

University Faculty Council Meeting Minutes

January 22, 2025

3:30pm Hurley Convergence Center

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

Guests: Tim O'Donnell (Provost), Keith Mellinger (Dean CAS), Pete Kelly (Dean COE), Miriam Liss (Chair UFAC), Jessica Zeitz (UFAC), Will Thompson (SGA Chair)

1. Before the meeting was called to order, one proxy was announced. Davis Oldham is serving as April Wynn's proxy.
2. Call to Order
3. Approval of previous meeting minutes.
 - a. Motion: to approve the November UFC minutes.
 - i. Unanimously approved.
4. Reports
 - a. President's Report: President Paino reported that he recently met with key legislators and is feeling optimistic about funding for our priorities.

He also reported that things are going well in the student recruitment cycle. Applications are up by about 12%, but it is difficult to know if this is a result of increased interest or simply the ease of applying to multiple schools through the Common App.

And finally, President Paino shared that the following items are top of mind for him: running a public university within the current political environment, student recruitment and retention within the contracting student market (both in terms of the demographic cliff and the public perception of the value of higher education), the impact of technology (and AI specifically) on education and what these developments mean for us moving forward, the aging facilities of our campus and cost of maintenance, and finally whether our system structures are conducive to rapid adaptation to all the challenges mentioned above. President Paino expanded more on the state of our facilities, reporting that 12 elevators are currently not working across campus. They are looking into our maintenance contract for these and also our ability to keep these elevators operational, which is critically important for accessibility. Finally, President Paino thanked faculty for the work that they are doing related to the Handbook and repeated his open invitation for faculty groups (department or otherwise) to have conversations with him about their views of important issues facing UMW.

i. Questions:

1. Caitie Finlayson: At our organizing meeting for UFC at the beginning of the year, the UFC Chair asked our administrative guests to provide written reports in advance. I've noticed that those have been inconsistent throughout the year. I find them very helpful when they are submitted so that we can prepare questions for meetings. I am wondering if they could be a priority moving forward?
 - a. President Paino: I'm happy to re-commit to written reports.
 - b. Provost O'Donnell: I do want to add that while I appreciate this request, sometimes the best and newest information would not be available at the time that a report would be submitted. So that's a bit of a challenge.

2. Mara Scanlon: Can you say anything about how yesterday's decisions to close DEI offices in Federal agencies impacts UMW as a public university that gets some federal funding.
 - a. President Paino: Not at all as far as I'm aware. How it may impact us indirectly moving forward is unknown. Everyone at UMW is a state employee so the closures and policy changes do not impact us even though we do get some federal money.
 - b. Provost's Report: Provost O'Donnell reported on the progress with the reorganization efforts. We are submitting proposals for two schools to SCHEV in February. We will learn from these responses before submitting proposals for additional schools.

Provost O'Donnell also reported on some recent changes to SCHEV processes. These were also reported on in the Nov UFC meeting. SCHEV is simplifying their process for approving new programs. The program proposals will use an online proposal and the program announcement step is no longer required. Once SCHEV has received a proposal, a staff member will verify that it is complete and then send it on to the council for further evaluation. Provost O'Donnell says in some ways this raises the bar to make sure that we have a very good first proposal. It also likely means that administrators may spend more time at State Council meetings answering questions about proposals that we put forward, but it should expedite new program approvals across the Commonwealth. Several departments and colleges have ideas for new programs that they would like to put forward, and we've been told that the State Council will review the new approach over the next months and we may be able to utilize it as early as March. Provost O'Donnell shared a second policy change related to program review. It's anticipated that additional staff resources and focus will be shifted to productivity review of programs and that SCHEV will be looking more frequently and more closely at the number of declared majors and graduates our degree programs have. We anticipate more frequent questions about what we intend to do to either boost productivity or improve or enhance or change particular programs. We will hear more about the new processes at upcoming meetings. They do intend to have a program productivity review next year. Provost O'Donnell reported that the work that we've done through the reorganization and work that departments are currently doing to examine some of their programs should position us well to have solid defenses of the programs that we have.

Finally, Provost O'Donnell followed up on the elevator situation and shared that some classroom exchanges are going to need to occur due to the elevator issues and accessibility. He is working with department chairs to find solutions in the next 24-48 hours. If you do encounter an elevator that isn't working, please contact the Provost's office so that we can respond quickly.

- i. Questions: No questions.
- c. College Dean Reports
 - i. Dean Mellinger's Report: The CAS searches are moving well. The Chemistry RTA search was successful. Computer Science has additional candidates interviewing for their tenure-track search and also has a new RTA position approved that is in early stages. Studio Art has a certified pool and anticipates bringing candidates later this month. Math is reviewing candidates for an RTA position. English is still working on a visiting position in Creative Writing. The Kinesiology position is the biggest challenge. The position only received 4 applicants and we will need to fail that search and rethink what we're doing with Biological Sciences. Biology will be pursuing some visitor positions next year.

In January, Dean Mellinger met with about 20 representatives from the humanities departments to strategize about some new program including a minor in public health, a minor in medical humanities, and talking about creating a new Center for Humanities.

