSC</p> <p><b>2-3 At Large</b>          (Could be truly at-large or 1/college if 3 reps)</p> <p>Consider adding qualifications:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Where units have multiple representatives, they must be from different departments.</li> <li>• Can a contingent faculty member be added? (Compensation was a challenge when these conversations began in 19-20.)</li> </ul> <p>Pros:</p>
--	---



	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Cuts down on number of service roles needed to fill this group.</li> <li>• Most similar to currently-adopted system.</li> </ul> <p>Cons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Maintains current model that some have complained exacerbates communication issues.</li> <li>• Current UFC has a 50/50 split between CAS and COE/COB/At-large; this model is a 57/43 split. Numbers could be adjusted if needed. However, at-large positions tend to be CAS due to larger population.</li> </ul> <p>Implementation Considerations:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• College governance for CASFC would need to be revisited, perhaps with a representative model (1/department). The UFC reps would automatically be on CASFC, and then supplemental departmental reps would support communication.</li> </ul>
<p><b><u>Option 2: Faculty Senate with 24-25 members:</u></b>  <b>CAS (15)</b>  School of Life &amp; Physical Sciences (3 depts)  School of the Arts (4 depts)  School of the Humanities (4 depts)  School of the Social Sciences (4 depts)</p> <p><b>COE&amp;H (3)</b>  3 depts: EDUC, NURS, AHPE</p> <p><b>COB&amp;CS (4)</b>  4 depts</p>	<p><b><u>Option 3: Faculty of the Whole with TBD members (entire full-time instructional faculty)</u></b>  Composition: Entire full-time instructional faculty</p> <p>Pros:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Streamlines communication, with every person representing themselves.</li> </ul> <p>Cons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Does not streamline service load; would require all instructional faculty</li> </ul>

**2-3 At Large**

(Could be truly at-large or 1/college if 3 reps)

Consider adding qualifications:

- Can a contingent faculty member be added? (Compensation was a challenge when these conversations began in 19-20.)

Pros:

- Having one rep per unit may reduce communication issues.
- Some faculty have expressed interest in returning to a Faculty Senate model.

Cons:

- Smaller departments would have a larger burden of staffing this model year after year. Some other schools have affordances for smaller departments to waive their representation and/or “bundle” with another unit, and these options could be explored.
- Current UFC has a 50/50 split between CAS and COE/COB/At-large; this model ranges from a 62.5/37.5 split (24 members) to a 60/40 split (25 members). However, at-large positions tend to be CAS due to larger population. Requiring at-large members to come from separate colleges could help with dispersing representation.

Implementation Considerations:

(if interested) to attend monthly meetings.

- |  |  |
|--|--|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• What would the role of an at-large rep be in a Faculty Senate? Are they still needed?</li><li>• Like Truman State, can smaller units (under a set number of full-time instructional faculty, like 5?) collaborate with others to send one representative that represents both departments? Would this be a double vote or a single vote?</li></ul> |  |
|--|--|

## Appendix B: Possible Configurations of University Standing and Faculty Advisory Committees

Based on the 2023 UFOC Reports as well as current plans for academic organization, the following models are recommendations to investigate for adaptation and/or implementation. **Yellow highlights** indicate positions that no longer exist and are recommended for updates in the “Round 1” revisions.

According to §2.3.2.6 (university committees), proposals for *new* University-wide *standing* committees, or *elimination* of current *standing* committees, must be developed in consultation with each college’s governing bodies. Such proposals must be approved by majority votes of the faculties of each college, through procedures to be determined in each college, before being submitted for approval as revisions to the University Faculty Handbook.

The working group recommends that UFOC check in with the committees to see if the recommended structure and other considerations are accurate and agreeable, and then present formalized recommendations to UFC in November 2024.