1. Questions: No questions
- ii. Dean Tabak was at a conference and submitted a written report.
- iii. Dean Kelly submitted a written report. In addition, he announced that the College of Education will be piloting a four-day class schedule beginning in fall 2025. This change will address challenges they face in creating meaningful clinical experience for students who are preparing to be teachers and the accrediting bodies have been requesting this change. It will also help with challenges regarding transportation to clinical experiences. Students need to complete practicum experiences as a central part of the COE curriculum. Students in the Elementary Education major will have classes on Mon/Fri and Tues/Thurs in the 75-minute time band (8-9:15am and 2-3:15pm). Elementary Education majors will do their clinical experiences on Wednesdays.

1. Questions:

- a. Melina Patterson: So are you having 75-minute classes on Monday/Fridays?
 - i. Dean Kelly: Yes.
- b. Mara Scanlon: Is this secondary and elementary?
 - i. Jennifer Walker: This is primarily the Elementary Education majors. Students who are early in the major will have their education courses and gen eds on Tues/Thurs or on Mon/Friday during the 8-9:15 or 2-3:15 time blocks. So anyone in the secondary ed program or in the first phase of the Elementary Education major will have a “normal” university schedule. Once Elementary Education majors are in the second phase of their coursework, they will have classes exclusively on M/F and T/R.
- c. Mara Scanlon: Would they be able to take a regular course on T/R at 11:00?
 - i. Jennifer Walker: Yes.
 - ii. Jonathan Levin: The issue would be if they needed to take something MWF.
 - iii. Jennifer Walker: Yes. But most of the students in the later phases have completed all of their general education requirements and are only taking EDUC courses.
- d. Melina Patterson: And are those students primarily juniors and seniors?
 - i. Jennifer Walker: By the time they are in phase 3 and 4, we are talking about juniors and seniors. They finish all of their gen eds by then. By then, they're only in our courses for elementary. We pulled a number of current student schedules including transfer students and the schedule worked for everyone that we tried.
- e. Melina Patterson: I'm just so glad that it turned out it was possible. Because we've always been told that it's not possible and it turns out that it is possible.
 - i. Jennifer Walker: Well, we're using the word pilot, so we will keep you posted. Perhaps if all buildings were open across campus, this could be a larger discussion.

- iv. SGA Representative's Report: Will Thompson, SGA Chair, shared that he and several other SGA members met with Facilities Management to conduct a safety walk on campus to identify areas that could benefit from updated safety measures such as guardrails and walkway signage. Due to city and state regulations and permits, these projects will take some time.

SGA also partnered with Eagles in Recovery and UMW Sustainability to assist in their important missions. They were able to assist in the free, on-campus NARCAN training and also assisted in removing several invasive trees around campus.

In April, students are looking forward to another ASPIRE Week, a campus-wide event celebrating the values and standards of UMW. They are also hoping to run an inclusive Disability Superpower Soccer event with Special Olympics. And they are hoping to partner with Mary Washington Hospital and the Rappahannock Area Service Board to expand the number of free medical training opportunities that we can offer at UMW. If anyone is interested in volunteering or is aware of useful connections to make these events possible, please let Will know.

Will shared that some students are experiencing issues in payment due to FAFSA issues. SGA is hopeful that there can be more transparency with the Financial Aid Office and Student Accounts in helping students with issues related to payment. SGA requests that faculty be understanding and provide a grace period for students who may be dropped from a course for late payment or other miscommunication with the financial offices.

1. Questions:

- a. Caitie Finlayson: I want to make sure that I understand the problem so that we can address it well as faculty. Students are getting dropped from classes because of payment issues and then they're asking to re-add the same course/s.
- b. Will Thompson: Yes, and it can cause a lot of unnecessary stress.
- c. Miriam Liss: Is there a day when these drops occur? We could probably manage it if we knew when to expect it. It's challenging to re-add a student if someone else has claimed the seat but if faculty or chairs knew that the dropped student was working on the issue, then they may be able to work with the Registrar's Office to hold the seat or reduce the enrollment cap.
- d. Provost O'Donnell: I have a few things to add related to this issue. We started a policy several years ago because there were so many students that hadn't paid at the start of the semester and all too often, those students went to collections. And all too often, they were students who enrolled in classes but never intended to come here. Once they go to collections, there's very little that we can do to work with them. The state becomes involved and their credit history is damaged. With this new policy, there are a number of people, offices, and units that work collectively during the three weeks leading up to the first week of classes to identify payment issues. Multiple eyes, serious scrutiny, several outreach attempts from multiple individuals and offices occur before a student is dropped. I think there were only 9 students affected this past semester. I looked at the result and there were a couple that were caught who otherwise wouldn't have been, so they were spared of going to collections and having the damage to their credit history. The others were able to get back into classes or find alternate courses, in part, I think because of flexibility and compassion. The number of students impacted is a very small number and the advantages of this approach, while onerous on all of us,

outweigh the small disadvantages. Provost O'Donnell recommended that they could consider additional steps to look at the schedules and notify chairs before the schedule is cleared.

- v. USC Representative's Report: No report.
 - vi. UFC Chair's Report: No report.
 - vii. UFC Vice-Chair's Report: No report
 - viii. Faculty Senate of Virginia's Report: Patricia Orozco reported that they are following up on a bill HB 1621 which says a non-voting faculty representative should be part of the Board of Visitors for each public institution.
 - 1. Questions:
 - a. Davis Oldham: Did anyone from UMW sign up to go to the Virginia Advocacy Day?
 - b. Patricia Orozco: Not that I know of.
- d. University Committee Minutes
- i. Comments:
 - 1. Christy Irish: The General Education Committee includes names and student IDs and those need to be redacted from their minutes.
 - 2. Davis Oldham: I will follow up and make sure that happens.
 - ii. Motion: To approve all of the committee minute with the noted redaction.
 - 1. Unanimously approved
- e. Unfinished Business
- i. Changes to the composition of UFC: Davis Oldham sent email this morning stating that all three college bodies agreed to the changes to section 2.3.4 related to the new governance model. We now have a senate model, where some departments can send two representatives. He thanked faculty who attended additional meetings in the fall and those who provided feedback that led to this agreement.
 - 1. Discussion:
 - a. Christy Irish: There are additional places in subsections of section 2.3.4 that also require changes to be consistent with the new governance model. These also need to be voted on and approved by all three colleges individually. The College of Education has a list of modifications that they will share in a few days (they are on someone's computer and they are at a conference). The UFC can change sections 2.3.5 and subsections of that and other parts of the Handbook without voting by individual college.
 - b. Melina Patterson: So if those subsections don't change, the Handbook will say that senate representatives need to be selected by procedures determined by their governing bodies and that we need UFOC to run elections for those positions?
 - c. Davis Oldham: Yes, but there's no reason to have the UFOC involved if the decision is at the department level. And also the section on temporary membership needs language changes because the current language doesn't fit with the new structure.
 - d. Caitie Finlayson: So what is our actual deadline for having these changes approved?

- e. Davis Oldham: We have up to the March UFC meeting. We have an April UFC meeting but that occurs after the April BOV meeting.
- f. Caitie Finlayson: So can we vote on it next month? It sounds like the colleges each have to vote individually on these subsections.
- g. Melina Patterson: I'm wondering if we need any of these sections. We've been told our handbook is longer than everyone else and that we go into detail in ways other schools don't. Could the colleges vote on getting rid of those subsections and that level of detail?
- h. Mindy Erchull: I'll argue that saying how we staff the positions is actually very important. There needs to be some standards related to the dates where departments are required to notify UFC of their representative because if you're on UFC, you can't also be on a standing committee.
- i. Melina Patterson: Is there a reason you can't be on a standing committee if you're on UFC?
- j. Mindy Erchull: Yes, because UFC is oversight on the committees.
- k. Mindy Erchull: If we're talking timing, a lot of this could take a week, right?
- l. Davis Oldham: Yes. It doesn't have to take a month.
- m. Jonathan Levin: Tim, what are our restrictions relative to the Handbook?
- n. Provost O'Donnell: Historically, the BOV adopts changes to the Handbook as last meeting, which is in April. This means that we're obligated to have all meeting materials to them on March 27. So all major updates need to be made by then. If there were a tweak here or there, they might be willing to consider that at one of their meetings in May or June. However, the May and June meetings would not be the appropriate place to introduce lengthy changes.
- o. Jonathan Levin: Just a follow up. Is that when they're going to consider all the other Handbook changes (in March)?
- p. Provost O'Donnell: Yes, unless there's a decision to bring some of the cosmetic changes forward in February.
- q. Jennifer Walker: We are texting with Melissa Wells from the Handbook committee. She says the rule preventing serving on both UFC and a standing committee has only been a CAS rule.
- r. Davis Oldham: I would generally defer to Melissa on a Handbook question, but I think if the rule about the standing committees only applied to CAS, it would have to be in the appendix not the Handbook. I don't think the rule is in the appendix. I think that we just recognize that if we didn't override that rule, then we wouldn't be able to include COB and COE staff on committee. Assuming my understanding is correct, then we need to reach out to the three college governing bodies to do a vote on the subsections of section 2.3.4. Are we all on the same page about that?
- s. Kim Kinsley: Are we going to have time to include this item on the UFC agenda next month? I don't think it's very controversial.
- t. Davis Oldham: UFC could discuss and approve it next month, but that isn't required since it has to be approved by the three colleges rather than UFC. So I'll send this out to the chairs of those three groups very soon, people can talk about it in your next college meeting and report back about whether it's approved. I know COE has some suggestions to the wording, so if Christy could get me that soon, that would be

helpful. If anyone else has wordsmithing suggestions or feedback in general, please send it now.