### Standing Committees

Committee	Current Structure	Recommended Structure & Other Considerations
University Academic Affairs Committee	5 faculty (1/college, 2 at-large)  Ex officio: Provost, Dean of Admissions, Registrar, <b>Associate Provost for Academic Engagement and Student Success</b> ; 2 students	Maintain 5 (1/college, 2 at-large)  <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Consider a request from UAAC to UFOC in 2019-2020: Account for institutional knowledge by adding a requirement for one member to be a full professor or senior lecturer.</li> </ul> Replace AP for AESS with the Provost (or their designee). (This was proposed in Round 1 <i>Handbook</i> revisions.)
University Curriculum Committee	4 faculty (chairs of 3 college curriculum committees, 1 UFC rep)  Ex officio: Provost, Registrar	See Appendix C for additional recommendations and considerations regarding the curriculum approval process, which would impact committee configuration.

Committee	Current Structure	Recommended Structure & Other Considerations
		<p>Add as an ex officio member the Associate Provost for Institutional Analysis and Effectiveness. (This was proposed in Round 1 <i>Handbook</i> revisions based on UCC’s request to UFOC in 2019-2020. Additionally, this will support future SACSCOC re-accreditation efforts.)</p> <p>Review Charge .5: “Review, approve, or reject proposals for changes in the relationship between programs or departments (for example, dissolution, division, or mergers).” Should these be faculty-initiated proposals (instead of administrative reorganization efforts)?</p>
University Faculty Affairs Committee	6 faculty (1/college [tenure/TT], 3 at-large [RTA eligible]); must have 3 years’ affiliation	<p><b>Reduce to 5</b> (1/college [tenure/TT], <b>2</b> at-large).</p> <p>Explicit reference to RTA eligibility for at-large positions is recommended for deletion from the <i>Handbook</i>, as it is already covered in §3.3.1.</p> <p>A new charge is being added to include the UFAC requirements outlined in §4.</p> <p>.6: Conduct formal investigations of allegations of violations of university policy by a faculty member (see §4.4); allegations of incompetence, neglect of duty, or misconduct by a faculty member (see §4.6); allegations of academic misconduct in scholarly activity or research by a faculty member (see §4.8); and termination of an appointment for medical reasons (see §4.9). <i>[Numbering of references to §4 sub-sections will likely change.]</i></p>
University Faculty Appeals and Grievance Committee	5 faculty (1/college, 2 at-large); Associate w/tenure	No changes recommended.

Committee	Current Structure	Recommended Structure & Other Considerations
University Faculty Organization Committee	6 faculty (2/college)	<p>Maintain 6 faculty (2/college).</p> <p>The original charge .5 tasks a review of faculty governance to UFOC, pointing to 2.9.2, but 2.9.2 says this is the responsibility of UFC (which is confirmed in 2.3.2.5). Therefore, this responsibility was deleted from UFOC's charge.</p> <p>The original charge .7 has been deleted, as UFOC no longer keeps digital archives of committee reports (committees do this themselves on their corresponding UFC webpages).</p> <p>Clarify if UFOC representatives assist with college-level committee population. This is not currently stated in §2.6.5, but CAS does require this of CAS UFOC representatives in §F.8. If this is a responsibility of UFOC, it should be added to the committee's charge.</p> <p>Consider if UFOC should also be charged with populating presidential councils, administrative advisory committees, and/or boards as a means of more holistic record-keeping of faculty service.</p>
University General Education Committee	5 faculty (at large)  Ex officio: Provost, Dean of Admissions, Associate Provost for Institutional Analysis and Effectiveness	<p>Option 1: Maintain 5 faculty.            Option 2: Reduce to 3 faculty.            Option 2: Merge with FSEM and maintain 5.</p> <p>A new charge was added to address duties of this committee that were not previously captured in the <i>Handbook</i>:</p> <p>.7 Review applications for general education designations for transfer courses, including equivalencies for AP, IB, CLEP, and other courses of study.</p> <p>Consider ex officio membership. Should the Registrar be included too? Is the Dean of Admissions needed?</p>

Committee	Current Structure	Recommended Structure & Other Considerations
University Sabbaticals, Fellowships, and Faculty Awards Committee	5 faculty (1/college with CAS divided into 3 divisions)  Ex officio: Associate Provost for Academic Affairs	<b>Increase to 6 faculty</b> (1 COB&I, 1 COE&HS, 4 CAS for each school)--however, this is an even number of voting members, which isn't ideal. (If Business divides into two schools, then they would have two representatives, which would total 7 faculty.)  Replace former APAA position with the Director for the Center for Teaching (proposed in Round 1 <i>Handbook</i> edits).

**Faculty Advisory Committees**

Committee	Current Structure	Recommended Structure & Other Considerations
Bachelor of Liberal Studies Committee	5 faculty (at large)  Ex officio: Director of BLS Degree Program; 1 student	<b>Reduce to 3 faculty</b> (at large).  Consider the following request from the BLS Committee to UFOC in 2019-2020: Include (as ex officio) the Senior Assistant Director of Transfer Admissions and the Assistant Director of the Bachelor of Liberal Studies Degree Program to be members since they attend all meetings and present reports on BLS transfers and special majors.
University Budget Advisory Committee	7 faculty (1/college, 4 at large)  Non-voting: 1 AHPE, 3 USC, 1 SGA	Consider options for streamlining: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Are 4 at-large faculty representatives needed? Would 2 or 3 be sufficient?</li> <li>• Are 3 USC representatives needed? Would 2 be sufficient?</li> </ul> Consider if clarifications of charge .4 are needed to accurately reflect requirements of §4.  Additionally, UBAC proposed to dissolve itself in Spring 2024, so this committee should be consulted about its charge, duties, and what structures would better support them. (Note

Committee	Current Structure	Recommended Structure & Other Considerations
		that UBAC has an important charge for action in situations of financial exigency and therefore complete dissolution would possibly be inadvisable.)
Distance and Blended Learning Committee	<p>5 faculty (at large)</p> <p>Chief Information Officer, VP for Student Affairs, University Librarian, Director of DLS, Director of Center for Teaching</p>	<p>Consider merging with the current Digital Intensive Committee to form a new committee that maintains 5 total faculty members and merges their revised charges. Specifically reconsider the procedures for approving online courses to meet SACSCOC regulations while also streamlining this committee’s workload (see designation data table below for evidence of disproportionately high numbers of proposals compared to other advisory committees). Charges .1 and .3 seem to overlap.</p> <p>Consider the following request from the DBL Committee to UFOC in 2019-2020: add as ex officio the Director of Disability Resources (or perhaps the Assistive Technology Coordinator or another designee) to provide input regarding online accommodations. As an advisory committee, clarify what unit this committee advises.</p> <p>DBL proposed the possibility in Spring 2024 of dissolving in the future, so this committee should also be consulted about its charge, duties, and what structures would better support them.</p>
First Year Seminar Committee	<p>5 faculty (at large)</p> <p>Ex officio: Representative from the Office of the Provost</p>	<p>Option 1: Reduce membership to 3 faculty. Option 2: Maintain 5 faculty and merge with the General Education Committee.</p> <p>The Director of the First Year Experience should be added as the ex officio member in place of the representative from the Office of the Provost. (This is being proposed in the Round 1 <i>Handbook</i> revisions.)</p>