- u. Christy Irish: Melissa is at a conference and will be back tomorrow. I'll send you what we have. Also Melissa confirmed that the standing committee/UFC rule is in the CAS appendix only.
- v. Melina Patterson: I think that could be removed. I also don't know why we have terms of service.
- w. Christy Irish: COE would argue that terms of service are important.
- x. Melina Patterson: And you think it's important for the entire university and not just your department?
- y. Christy Irish: I think so. It prevents one person from having to serve on UFC every year and also gives other people a chance to be selected by their department.
- z. Davis Oldham: From the perspective of the UFC Chair, it is helpful to have people who have served on UFC in the previous year for continuity because some business spills over from year to year. A staggered cohort brings a mix of people who are familiar with the previous year's business and people with fresh ideas. I think term limits will assist in creating a staggered cohort.
- aa. Janine Davis: Are we starting the staggered cohorts next year? Will everyone be starting their term over next year.
- bb. Davis Oldham: I don't know how to formalize that.
- cc. Mindy Erchull: I think the terms being 2 or 3 years will already give departments flexibility.
- dd. Karen Anewalt: But the terms aren't going to be neat and tidy. People are going to have sabbatical and other leaves. So why even have the term limit?
- ee. Melina Patterson: I keep going back to Tim saying our handbook is longer than any other university's handbook. And I feel like instead of trying to figure out these details, we could just not include them and let departments figure it out in a way that makes sense for them.
- ff. Mindy Erchull: If we have a goal of streamlining the handbook, I think that's almost a separate endeavor because you can't streamline just the part about the UFC and not the parts about other committees. The Handbook Committee has already done a lot of work. If we try to modify what they've already done, we're making everyone's lives harder because we're against a deadline. Streamlining could be a task for a different summer or year.
- gg. Davis Oldham: I agree with Mindy's point. The more we can agree on this year, the better. I tried to identify all the places in which making the one change precipitated another in the subsections of 2.3.4. These others are new ideas that came from the discussion between UFC Executive Committee and representatives from COB and COE. One example is the idea that if any college doesn't have a member who is a past/present officer making them part of the UFC Executive committee, they can send someone to the UFC Executive Committee meetings. I think the power of that group is perhaps over-estimated but representation is very important.
- hh. Jennifer Walker: So where did we land relative to the sections of 2.3.4?
- ii. Davis Oldham: I didn't hear any objections to doing another vote for the three faculty governance structures of all of the subsections that

start at section 2.4.3. So COE and COB can vote at their next college meeting and report back to me. CAS can do this either by having CAS-FC vote or having a full CAS faculty vote.

- jj. Mindy Erchull: Am I remembering correctly that these ideas have already been communicated to faculty?
- kk. Davis Oldham: That's correct. And Christy is going to send me the updated wording from Melissa Wells tomorrow.
- ll. Alex Dunn: So then do we have to agree on all of those changes before our college votes?
- mm. Davis Oldham: UFC could vote on this but there's no need to because it's not binding. So we're just sending it to the colleges and they'll report back yes or no.
- nn. Karen Anewalt: But what happens if one votes no?
- oo. Alex Dunn: Right, what if we get Christy's update and then someone disagrees with that wording. What's the next step?
- pp. Mindy Erchull: So technically, the college bodies vote and it needs to be aligned.
- qq. Jonathan Levin: If you get the email tomorrow and you have an objection, raise it then.
- rr. Davis Oldham: Yes, if you see something that your college would object to, please let me know because perhaps we as UFC can tweak the wording over email to make it not objectionable.
- ss. Davis Oldham: Back to the sections that start with 2.3.5. This is something that UFC can vote on or that we can decide to have an all faculty vote on, depending on whether people heard strong opinions on this point (adding a representative to the UFC Executive Committee if a college doesn't have representation in the group).
- tt. Jonathan Levin: I haven't heard this as a topic of discussion among anyone.
- uu. Mindy Erchull: That idea was included in the information that went out to all of CAS.
- vv. Davis Oldham: The last change was added by April. This is in the appendix to be consistent. If there's no concerns, we can vote to approve the changes to section 2.3.5 and L11.
- ww. Mindy Erchull: Is the intent for L11 to stay where it is in the Appendix or to bring it into section 2?
- xx. Davis Oldham: Stay where it is in the appendix.
- yy. Motion: To accept these changes to the Handbook with the understanding that the last one is in Appendix L.
 - i. Approved unanimously

f. New Business - University Committee Action Items

i. University Curriculum Committee

1. Discussion:

- a. Mara Scanlon: In item bb, it reads "Undergraduate Education Initial Licensure – add elective and ?" What does the question mark mean?
- b. Janine Davis: COE requested a small change where an elective in teaching English and theatre arts was counted in the Initial Licensure Program for English but not for Theatre Licensure Program and we changed it to count for both.
- c. Mara Scanlon: So can we assume that anything we approve will include the information in place of the question mark?