Committee	Current Structure	Recommended Structure & Other Considerations
		As an advisory committee, clarify what unit this committee advises.
Honors Program Committee	5 faculty (at large), Director of the Honors Program	Maintain 5 faculty.  Kelli Slunt (current Director of the Honors Program) has requested that she be shifted to an ex officio role and that the Associate Directors be added as ex officio members. (This is being proposed in the Round 1 <i>Handbook</i> revisions.)
James Farmer Multicultural Center Advisory Committee	5 faculty (at large)  Ex officio: Director of JFMC, USC representative, 2 students	Option 1: Maintain 5 faculty. Option 2: Reduce to 3 faculty members. Option 3: Consider reframing JFMC Advisory Committee to have a wider focus on UMW ASPIRE values. Consult with Marion Sanford and Shavonne Shorter about if this would be a good fit for UMW vision and mission.
Journalism Advisory Committee	4 faculty (at large); at least 3 must be tenured, preferably full; optional external member  Ex officio: VP for Student Affairs, Faculty Advisor to Weekly Ringer	<b>Reduce to 3</b> faculty members.  Consider if charge .4 is necessary, or if it is redundant with .5.
Speaking Intensive Committee	5 faculty (at large), Faculty Director of SI Program  Ex officio: Director of Speaking and Writing Center	Option 1: Combine with WI Committee (5 total members). Option 2: Combine with WI and DI Committee (if not combined with DBL).  Clarify if Faculty Director of SI Program should be a voting or ex officio member.  As an advisory committee, clarify what unit this committee advises.

Committee	Current Structure	Recommended Structure & Other Considerations
Student Affairs and Campus Life Advisory Committee	5 faculty (at large)  Ex officio: VP for Student Affairs, 2 student members (Fred/Stafford campuses)	<b>Reduce to 3</b> faculty members.  Revisit the 2 student representatives from the Fredericksburg and Stafford campuses. Should there be one undergraduate and one graduate representative, two general representatives, or another configuration?
Writing Intensive Committee	5 faculty (at large),  Ex officio: Director of Speaking and Writing Center	Option 1: Combine with SI Committee (5 total members). Option 2: Combine with SI and DI Committee (if not combined with DBL).  As an advisory committee, clarify what unit this committee advises.
Digital Intensive Committee	3 faculty (at large)  Ex officio: University Librarian, Director of DLS	Consider merging with the current DBL Committee to form a new committee that maintains 5 total faculty members and merges their revised charges.  As an advisory committee, clarify what unit this committee advises.

**Designation Proposal Data, Fall 2021-Spring 2024**

Committee	Fall 2021	Spring 2022	Fall 2022	Spring 2023	Fall 2023	Spring 2024
DBL	82 (including 14 emergency)	67	47	21	16	57
DI	8	4	6	3	4	2
FSEM	5	6	9	7	9	8
GE	13	10	17	8	5	7
HN	2	5	0	8	19	7
SI	6	5	13	5	1	2
WI	5	4	4	2	1	4

\*Note: This reports ALL activity, which could include proposals that were rolled back and never finalized.

# Appendix C: Considerations for Streamlining the Curriculum Approval Process

For the past several years, requests have been made for streamlining the curriculum approval process. Considerations for taking such action are outlined below, based on initial conversations with the UMW Registrar. Continuing the recommendation of the UFOC report in 2023, the *Faculty Handbook* Working Group recommends that UCC collaborate with the Registrars and Provost to investigate options and implications in more depth.

Within the scope of the *Faculty Handbook*, the most direct impact of altering the curriculum approval process would be the composition and charge of UCC. According to §2.3.2.6 (university committees), proposals for new University-wide *standing* committees, or elimination of current *standing* committees, must be developed in consultation with each college’s governing bodies. Such proposals must be approved by majority votes of the faculties of each college, through procedures to be determined in each college, before being submitted for approval as revisions to the University Faculty Handbook.

Helpful resources include UMW’s [current process](#) (includes a link to the Statement on Shared Curriculum Governance) and the [CIM User Guide](#) (includes appendices with specific workflows in the appendices). Overall, the workflow considers to whom the various committees “answer.” College-level curriculum committees report to college governance; UCC reports to UFC. One exception is in CAS Faculty Council, which recently voted not to approve CAS curriculum proposals. Instead, CAS curriculum proposals go directly from the CAS Curriculum Committee to UCC.

<p><b>Model 1: Maintain college and university-level curriculum committees, but add more actions to the expedited list.</b></p>	<p><b>Model 2: Remove college-level curriculum committees.</b></p>
<p>Current expedited actions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Change to a course’s number</li> <li>• Change to a course’s title<sup>[L]</sup><sub>[SEP]</sub></li> <li>• Change to a course’s catalog description<sup>[L]</sup><sub>[SEP]</sub></li> <li>• Change to a course’s prerequisites</li> <li>• Cross-list a course at the same level<sup>[L]</sup><sub>[SEP]</sub></li> <li>• Inactivate a course</li> </ul>	<p>Possible UCC faculty composition:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• CAS: 4 reps (1 per school) OR 2 reps (1 rep for 2 schools)</li> <li>• COE&amp;H: 1-2 reps</li> <li>• COB&amp;CS: 1-2 reps</li> <li>• [Instead of UFC rep, ask that one UCC member attend UFC meetings until their minutes/action items are approved to be able to answer any questions.]</li> </ul>

Pros:

- Would reduce duplications in committees
- Would lessen number of curriculum-focused service roles currently required with 3 college committees
- Would align with reorganization's goal to increase interdisciplinarity

Cons:

- Reduces one feedback level (in the past, UCC has caught mistakes that the college-level committees did not)
- What happens to the work that currently occurs in college-level curriculum committees? This work still needs to be done and might be beyond the scope/interest of a single university-level committee, which would result in ongoing service in less recognized roles.
- Might be an overwhelming amount of work at one combined university level
- Expedited proposals currently only go to college-level curriculum committees, so there would need to be a new workflow for expedited (if possible at all in this system).
- If each CAS school needs a rep, be aware of burdens on smaller schools (i.e., Arts).

Next Steps:

- Is taking a vote at UFC meetings necessary? (Right now this is done because UCC reports to UFC.)

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• How can we balance streamlining the process while also maintaining levels of feedback/checks?</li><li>• Consider when to move Registrar's check in the process.</li><li>• Could we somehow utilize college-focused subcommittees of UCC that report only to UFC and not college structures?</li></ul>
--	---

## Appendix D: Possible Configurations of Promotion and Tenure Process

Based on current plans for academic organization as well as the Faculty Handbook Working Group’s inquiry into similar COPLAC and Virginia institutions, the following models are recommendations for UFAC to investigate for adaptation and/or implementation. The final recommendation based on the models presented below should be made to UFC at its October 2024 meeting.

Depending on the model recommended, next steps will vary. If college-level promotion and tenure committees remain, then UFAC would oversee changes to the college-level committees to bring them into alignment with the updated *Handbook* and Academic Affairs organization. If a university-level committee is recommended, this would become a new University standing committee. According to §2.3.2.6 (university committees), proposals for new University-wide *standing* committees, or elimination of current *standing* committees, must be developed in consultation with each college’s governing bodies. Such proposals must be approved by majority votes of the faculties of each college, through procedures to be determined in each college, before being submitted for approval as revisions to the University Faculty Handbook.

If UFAC proposes any additional modifications to §§6 and/or 7, as specified in §1.12, §§1-7 generally require recommendations from either the UFC (approved by a majority vote of UFC members), the President, or a vote of the general faculty (“if reconsidering an action on an amendment that was passed by the UFC and voted on but not approved by the faculties in the colleges as stipulated in §§2.3.2.4 [UFC] and 2.3.2.6 [University standing committees]”). Legal counsel will also review the proposed changes, and the BOV will vote to adopt proposed changes before they become final.

<b>Model 1: Maintain current 3-college structure.</b>	<b>Model 2: Consolidate into one university-wide P&amp;T committee.</b>
<p>Pros:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Least “disruptive” of status quo.</li> <li>• A few survey responses strongly support this model.</li> </ul> <p>Cons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Adjustments of college P&amp;T would still need to be made in COE and COB, as</li> </ul>	<p>Pros:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Would reduce redundancies in committee structures.</li> <li>• CAS already reviews cross-discipline dossiers.</li> <li>• Adjustments of college P&amp;T would need to be made anyway in COE and</li> </ul>

now their units will include other units formerly within CAS.