- d. Davis Oldham: Yes.
 - e. Mara Scanlon: It would have to come from the Curriculum Committee as a correction to their minutes. As a separate issue, did we hear today that we're not hiring anyone in Kinesiology, but we're still approving a new program?
 - f. Dean Mellinger: This is actually not a new degree program, it's a new major in an existing degree program. Kinesiology will be a major in the BS in Biology degree program. So we can approve this new major and if we don't have the appropriate staff, then we won't announce it/list it in the catalog.
 - g. Davis Oldham: Do I still need to approve it in CIM?
 - h. Dean Mellinger: Yes. We can still approve this program and just not advertise it until we have the appropriate staff.
- 2. Motion: To approve all action items from the University Curriculum Committee.
 - a. Approved unanimously.
- ii. University General Education Committee
 - 1. Questions: None
 - 2. Motion: To approve all action items from the University General Education Committee.
 - a. Approved unanimously
- iii. Distance & Blended Learning Committee
 - 1. Questions: None
 - 2. Motion: To approve all action items from the University Distance and Blended Learning Committee.
 - a. Approved unanimously
- iv. First Year Seminar Committee
 - 1. Questions: None
 - 2. Motion: To approve all action items from the First Year Seminar Committee.
 - a. Approved unanimously
- v. University Faculty Affairs Committee
 - 1. The UFAC brought a two part proposal. One is to create a single University Promotion and Tenure Committee of 9 members. The wording for this approval process is little different than what we saw with the changes to section 2.4.3. Section 2.3.2.6 says that proposals for a new university-wide standing committee has to be developed in consultation with each college's governing body and these proposals are submitted to the faculty. Then they need to be approved by a majority vote of the faculty of each college. The wording is different but the process is effectively the same.

Once the change is approved, we will need to do some additional work to change impacted sections of the Handbook. I'll let the representatives from Faculty Affairs explain where we are now.
 - 2. Miriam Liss (Chair, University Faculty Affairs): We have met since the minutes were submitted. We do realize that section B is not fleshed out in a sophisticated way. We felt that it was premature to write that given that the decision in section A was not unanimous. It was a majority vote with a very strong objection from the College of Business. This made us doubtful that it would pass all three

colleges and so creating a draft of section 7 for a university-level Promotion and Tenure Committee did not make sense.

At our last meeting, we talked about what next steps could be. One option is for UFC to say we could put this concept for a single committee to a vote of all three colleges and see where we are. A second option is for UFC to ask us to write more details for section 7 and potentially have more conversations to build consensus in the same way that the governing bodies did.

If this doesn't get approved by all three governing bodies, then the three college-level Promotion and Tenure committees would continue and would need to amend their appendices to deal with the new units coming under their domains.

3. Discussion:

- a. Mindy Erchull: Even CAS will need to make modifications to the appendix to reflect the new school structure.
- b. Melina Patterson: Except we don't have a new school structure.
- c. Miriam Liss: The criteria and process would likely be very similar but perhaps some of the wording of school verses college or department would be different. The committee is feeling at an impasse.
- d. Jessica Zeitz: I'll add that in the conversations that we had, I and I believe other committee members had a lot of trouble pinning down exactly what the concerns are. It's hard to solve a problem if no one can state what the problem is. But if we don't get a consensus, we're just kicking this problem down to the colleges because we're still going to have an interdisciplinary college-level committee because we are moving departments; we have to change the current systems. To me a university-level committee makes sense because we're supporting equity across the institution, we're lessening workload, and we're making things more open. We're agreeing on broad requirements. These might be satisfied in different ways by different departments, but we're all working toward the same goals: teaching, professional development, and service.
- e. Davis Oldham: This issue was discussed as part of the Handbook Committee. Did you start to look at this university level vs department level decision?
- f. Miriam Liss: Yes, this was a large part of our discussion. This is how the process works in CAS already. We have broad guidelines that are used across diverse departments who create output and achieve the goals in different ways. A Biology professor and a Studio Arts professor might have very different activities. And so those differences are contextualized in the candidates' files. The department explains what it means to meet those guidelines for your department. This is a fundamentally important role in the CAS process. Because there has been more uniformity in COB and COE, they haven't had to provide that context. We talked about how if we had just a single committee, those norms for each department could be a formalized document or they could be informal. That's something to be discussed. The point would be that departments have to have conversations about what the norms are for their department and department chairs would need to frame the candidate's activities using their departmental norms to show that they met the standards. And there's nothing about having a

single committee that prevents a department from having higher standards. For example in the case of AACSB, it would be expected for the Business department to explain the required standard and then the chair would indicate that the candidate met those standards. We'd expect every department to be able to articulate the standards and contextualize candidates in based on these standards. This is already happening in CAS.