- Would impact COE/COB the most.

Next Steps if Chosen:

- Modify P&T procedures/criteria in COE & COB to be more inclusive of new units.
- COB/COE would have the most impact, but are smaller units. Consider how to equitably consider feedback requests.
- Would a university-level check/appeal in cases of disagreement be needed? Separate committee or combine with University Faculty Appeals & Grievance?

COB, as now their units will include other units formerly within CAS.

- Most survey responses support this model.

Cons:

- Would impact COE/COB the most.
- Would be the most disruptive model to the status quo.

Next Steps:

- Consider how to equitably staff combined P&T committee. 1 representative per school (CAS) or college (COE and COB)? Break into sub-committees and assure candidates that one reviewer will be from their school/college?
- Possible structures: 6 (1/unit, but even number; however, small number of individuals to consider large # of files); 12 (2/unit, but still even number); **9 (1/unit, 3 at large)**. Note: If Business expands into two schools, that would increase these numbers accordingly.
- Consider that to be on P&T committee, must be tenured. In new COE&HS, only education faculty are currently eligible for tenure, which again puts undue burden on education.
- Rewrite P&T criteria/rubrics for all three colleges to be more specific (CAS) and more inclusive (COE/COB).
- COB/COE would have the most impact, but are smaller units.

	<p>Consider how to equitably consider feedback requests.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Process at other schools: individual --&gt; department --&gt;school (if applicable)--&gt;university</li> <li>• If at the department level, how would this work in smaller departments with low numbers of tenured people?</li> <li>• Would single committee still report recommendations to relevant college dean?</li> </ul>
<p><b>Model 3: Department-Level Committee</b></p> <p>Pros:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Department has most insights about candidate’s performance and whether they have met expectations.</li> <li>• Would eliminate both college and university-level P&amp;T committee.</li> <li>• Workload would be lighter/more distributed.</li> </ul> <p>Cons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Regulation of all departmental plans/procedures would be a logistical nightmare. Most schools that do this have a separate Personnel Policy Committee that reviews these.</li> <li>• Would require localized peer review committees for every department (could be challenging for smaller departments; would need to bring in external tenured individuals at times).</li> </ul> <p>Next Steps if Chosen:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Would a university-level check/appeal in cases of disagreement be needed? Separate committee or combine with</li> </ul>	<p><b>Model 4: Combination of Committees (i.e., Department + University)</b></p> <p>Pros:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Double level is thorough.</li> </ul> <p>Cons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Does not streamline. Instead, work in university committee only “as needed” (i.e., disagreement in committee/Dean).</li> </ul> <p>Next Steps if Chosen:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Faculty Handbook Working Group did not think this model would meet UMW’s needs but wanted to share it as an option that some institutions utilize. If there is interest, implementation considerations would need to be developed.</li> </ul>



University Faculty Appeals & Grievance (i.e., TCNJ)?

- Would need to institute procedures for small departments to ensure a minimum size for departmental committees (several of the schools we looked at had procedures for this)
- What happens to peer letters, if those peers are now likely on the committee? Would this privilege large departments who have enough people to separately write letters and be on the committee? Perhaps # within university (could be department peers), # external to university.
- Consideration of how to standardize expectations if locally decided.

# Appendix E: UFAC Guidelines for the Formal Investigation of Violations of University Policy

\*This document describes the implementation of the requirements presented in UMW Faculty Handbook Section 4.4

## **General Notes about the investigation procedure:**

1. Before evidence is reviewed by the UFAC, the administration and the accused faculty member will be given an opportunity to challenge the makeup of the committee according to Section 4.4.1.
2. The UFAC should identify several key dates.
  - a) Deadline for challenges (committee agreed that 7 days for administration and accused faculty member to decide is appropriate)
  - b) When a pre-hearing meeting should take place (only one committee member is required, more desired if possible) to discuss our ground rules. Both the administration and accused faculty member must be present at the meeting with the UFAC representative(s).
  - c) When all evidence needs to be presented to all parties (administration, accused, committee). There could be a different date for witness list and evidence.
  - d) Date of the hearing. For the 20 days pre-notice, the UFAC should ignore the dates the University is closed for breaks, but could work during J-Term.
3. Documentation is required: The UFAC will need to document all emails sent regarding this investigation and all notes taken by committee members will be entered into the record of the case.
4. At the pre-hearing meeting, the UFAC representative(s) will review the charges and give the accused faculty member an opportunity to agree or disagree with the charges. The purpose of this meeting will be (1) simplify the issues, (2) effect stipulations of facts, (3) provide for the exchange of documentary or other information, and (4) achieve such other appropriate pre-hearing objectives as will make the hearing fair, effective, and expeditious. (UMWFH Section 4.4.2) Note: the accused faculty member has the right to waive the hearing and may respond to the charges in writing at any time before the hearing (FH Section 4.4.3).
5. A one-drive folder will be created that only UFAC members, the administration, and the accused faculty member would have access to. Only the UFAC chair will have edit rights; other participants would have read rights only. This folder will be used to house all evidence and both the administration and accused faculty member are responsible for sending said evidence to the UFAC chair for inclusion into the folder. It is the responsibility of the administration and

accused faculty member to verify that all evidence exhibits they wish included are in the folder by the closing date for new evidence.

6. Both the administration and accused faculty member will be responsible for creating a document containing their witness lists and list of evidence exhibits. The list of evidence exhibits must include where to look for specific evidence. (e.g., If a syllabus is evidence, the page and section title of the specific part of the syllabus that supports the case being presented must be indicated)

### **Procedures for Hearings:**

1. When an in-person hearing is not possible (e.g., during a global pandemic), the hearing will be conducted by Zoom and will be recorded to the cloud. The decision as to whether the hearing is open to the public or private, belongs to the accused faculty member. This topic could be discussed at the pre-hearing meeting.

2. The hearing will be scheduled for 3 hours. During the hearing, the administration and accused faculty member will each have 60 minutes to present their entire case. After both sides have presented their cases, the UFAC will dismiss them for up to 30 minutes and then rejoin to see if the committee has any additional fact-finding or clarifying questions for the two sides before ending their participation.

3. After or in the days immediately following the hearing, the UFAC will deliberate to render their formal finding based upon the evidence admitted at the hearing or hearings; the formal finding shall be based solely upon the evidence provided to the UFAC and upon the information provided during the hearing. The formal finding shall be issued in writing.

4. The procedures for the hearing are as follows:

- a) When the hearing is convened, all those in attendance introduce themselves by their name and their role in the hearing.
- b) The Hearing Chair reminds all present about adherence to the UMW Faculty Handbook and the standard of evidence used, which is clear and convincing evidence.
- c) The Hearing Chair reads the charges to the accused faculty member who pleads "Responsible" or "Not Responsible" after each charge. (If the accused faculty member pleads "Responsible" to all charges, the hearing time may be used to determine the appropriateness of the suggested sanction. In that case, each side will be limited to 30 minutes to make their cases before the committee deliberates.)
- d) The administration then has 60 minutes to present their case. If the administration chooses to call witnesses, the administration questions each witness first followed by the accused faculty member. The UFAC is then allowed to ask clarifying or fact-finding questions only.

- e) The accused faculty member then has 60 minutes to present their case. If the accused faculty member chooses to call witnesses, the accused faculty member questions each witness first followed by the administration. The UFAC is then allowed to ask clarifying or fact-finding questions only.
- f) The Hearing Chair will dismiss all participants for up to 30 minutes and then rejoin to see if the committee has any additional fact-finding or clarifying questions for the two sides before ending their participation.
- g) The Hearing Chair adjourns the hearing for deliberations of findings, and if the faculty member is found responsible, deliberations of sanctioning, in the days immediately following the hearing.