- g. Davis Oldham: Just to play devil's advocate, could the process become so department-centric that there's no need for a university-level committee?
- h. Jessica Zeitz: It's about oversight. Your department is helping you create the file and writing the letters. So you don't want them to also be the people evaluating the file. In CAS now, different departments have different levels of oversight on colleagues' files during the pre-tenure process. So by having a single process and department norms for context, the process and goals becomes more transparent to everyone (the committee and the candidates).
- i. Miriam Liss: Oversight of department chair decisions is appropriate. You can imagine a situation with a non-sympatric department chair where there is conflict perhaps between the letters from the tenured department colleagues and perhaps the chair doesn't recommend for promotion. But the committee may take a different perspective because they are outside the department conflict. So committee and dean oversight are both important. We imagine that the decision will go from the university level committee, then the dean of the college, and then the provost.
- j. Melina Patterson: I'm concerned about what is going to happen to faculty in Computer Science and Math and Econ. How do they fit into the existing structure of the COB tenure process?
- k. Miriam Liss: As a committee, we don't know. I'd love to hear from COB on this. I can tell you what was stated in the UFAC meeting by the COB rep, which was just that "We will figure that out. They're going to come here and we'll have these conversations."
- l. Christy Irish: Do CAS and COB have different criteria for P&T?
- m. Karen Anewalt: COB requires specific publications while CAS is more flexible in types of activities that count for professional development.
- n. Christy Irish: That doesn't seem that difficult to reconcile.
- o. Jessica Zeitz: But if we're going to have to figure it out at the college level, then why not just figure it out at the university level and make it a more cohesive process across the university? It would be nice to have more of a conversation where people can state the items that they're unhappy about so that we can address them.
- p. Alex Dunn: Do you want us to answer the question about the differences?
- q. Melina Patterson: I just see this as troubling for those departments that are moving out of CAS.
- r. Alex Dunn: I haven't been privy to the conversations about how to integrate. But why is it troubling that COB has concerns about making a single university P&T level committee?
- s. Melina Patterson: Because what I'm hearing is that there are standards that the Department of Business does not want change and that cannot

be accommodated in a university-wide committee. But Computer Science has very different norms and understandings of the importance of publications and conference presentations. The CAS committee has a lot of experience working with these different expectations because the expectations for Computer Science and the expectations for Studio Art are really different. So when you serve on a CAS P&T committee, you have conversations about these differences, which is why I feel like a university-level committee can have these discussions. But I feel like the former College of Business is saying we know how this works and we want control over it. And that makes me worried for people who are moving into a college that doesn't have a name except for College of Business.

- t. Alex Dunn: That's not our fault that it doesn't have a name.
- u. Melina Patterson: I'm not mad at you. I'm mad about the entire process.
- v. Alex Dunn: The concerns being raised by the COB aren't motivated by trying to make it more difficult for anyone coming into the new college. I think we have questions similar to what Davis brought up. Are we going to have departmental criteria to explain to people outside our department what various publications mean, then why even have the committee? Also, in the COB we don't believe having a single committee will decrease workload. It's not that we're saying no because we want control or want to be problematic, but I think we have questions that have not yet been answered.
- w. Melina Patterson: That is what the P&T Committee does. They work to understand what the norm is for the candidates' departments. And if you have a college with more than one department, then you're going to have to explain your departmental and disciplinary norms, because people in Computer Science will be on the committee and are not going to know your norms. And I'm concerned that it's not something that seems fine. And I want to say that if this does not pass, I want to propose that Computer Science and Math can continue to go to the CAS P&T, because we've been able to evaluate their applications in the past, because we actually are okay with disciplines explaining their norms. And I'm just worried about them having to go to a committee that doesn't think that understanding how other disciplines work is part of their job.
- x. Alex Dunn: I understand but I don't think that one of our concerns.
- y. Miriam Liss: I apologize for making it sound like COB is being troublemakers. It did feel a little high-drama as it was happening. I understand that you're just trying to figure it out. Your comment about workload is valid. If you currently have a few people on a committee reading a few files, then moving to a university committee that reads more files will not be less work. I've served on the COB P&T committee. There were not that many files and it was not a super heavy lift. However, keeping things as-is is going to be a lot more work than you realize because you're going to have to change your whole appendices to accommodate these other units coming into your college. UFAC just met a few days ago and one thing we did discuss at our last meeting (so will be in the next set of minutes) was that for the faculty who are moving to a different college, it can be stressful to move away from a process that they have been working towards for

years. We talked about grandparenting people into the P&T standards for the year that they were hired and how long that grandparenting should be an option. This way, if we can't pass the university-level P&T in the three colleges, the faculty in the departments who are moving could at least feel some sense of security moving forward for at least a few good years. We talked about how they might be evaluated by the COB committee but using the CAS Handbook Appendices. Is that accurate?

- z. Provost O'Donnell: I think that's the discussion that you're having right now. When you're hired, you're given a set of standards that you work for six years, and those are the standards should apply.
- aa. Christy Irish: As this is written, COE would not approve this because we have questions about the first part. There are 9 committee members and we want to know if the 9 members are going to review every file or are you breaking into groups and reviewing a subset of the files?
- bb. Melina Patterson: That's the way the CAS committee traditionally works.
- cc. Jonathan Levin: As a former chair of the CAS P&T committee member, I can say that there is typically someone assigned to a file to shepherd it through the conversation and write the initial draft of the letter, but everyone on the committee participates on the basis of having reviewed each file.
- dd. Christy Irish: So we have concerns over that. That is not reducing our service load. And then also, number 4 says that letter writers in each department unit are responsible for interpreting the candidate's file. COE discussed that across the university, we're all doing things very differently, which maybe isn't good. We don't read the candidate's file before we write letters. We don't understand how other departments read the files and write the letters if the files are due on the 31st but the letters are due before the 31st.
- ee. Jonathan Levin: In my department, parts of the file are available July 1 and department members can review those before writing their letter.
- ff. Christy Irish: Okay, well that needs to be in writing somewhere because it reduces the candidate's time to create the file by a month.
- gg. Alex Dunn: Just like with the senate conversation, if we could have a full proposal to look at, it would be helpful because we don't do it this way and so how are we supposed to agree to the process even though we have a lot of questions. Maybe people in CAS know the information because it's what they're currently doing.
- hh. Christy Irish: Melissa Wells is on the UFAC and she said the committee discussions have contained conflicting information about questions like the ones just asked.
- ii. Jonathan Levin: There is some departmental variation.
- jj. Christy Irish: And a lot of this is off-contract time.
- kk. Karen Anewalt: I think it's premature to say that we have to use the CAS process in the new university-level P&T committee. If that's something that people are concerned about – reading all of the files or something about the timeline – I think the P&T Committee could discuss what makes sense and that we don't have to spell out how the committee works in the handbook. I did a term on CAS P&T around 2012 and then another around 2020 and we used a different process to review the files in 2020 than we did in 2012. And both processes were

effective. I think the CAS process has evolved in a way that makes sense and serves CAS well. But if adding additional files to the process raises concerns about workload, then some alternate process might make sense for a P&T Committee to adopt in that year with the extreme volume of files.

- ll. Davis Oldham: In my experience submitting files to CAS, there are things that we do well related to evaluating diverse fields but there's also flaws in our appendix. This is our opportunity to come up with something that works well, so I agree with Karen that the operation of a new university-level P&T Committee does not need to be the traditional operation of the CAS P&T Committee.
- mm. Janine Davis: In the interest of finding common ground, the teaching categories between CAS and COB are identical or nearly so. The service categories are almost the same. The biggest difference is in the professional development section. And then also I think not having every member of P&T committee read every file would help with some of our concerns. And we'd want to understand what we're signing up for before we agree to it.
- nn. Davis Oldham: So it sounds like we still have some unanswered questions. What is the best way to get those taken care of? Is it to send those questions to the UFAC? Or should I get a group of people together?
- oo. Jennifer Walker: I think this is kind of paralleling where we were before with the senate model and that really all we needed was time to talk and understand each other's processes, to get questions answered. Again, it's not that anybody's pushing back. It's just we need to all understand and we haven't had those conversations. So I don't know what that looks like. Maybe it looks like another group that talks again or we make more time at UFC. I would just rather have a conversation about it because that seems to be the most effective way.
- pp. Davis Oldham: So echoing one of the themes of the last meeting, that sometimes more meetings are necessary, this may involve another subset of UFC and representation from all three colleges getting together and probably the UFAC committee members.
- qq. Miriam Liss: Our committee felt like it was at a bit of an impasse, so we were not comfortable writing Section 7 and figuring out all the details; we just couldn't. We didn't have enough representation. We had one from education and one member from business in our committee. The COB member just kept saying that it would never happen and it just felt like there was no way forward. So I think we would be amenable to having more of these conversations. But I don't like a vision of UFAC, you take care of it and fix it and answer all questions because we need more people at the table if this is going to come to any kind of workable consensus. I think there's a way to get to a university committee that could work for everybody. But it also seemed from our committee conversations that we were not going to be able to do that. I also think our timeline is a little tight. I don't know that we're going to have revised handbook language for a Board meeting in April. I'm open to whatever people want to do. But I would request that you don't just send it back to UFAC and tell us to figure it out because what you have in front of you is the best we could do.

- rr. Davis Oldham: So would you be open to having either at a specific UFAC meeting with COE, CAS, and COB representatives or having a separate meeting with COB, COE, and CAS representatives?
- ss. Miriam Liss: As chair of UFAC, I'd be happy to go around to different colleges and have conversations and try to come to consensus.
- tt. Davis Oldham: It's going to have to be like last time, everybody together.
- uu. Christy Irish: If we could find a common time for something similar to the last group that we did and then invite anybody from UFAC that can come, that would be helpful. Maybe we try and talk about what our absolutes are like, our make or breaks. If each college could do that and then we come together and see if we can have a consensus again.
- vv. Davis Oldham: Yes, and I think that would also be a good time to make sure we have some of the lingering questions answered as well.
- ww. Alex Dunn: I just wanted to point out as we continue this discussion, I know that one thing that will not go over well in the College of Business is saying, we're going to figure it out year by year based on the volume of work. That is not going to be something like College of Business is going to want to see.
- xx. Mindy Erchull: The Handbook doesn't say how any committee runs. The committee decides how the committee runs. I don't think we can make an exception for P&T.
- yy. Elizabeth Johnson-Young: I don't know if I'm adding anything different, but two things. It seems like the conversation is going to benefit from having more people involved. And also if each college were to lay out what they typically do, look at, and what the process is, that might be helpful. I imagine that COB and COE are feeling forced into a CAS structure that they don't understand. And CAS is feeling the same way, especially departments that are going into another college. So without complete clarity, it just seems impossible. And then I would also say that maybe P&T is important enough that we should have a very strict structure on how the committee works.
- zz. Davis Oldham: Do people want me to kind of arrange something and then invite UFAC or is there a better way to kind of get that initial meeting set up to work out some questions?
- aaa. Melina Patterson: I feel like the last time this came up it was really useful when the Business faculty talked to Math and Computer Science faculty, and when Education faculty talked to Athletics and Nursing faculty about what they wanted in terms of representation. And I wonder if that's the meeting that needs to happen. Maybe it's too late for us to create a single standing university P&T committee for next year. And maybe what needs to happen is that faculty who are about to move into a different college with a different tenure process need to be brought into that discussion about what that looks like so they know what they're doing. My instinct is to say if you were hired under CAS, you get to go to CAS. But maybe there could be a discussion between faculty who will be in these department in these colleges, these unnamed colleges, so that they have some voice and even some idea about what that process looks like in other colleges.

- bbb. Davis Oldham: After all these discussions, it may be the case that maybe we do prefer having P&T at the college level. I think we want to make sure that we do what's best for everybody.
- ccc. Caitie Finlayson: I'm hopeful we can come to a consensus based on our conversation today. I appreciate you all sharing the questions and concerns you have. And similarly, it's helpful to know how the different colleges are run. I guess my concern is just if we don't create something, what happens? Is it possible that they can still be under CAS P&T? And mechanically, how does that happen?
- ddd. Miriam Liss: They can be evaluated with the CAS P&T guidelines for sure.
- eee. Caitie Finlayson: But then are they going to potentially be evaluated by a college where they have no representation on that P&T Committee? In CAS, we're used to having to frame our research for the committee. Hypothetically, you could have a geographer and a chemist going up for promotion, having to frame that for a committee where there's no chemistry, geographers evaluating us. And I'd like to think that someone from COB or COE could evaluate my application based on what I put forward. So my concern is just like, if we don't change this, like mechanically, what are our options?
- fff. Christy Irish: Within COE, when we've made changes to P&T, we have opted to give candidates a choice of what happens. So when we went from paper to electronic, they got the choice.
- ggg. Jonathan Levin: I feel like it's kind of late in the game for us to be thinking that this is a change that could be implemented for next year. So we should continue doing the work we're doing right now, but with the idea that we are going to allow candidates to go up under the system that they're under right now.
- hhh. Davis Oldham: I agree that it is just too late in the game. My question for Karen, COB, and COE, is would it be most helpful to have the discussion with Business, Math, Computer Science and Econ (and Athletics, Nursing and Education) first or would you rather jump to a larger group conversation with UFAC?
- iii. Jennifer Walker: Can we just set a date to have a discussion and get our questions answered? I don't think that anybody's pushing back. We just need information. If we set the date, then we can be responsible departments and get with the people who we'll be working with as good colleagues.
- jjj. Kim: I completely agree with Jonathan that I don't think we could do this well by the fall. We can bring these different perspectives back to our college. COB has a strategic group that meets with Filiz and representatives from departments that will be joining us and maybe they can start working on this.
- kkk. Miriam Liss: So what's the next step.
- lll. Davis Oldham: I'm going to work with representatives from UFC and all the different colleges. Then a more coherent document can come to UFAC in the next year.
- mmm. Miriam Liss: Do you want UFAC to be part of the discussions this spring?
- nnn. Davis Oldham: Yes, so that you can bring the benefit of discussions that you've already had. And also, you'll hear what some of the other concerns that have been raised are.

- ooo. Miriam Liss: During the UFAC discussions, we did reach out to all of our constituents. Melissa reached out to people in athletics and nursing to get their opinion. In CAS we were all unanimously hoping for a unified P&T committee.
- ppp. Mara Scanlon: I hope that in continuing these conversations, people can talk about what would it look like to reduce the workload for that committee. As Christy mentioned, I'm also concerned about the amount of work being asked of departments off-contract to put a candidate forward. I've talked to colleagues at other schools just casually and many say they aren't all required to write letters. I think there's a lot more to be discussed here that would affect what those files look like and what the workload is for everybody involved on the committee.
- qqq. Jonathan Levin: I think part of our challenge is the calendar. The calendar forces a lot of the workflow to happen in the summer. Maybe we could ease the calendar so that the file could spend a month in the department before moving forward to the rest of the committee.
- rrr. Miriam Liss: Representatives from the P&T committees should also be part of this discussion. I did feel like our conversations in UFAC were limited by the fact that nobody on UFAC had ever served on P&T. I think the people who are serving on P&T have a much clearer sense of the pitfalls and challenges and ways in which things could be improved across the board.
- sss. Davis Oldham: All right, so we'll get that meeting set up. We're going to have to table the changes to the committee structure. I would like to get those done this year, but the handbook won't fall apart if we don't approve them.
- ttt. Davis Oldham: Are there announcements? The only announcement I really have is that I'm starting an outline for a presentation that I have to give to the Board on advising. And I may reach out to people as I'm preparing.

5. Adjourn: 5:29pm